

Chapter 3

Document 2

Daniel Dulany, *Considerations on the Propriety of Imposing Taxes in the British Colonies* (1765)

The Stamp Act elicited a barrage of pamphlets from its colonial critics, of which Daniel Dulany's August 1765 contribution was by far the most influential.² A wealthy Marylander who had been educated at Cambridge University and the Inns of Court, Dulany denounced the Stamp Act on constitutional grounds. He rejected the idea that the colonies could have virtual representation in Parliament, arguing that the colonists' right to be taxed only by their own representatives was compatible with their dependence on and subordination to the king's government. In 1776, Dulany remained loyal to the Crown, unwilling to accept American independence.

In the constitution of England the three principal forms of government, monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, are blended together in certain proportions; but each of these orders, in the exercise of the legislative authority, hath its peculiar department from which the others are excluded. In this division the granting of supplies or laying taxes is deemed to be the province of the House of Commons, as the representative of the people. All supplies are supposed to flow from their gift; and the other orders are permitted only to assent or reject generally, not to propose any modification, amendment, or partial alteration of it. This observation being considered, it will undeniably appear that in framing the late Stamp Act the Commons acted in the character of representative of the colonies. They assumed it as the principle of that measure, and the propriety of it must therefore stand or fall as the principle is true or false, for the preamble sets forth that the Commons of Great Britain had resolved to give and grant the several rates and

duties imposed by the act. But what right had the Commons of Great Britain to be thus munificent at the expense of the commons of America? To give property not belonging to the giver and without the consent of the owner is such evident and flagrant injustice in ordinary cases that few are hardy enough to avow it; and therefore when it really happens, the fact is disguised and varnished over by the most plausible pretenses the ingenuity of the giver can suggest. But it is alleged that there is a virtual or implied representation of the colonies springing out of the constitution of the British government; and it must be confessed on all hands that as the representation is not actual it is virtual or it doth not exist at all, for no third kind of representation can be imagined. The colonies claim the privilege, which is common to all British subjects, of being taxed only with their own consent given by their representatives, and all the advocates for the Stamp Act admit this claim. Whether, therefore, upon the whole matter the imposition of the stamp duties is a proper exercise of constitutional authority or not depends upon the single question, whether the Commons of Great Britain are virtually the representatives of the commons of America or not.

The advocates for the Stamp Act admit, in express terms, that “the colonies do not choose members of Parliament,” but they assert that “the colonies are *virtually* represented in the same manner with the nonelectors resident in Great Britain.

How have they proved this position? Where have they defined or precisely explained what they mean by the expression *virtual representation*?...They argue that “the right of election being annexed to certain species of property, to franchises, and inhabitancy in some particular places, a very small part of the land, the property, and the people of England are comprehended in those descriptions. All landed property not freehold and all monied property are excluded. The merchants of London, the proprietors of the public funds, the inhabitants of Leeds, Halifax, Birmingham, and Manchester, and that great corporation of the East India Company, none of them choose their representatives, and yet they are all represented in Parliament, and the colonies being exactly in their situation are represented in the same manner.”

Now this argument, which is all that their invention hath been able to supply, is totally defective, for it consists of facts not true and of conclusions inadmissible....

Lessees for years, copyholders, proprietors of the public funds, inhabitants of Birmingham, Leeds, Halifax, and Manchester, merchants of the city of London, or members of the corporation of the East India

Company are as such under no personal incapacity to be electors, for they may acquire the right of election; and there are actually not only a considerable number of electors in each of the classes of lessees for years, etc., but in many of them, if not all, even members of Parliament. The interests therefore of the nonelectors, the electors, and the representatives are individually the same, to say nothing of the connection among neighbors, friends, and relations. The security of the nonelectors against oppression is that their oppression will fall also upon the electors and the representatives. The one can't be injured and the other indemnified.

Further, if the nonelectors should not be taxed by the British Parliament they would not be taxed at all; and it would be iniquitous as well as a solecism in the political system that they should partake of all the benefits resulting from the imposition and application of taxes and derive an immunity from the circumstance of not being qualified to vote. Under this constitution, then, a double or virtual representation may be reasonably supposed. The electors, who are inseparably connected in their interests with the nonelectors, may be justly deemed to be the representatives of the nonelectors at the same time they exercise their personal privilege in their right of election, and the members chosen, therefore, the representatives of both. This is the only rational explanation of the expression *virtual representation*. None has been advanced by the asserters of it, and their meaning can only be inferred from the instances by which they endeavor to elucidate it, and no other meaning can be stated to which the instances apply....

There is not that intimate and inseparable relation between the electors of Great Britain and the inhabitants of the colonies which must inevitably involve both in the same taxation; on the contrary, not a single *actual* elector in Great Britain might be immediately affected by a taxation in America imposed by a statute which would have a general operation and effect upon the properties and inhabitants of the colonies. The latter might be oppressed in a thousand shapes without any sympathy or exciting any alarm in the former. Moreover, even acts oppressive and injurious to the colonies in an extreme degree might become popular in England from the promise or expectation that the very measures which depressed the colonies would give ease to the inhabitants of Great Britain....

The colonies are dependent upon Great Britain, and the supreme authority vested in the King, Lords, and Commons may justly be exercised to secure or preserve their dependence whenever necessary for that purpose. This authority results from and is implied in the idea of the relation subsisting between England and her colonies; for considering the nature of human affections, the inferior is not to be trusted

with providing regulations to prevent his rising to an equality with his superior. But though the right of the superior to use the proper means for preserving the subordination of his inferior is admitted, yet it does not necessarily follow that he has a right to seize the property of his inferior when he pleases or to command him in everything since, in the degrees of it, there may very well exist a dependence and inferiority without absolute vassalage and slavery. In what the superior may rightfully control or compel, and in what the inferior ought to be at liberty to act without control or compulsion, depends upon the nature of the dependence and the degree of the subordination; and these being ascertained, the measure of obedience and submission and the extent of the authority and superintendence will be settled. When powers compatible with the relation between the superior and inferior have by express compact been granted to and accepted by the latter, and have been, after that compact, repeatedly recognized by the former--when they may be exercised effectually upon every occasion without any injury to that relation--the authority of the superior can't properly interpose, for by the powers vested in the inferior is the superior limited.

By their constitutions of government the colonies are empowered to impose internal taxes. This power is compatible with their dependence and hath been expressly recognized by British ministers and the British Parliament upon many occasions; and it may be exercised effectually without striking at or impeaching in any respect the superintendence of the British Parliament. May not then the line be distinctly and justly drawn between such acts as are necessary or proper for preserving or securing the dependence of the colonies and such as are not necessary or proper for that very important purpose?

Document 3

Destruction of the Home of Thomas Hutchinson (1765)

In 1765, Thomas Hutchinson, a Massachusetts native and descendant of the colony's Puritan founders, was its lieutenant governor. Although he questioned the wisdom of the Stamp Act, Hutchinson's royal commission charged him with enforcing all acts of Parliament, so he vowed to oversee the law's implementation. On 14 August 1765,

crowds in Boston rioted to protest the Stamp Act and force the resignation of the stamp distributor, without whose services the law would not be viable. Twelve days later, as Hutchinson reported in this letter to an English friend, the rioters targeted his home and those of other royal officials who still sought to enforce the unpopular legislation.³

I came from my house [to Boston] with my family on the 26th in the morning. After dinner it was whispered in town there would be a mob that night and that...the customs-house and admiralty officers houses would be attacked...In evening whilst I was at supper and my children round me somebody ran in and said the mob were coming. I directed my children to fly to a secure place and shut up my house as I had done before, intending not to quit it but my eldest daughter...hastened back and protested she would not quit the house unless I did. I could not stand against this and withdrew with her to a neighbouring house where I had been but a few minutes before the hellish crew fell upon my house with the rage of devils and in a moment with axes split down the doors and entered. My son being in the great entry heard them cry damn him he is upstairs we'll have him. Some ran immediately as high as the top of the house; others filled the rooms below and cellars and others remained without the house to be employed there. Messages soon came one after another to the house where I was to inform me the mob were coming in pursuit of me and I was obliged to retire through yards and gardens to a house more remote...where I remained until 4 o'clock, by which time one of the best finished houses in the province had nothing remaining but the bare walls and floors. Not contented with tearing off all the wainscot and hangings and splitting the doors to pieces they beat down the partition walls and although that alone cost them nearly two hours they cut down the cupola or lantern and they began to take the slate and boards from the roof and were prevented only by the approaching daylight from a total demolition of the building. The garden fence was laid flat and all my trees...broke down to the ground. Such ruins were never seen in America. Besides my plate and family pictures, household furniture of every kind, my own children's and servants' apparel, they carried off about £900 sterling in money and emptied the house of every thing whatsoever except a part of the kitchen furniture not leaving a single book or paper in it and have scattered or destroyed all the manuscripts and other papers I had been collecting for 30 years together besides a great number of public papers in my

custody... Many articles of clothing and good part of my plate have since been picked up in different quarters of the town but the furniture in general was cut to pieces before it was thrown out of the house and most of the beds cut open and the feathers thrown out of the windows....

The encouragers of the first mob never intended matters should go to this length and the people in general express the utmost detestation of this unparalleled outrage and I wish they could be convinced what infinite hazard there is of the most terrible consequences from such demons when they are let loose in a government where there is not constant authority at hand sufficient to suppress them.

I am told the government here will make me a compensation for my own and my family's loss which I think cannot be much less than £3000 sterling. I am not sure that they will. If they should not it will be too heavy for me and I must humbly apply to his Majesty in whose service I am a sufferer but this and a much greater sum would be an insufficient compensation for the constant distress and anxiety of mind I have felt for some time past and must feel for months to come. You cannot conceive the wretched state we are in. Such is the resentment of the people against the stamp duty that there can be no dependence upon the [lower house] to take any steps to enforce or rather advise the payment of it. On the other hand, such will be the effects of not submitting to it that all trade must cease, all courts fall and all authority be at an end. Must not the ministry be extremely embarrassed? On the one hand it will be said if concessions be made the Parliament endanger the loss of their authority over the colonies; on the other hand if external force should be used there seems to be danger of a total lasting alienation of affection. Is there no alternative?

Document 5

The New York Stamp Act Riot (1765)

In New York City, the resignation of the local stamp distributor in August 1765 averted violence, at least until 1 November, the date on which the Stamp Act was to go into effect. Then, an angry crowd mobilized against Lieutenant Governor Cadwallader Colden, a staunch defender of imperial authority who they believed would enforce the

offensive legislation. New York's leaders, unlike those in most other colonies, had taken no official action against the Stamp Act beyond sending delegates to the Stamp Act Congress. In New York, middling men—soon to be known as the Sons of Liberty—and sea captains led the attack on Colden, who described the episode in this letter to his superiors in London.⁵

Sir,

In a day or two after the date of my letter of the 26th of last month...the packages of stamped papers were landed from His Majesty's ship Garland at noonday without a guard or the least appearance of discontent among the people...But on the evening of the first day of this month the mob began to collect together, and after it became dark they came up to the Fort Gate with a great number of torches, and a scaffold on which two images were placed, one to represent the governor in his grey hairs, & the other the devil by his side. This scaffold with the images was brought up within 8 or 10 feet of the gate with the grossest ribaldry from the mob. As they went from the gate they broke open my coach house, took my chariot out of it & carried it round the town with the images, & returned to the Fort Gate, from whence they carried them to an open place, where they had erected a gibbet, within 100 yards of the Fort Gate & there hung up the images. After hanging some time they were burnt in a fire prepared for the purpose, together with my chariot, a single horse chair and two sledges, our usual carriages when snow is on the ground, which they took out of my coach house. While this was doing a great number of gentlemen of the town if they can be called so, stood around to observe the outrage on their King's governor. The garrison was at the same time on the ramparts with preparation sufficient to destroy them, but not a single return in words or otherwise was made from any man in the fort, while this egregious insult was performing...It is given out that the mob will storm the fort this night. I am not apprehensive of their carrying out their purpose; probably it might be attended with much bloodshed because a great part of the mob consists of men who had been privateers & disbanded soldiers whose view it is to plunder the town.

This goes by Major James of the Royal Artillery who with much zeal for his Majesty's service put the fort in the best posture of defence he could, for reason which the mob, the same night they insulted their

governor, broke open his house, burnt all his furniture, wearing clothes and every thing in it to a great value, at the same time threatening to take away his life in the most shameful manner.

Document 6

John Dickinson, *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania* (1767-68)

John Dickinson was probably the most widely read colonial pamphleteer of the prerevolutionary era. His most important work, *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania* first appeared in 1767 and 1768.⁶ Dickinson encouraged his readers to oppose the Townshend Act and other imperial measures. In Letter I, he condemned the New York Restraining Act. In Letter II, he initiated an extended analysis of the constitutional and economic implications Townshend Act.

Letter II

Beloved Countrymen,

There is another late act of parliament, which seems to me to be as destructive to the liberty of these colonies, as that inserted in my last letter; that is, the act for granting the duties on paper, glass, &c. It appears to me to be unconstitutional.

The parliament unquestionably possesses a legal authority to regulate the trade of Great Britain, and all its colonies. Such an authority is essential to the relation between a mother country and its colonies; and necessary for the common good of all. He, who considers these provinces as states distinct from the British empire, has very slender notions of justice, or of their interests. We are but parts of a whole; and therefore there must exist a power somewhere, to preside, and preserve the connection in due order. This power is lodged in the parliament; and we are as much dependent on Great Britain, as

a perfectly free people can be on another.

I have looked over every statute relating to these colonies, from their first settlement to this time and find every one of them founded on this principle, till the Stamp Act administration. All before, are calculated to preserve or promote a mutually beneficial intercourse between the several constituent parts of the empire; and though many of them imposed duties on trade, yet those duties were always imposed with design to restrain the commerce of one part, that was injurious to another, and thus to promote the general welfare. The raising a revenue thereby was never intended ... Never did the British parliament, till the period above mentioned, think of imposing duties in America,
FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING A REVENUE....

This I call an innovation; and a most dangerous innovation. It may perhaps be objected, that Great Britain has a right to lay what duties she pleases upon her exports, and it makes no difference to us, whether they are paid here or there.

To this I answer. These colonies require many things for their use, which the laws of Great Britain prohibit them from getting any where but from her. Such are paper and glass.

That we may be legally bound to pay any general duties on these commodities, relative to the regulation of trade, is granted; but we being obliged by her laws to take from Great Britain, any special duties imposed on their exportation to us only, with intention to raise a revenue from us only, are as much taxes, upon us, as those imposed by the Stamp Act.

What is the difference in substance and right, whether the same sum is raised upon us by the rates mentioned in the Stamp Act, on the use of paper, or by these duties, on the importation of it. It is nothing but the edition of a former book, with a new title page....

Why was the Stamp Act then so pernicious to freedom? It did not enact that every man in the colonies should buy a certain quantity of paper. No: It only directed, that no instrument of writing should be valid in law, if not made on stamp paper.

The makers of that act knew full well, that the confusions that would arise upon the disuse of writings would compel the colonies to use the stamp paper, and therefore to pay the taxes imposed. For this reason the Stamp Act was said to be a law that would execute itself. For the very same reason, the last act

of parliament, if it is granted to have any force here, will execute itself, and will be attended with the very same consequences to American liberty.

Some persons perhaps may say, that this act lays us under no necessity to pay the duties imposed, because we may ourselves manufacture the articles on which they are laid; whereas by the Stamp Act no instrument of writing could be good, unless made on British paper, and that too stamped.

Such an objection amounts to no more than this, that the total disuse of British paper and glass will not be so afflicting as that which would have resulted from the total disuse of writing among them; for by that means even the Stamp Act might have been eluded. Why then was it universally detested by them as slavery itself? Because it presented to these devoted provinces nothing but a choice of calamities, embittered by indignities, each of which was unworthy of freemen to bear. But is no injury a violation of right but the greatest injury? If eluding the payment of the duties imposed by the Stamp Act would have subjected us to a more dreadful inconvenience, than the eluding the payment of those imposed by the late act, does it therefore follow that the last is no violation of our rights, though it is calculated for the same purpose that the other was, that is, to raise money upon us, without our consent?....

But the objectors may further say, that we shall sustain no injury at all by the disuse of British paper and glass. We might not, if we could make as much as we want. But can any man, acquainted with America, believe this possible? I am told there are but two or three glass-houses on this continent, and but very few paper-mills; and suppose more should be erected, a long course of years must elapse, before they can be brought to perfection. This continent is a country of planters, farmers, and fishermen; not of manufacturers. The difficulty of establishing particular manufactures in such a country is almost insuperable, for one manufacture is connected with others in such a manner, that it may be said to be impossible to establish one or two, without establishing several others. The experience of many nations may convince us of this truth....

Great Britain has prohibited the manufacturing of iron and steel in these colonies, without any objection being made to her right of doing it. The like right she must have to prohibit any other manufacture among us. Thus she is possessed of an undisputed precedent on that point. This authority, she will say, is founded on the original intention of settling these colonies; that is, that she should manufacture

for them, and that they should supply her with materials. The equity of this policy, she will also say, has been universally acknowledged by the colonies, who never have made the least objection to statutes for that purpose; and will further appear by the mutual benefits flowing from this usage, ever since the settlement of these colonies....

Here then, my dear countrymen rouse yourselves, and behold the ruin hanging over your heads. If they once admit, that Great Britain may lay duties upon her exportations to us, for the purpose of levying money on us only, she then will have nothing to do, but to lay those duties on the articles which she prohibits us to manufacture--and the tragedy of American liberty is finished... If Great Britain can order us to come to her for necessaries we want, and can order us to pay what taxes she pleases before we take them away, or when we have them here, we are as abject slaves as France and Poland can shew in wooden shoes, and with uncombed hair....

The single question is, whether the parliament can legally impose duties to be paid by the people of these colonies only for the sole purpose of raising a revenue, on commodities which she obliges us to take from her alone; or, in other words, whether the parliament can legally take money out of our pockets, without our consent. If they can, our boasted liberty is but... a sound, and nothing else.

A Farmer.

Document 7

“Address to the Ladies” (1767)

Colonial boycotts presented women with an unusual opportunity to act politically.

Although men and women alike were enthusiastic consumers of British imports, popular culture regarded fashion, ornaments, and tea-drinking as particularly feminine concerns.

Accordingly, colonial leaders appealed to women to forego such luxuries for the good of their country, and many later made women the scapegoats for the eventual disintegration of the nonimportation effort. This early version of a poem that appeared in many colonial newspapers was published in the *Virginia Gazette*.⁷

Young ladies in town, and those that live round,
Let a friend at this season advise you;
Since money's so scarce, and times growing worse,
Strange things may soon hap and surprise you.
First, then, throw aside your high topknots of pride;
Wear none but your own country linen;
Of economy boast, let your pride be your most
To show clothes of your own make and spinning.
What if homespun they say is not quite so gay
As brocades, yet be not in a passion,
For when once it is known this is much wore in town,
One and all will cry out, 'tis the fashion!
And as one all agree that you'll not married be
To such as will wear London factory,
But at first sight refuse, tell them such you do choose
As encourage our own manufactory.
No more ribands wear, nor in rich dress appear,
Love your country much better than fine things,
Begin without passion, 'twill soon be the fashion
To grace your smooth locks with a twine string.
Throw aside your Bohea, and your Green Hyson tea,
And all things with a new fashion duty;
Procure a good store of the choice Labrador,
For there'll soon be enough here to suit you.
These do without fear, and to all you'll appear,
Fair, charming, true, lovely and clever;
Though the times remain darkish, young men may be sparkish,
And love you much stronger than ever.

Chapter 4

Document 1

The Soldiers and the “Mob” (1770)

Captain Thomas Preston was officer of the day for the 29th Regiment on 5 March 1770, when the troops engaged in violent confrontation with townspeople on the snowy streets of Boston. Preston provided this account of the incident to his superiors in London.¹ He himself was arrested and remained in jail for seven months before being acquitted of a murder charge in October. Preston returned to England in December.

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, and to bring them into contempt by promoting and aiding desertions, and with impunity, even where there has been the clearest evidence of the fact, and by grossly and falsely propagating untruths concerning them... The insolence as well as utter hatred of the inhabitants to the troops increased daily, insomuch that Monday and Tuesday, the 5th and 6th [of March], were privately agreed on for a general engagement, in consequence of which several of the militia came from the country armed to join their friends, menacing to destroy any who should oppose them. This plan has since been discovered.

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 mob 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. They soon rushed through the people, and by charging their bayonets in half-circles, kept them at a little distance. Nay, so far was I from intending the death of any person that I suffered the troops to go to the spot where the unhappy affair took place without any loading in their pieces; nor did I ever give orders for loading them. This remiss conduct in me perhaps merits censure; yet it is evidence, resulting from the nature of things, which is the best and surest that can be offered, that my intention was not to act offensively, but the contrary part, and that not without compulsion.

The mob still increased and were more outrageous, striking their clubs or bludgeons one against another, and calling out, come on you rascals, you bloody backs, you lobster scoundrels, fire if you dare, G-d damn you, fire and be damned, we know you dare not, and much more such language was used. At this time I was between the soldiers and the mob, parleying with, and endeavouring all in my power to persuade them to retire peaceably, but to no purpose. They advanced to the points of the bayonets, struck some of them and even the muzzles of the pieces, and seemed to be endeavouring to close with the soldiers. On which some well behaved persons asked me if the guns were charged. I replied yes. They then asked me if I intended to order the men to fire. I answered no, by no means, observing to them that I was advanced before the muzzles of the men's pieces, and must fall a sacrifice if they fired; that the soldiers were upon the half cock and charged bayonets, and my giving the word fire under those circumstances would prove me to be no officer. While I was thus speaking, one of the soldiers having received a severe blow with a stick,

stepped a little on one side and instantly fired, on which turning to and asking him why he fired without orders, I was struck with a club on my arm, which for some time deprived me of the use of it, which blow had it been placed on my head, most probably would have destroyed me.

On this a general attack was made on the men by a great number of heavy clubs and snowballs being thrown at them, by which all our lives were in imminent danger, some persons at the same time from behind calling out, damn your bloods-why don't you fire. Instantly three or four of the soldiers fired, one after another, and directly after three more in the same confusion and hurry. The mob then ran away, except three unhappy men who instantly expired...one more is since dead, three others are dangerously, and four slightly wounded. The whole of this melancholy affair was transacted in almost 20 minutes. On my asking the soldiers why they fired without orders, they said they heard the word fire and supposed it came from me. This might be the case as many of the mob called out fire, fire, but I assured the men that I gave no such order; that my words were, don't fire, stop your firing.

In short, it was scarcely possible for the soldiers to know who said fire, or don't fire, or stop your firing. On the people's assembling again to take away the dead bodies, the soldiers supposing them coming to attack them, were making ready to fire again, which I prevented by striking up their firelocks with my hand. Immediately after a townsman came and told me that 4 or 5000 people were assembled in the next street, and had sworn to take my life with every man's with me. On which I judged it unsafe to remain there any longer, and therefore sent the party and sentry to the main guard, where the street is narrow and short, there telling them off into street firings, divided and planted them at each end of the street to secure their rear, moment[ari]ly expecting an attack, as there was a constant cry of the inhabitants to arms, to arms, turn out with your guns; and the town drums beating to arms, I ordered my drums to beat to arms, and being soon after joined by the different companies of the 29th regiment, I formed them as the guard into street firings. The 14th regiment also got under arms but remained at their barracks. I immediately sent a sergeant with a party to Colonel Dalrymple, the commanding officer, to acquaint him with every particular.

Several officers going to join their regiment were knocked down by the mob, one very much wounded and his sword taken from him. The lieutenant-governor [Thomas Hutchinson] and Colonel Carr soon after met at the head of the 29th regiment and agreed that the regiment should retire to their barracks, and the people to their houses, but I kept the picket to strengthen the guard. It was with great difficulty that

the lieutenant-governor prevailed on the people to be quiet and retire. At last they all went off, excepting about a hundred.

A Council was immediately called, on the breaking up of which three justices met and issued a warrant to apprehend me and eight soldiers. On hearing of this procedure I instantly went to the sheriff and surrendered myself, though for the space of 4 hours I had it in my power to have made my escape, which I most undoubtedly should have attempted and could easily executed, had I been the least conscious of any guilt. On the examination before the justices, two witnesses swore that I gave the men orders to fire. The one testified he was within two feet of me; the other that I swore at the men for not firing at the first word. Others swore they heard me use the word "fire," but whether do or do not fire, they could not say; others that they heard the word fire, but could not say if it came from me.

The next day they got 5 or 6 more to swear I gave the word to fire. So bitter and inveterate are many of the malcontents here that they are industriously using every method to fish out evidence to prove it was a concerted scheme to murder the inhabitants... I am, though perfectly innocent, under most unhappy circumstances, having nothing in reason to expect but the loss of life in a very ignominious manner, without the interposition of his Majesty's royal goodness.

Document 2

The Boston Massacre (1770)

This account of the altercation between soldiers and Bostonians appeared one week later in the *Boston Gazette*, a leading radical newspaper. Radical spokesmen spread the news of the incident and shaped the public's understanding of it. Among other things, radical propagandists invented the name by which the episode would be widely known: the Boston "massacre."²

On the evening of Monday...the fifth...several soldiers of the 29th Regiment were seen parading the streets with their drawn cutlasses and bayonets, abusing and wounding numbers of the inhabitants. A few minutes after nine o'clock four youths, named Edward Archbald, William Merchant, Francis Archbald, and John Leech, jun., came down Cornhill together, and separating at Doctor Loring's corner, the two former were passing the narrow alley leading to Murray's barrack in which was a soldier brandishing a broad sword of an uncommon size against the walls, out of which he struck fire plentifully. A person of mean countenance armed with a large cudgel bore him company. Edward Archbald admonished Mr. Merchant to take care of the sword, on which the soldier turned round and struck Archbald on the arm, then pushed at Merchant and pierced through his clothes inside the arm close to the armpit and grazed the skin. Merchant then struck the soldier with a short stick he had; and the other person ran to the barrack and brought with him two soldiers, one armed with a pair of tongs, the other with a shovel. He with the tongs pursued Archbald back through the alley, collared and laid him over the head with the tongs. The noise brought people together; and John Hicks, a young lad, coming up, knocked the soldier down but let him get up again; and more lads gathering, drove them back to the barrack where the boys stood some time as it were to keep them in. In less than a minute ten or twelve of them came out with drawn cutlasses, clubs, and bayonets and set upon the unarmed boys and young folk who stood them a little while but, finding the inequality of their equipment, dispersed.

On hearing the noise, one Samuel Atwood came up to see what was the matter; and entering the alley from dock square, heard the latter part of the combat; and when the boys had dispersed he met the ten or twelve soldiers aforesaid rushing down the alley towards the square and asked them if they intended to murder people? They answered Yes, by God, root and branch! With that one of them struck Mr. Atwood with a club which was repeated by another; and being unarmed, he turned to go off and received a wound on the left shoulder which reached the bone and gave him much pain. Retreating a few steps, Mr. Atwood met two officers and said, gentlemen, what is the matter? They answered, you'll see by and by. Immediately after, those heroes appeared in the square, asking where were the boogers? Where were the cowards? But notwithstanding their fierceness to naked men, one of them advanced towards a youth who had a split of a raw stave in his hand and said, damn them, here is one of them. But the young man seeing a person near him with a drawn sword and good cane ready to support him, held up his stave in defiance; and they

quietly passed by him up the little alley by Mr. Silsby's to King Street where they attacked single and unarmed persons till they raised much clamour, and then turned down Cornhill Street, insulting all they met in like manner and pursuing some to their very doors.

Thirty or forty persons, mostly lads, being by this means gathered in King Street, Capt. Preston with a party of men with charged bayonets, came from the main guard to the commissioner's house, the soldiers pushing their bayonets, crying, make way! They took place by the custom house and, continuing to push to drive the people off, pricked some in several places, on which they were clamorous and, it is said, threw snow balls. On this, the Captain commanded them to fire; and more snow balls coming, he again said, damn you, fire, be the consequence what it will! One soldier then fired, and a townsman with a cudgel struck him over the hands with such force that he dropped his firelock; and, rushing forward, aimed a blow at the Captain's head which grazed his hat and fell pretty heavy upon his arm. However, the soldiers continued the fire successively till seven or eight or, as some say, eleven guns were discharged.

By this fatal maneuver three men were laid dead on the spot and two more struggling for life; but what showed a degree of cruelty unknown to British troops, at least since the house of Hanover has directed their operations, was an attempt to fire upon or push with their bayonets the persons who undertook to remove the slain and wounded!....

The dead are Mr. Samuel Gray, killed on the spot, the ball entering his head and beating off a large portion of his skull.

A mulatto man named Crispus Attucks, who was born in Framingham, but lately belonged to New-Providence and was here in order to go for North Carolina, also killed instantly, two balls entering his breast, one of them in special goring the right lobe of the lungs and a great part of the liver most horribly.

Mr. James Caldwell, late of Capt. Morton's vessel, in like manner killed by two balls entering his back.

Mr. Samuel Maverick, a promising youth of seventeen years of age, son of the widow Maverick, and an apprentice to Mr. Greenwood, ivory-turner, mortally wounded; a ball went through his belly and was cut out at his back. He died the next morning.

A lad named Christopher Monk, about seventeen years of age, an apprentice to Mr. Walker, shipwright, wounded; a ball entered his back about four inches above the left kidney near the spine and was cut out of the breast on the same side. Apprehended he will die.

A lad named John Clark, about seventeen years of age, whose parents live at Medford, and an apprentice to Capt. Samuel Howard of this town, wounded; a ball entered just above his groin and came out at his hip on the opposite side. Apprehended he will die.

Mr. Edward Payne of this town, merchant, standing at his entry door received a ball in his arm which shattered some of the bones.

Mr. John Green, tailor, coming up Leverett's Lane, received a ball just under his hip and lodged in the under part of his thigh, which was extracted.

Mr. Robert Patterson, a seafaring man...wounded; a ball went through his right arm, and he suffered a great loss of blood.

Mr. Patrick Carr, about thirty years of age, who worked with Mr. Field, leather breeches-maker in Queen Street, wounded; a ball entered near his hip and went out at his side.

A lad named David Parker, an apprentice to Mr. Eddy, the wheelwright, wounded; a ball entered in his thigh.

The people were immediately alarmed with the report of this horrid massacre, the bells were set a-ringing, and great numbers soon assembled at the place where this tragical scene had been acted. Their feelings may be better conceived than expressed; and while some were taking care of the dead and wounded, the rest were in consultation what to do in those dreadful circumstances. But so little intimidated were they, notwithstanding their being within a few yards of the main guard and seeing the 29th Regiment under arms and drawn up in King Street, that they kept their station and appeared, as an officer of rank expressed it, ready to run upon the very muzzles of their muskets.

The lieutenant-governor soon came into the town house and there met some of his Majesty's Council and a number of civil magistrates. A considerable body of the people immediately entered the council chamber and expressed themselves to his honour with a freedom and warmth becoming the occasion. He used his utmost endeavours to pacify them, requesting that they would let the matter subside for the night and promising to do all in his power that justice should be done and the law have its course.

Men of influence and weight with the people were not wanting on their part to procure their compliance with his Honour's request by representing the horrible consequences of a promiscuous and rash engagement in the night, and assuring them that such measures should be entered upon in the morning as would be agreeable to their dignity and a more likely way of obtaining the best satisfaction for the blood of their fellow townsmen. The inhabitants attended to these suggestions; and the regiment under arms being ordered to their barracks, which was insisted upon by the people, they then separated and returned to their dwellings by one o'clock. At three o'clock Capt. Preston was committed, as were the soldiers who fired, a few hours after him.

Tuesday morning presented a most shocking scene, the blood of our fellow citizens running like water through King Street and the Merchants' Exchange, the principal spot of the military parade for about eighteen months past. Our blood might also be tracked up to the head of Long Lane, and through divers other streets and passages.

At eleven o'clock the inhabitants met at Faneuil Hall; and after some animated speeches becoming the occasion, they chose a committee of fifteen respectable gentlemen to wait upon the lieutenant-governor in Council to request of him to issue his orders for the immediate removal of the troops.

Document 3

Bostonians Oppose the Tea Act (1773)

In March 1770, Parliament repealed all the Townshend Duties except the tea tax, prompting the colonists to shelve nonimportation while continuing to boycott tea. Three years later, however, Parliament passed the Tea Act, which gave the British East India Company a monopoly on colonial tea sales and tax concessions so it could sell its tea at lower prices. Colonists resented the monopoly provision and regarded the tax cuts as a ploy to trick them into buying duties tea. Patriots in some colonial seaports prevented the tea ships from landing their cargo; in Boston, the failure to do so led to another dramatic

rejection of Parliamentary authority. In this letter, John Andrews of Boston described the tea-dumping incident to his merchant brother-in-law, William Barrell of Philadelphia.³

However precarious our situation may be, yet such is the present calm composure of the people that a stranger would hardly think that ten thousand pounds sterling of the East India Company's tea was destroyed the night, or rather evening before last, yet it's a serious truth...A general muster was assembled, from this and all the neighbouring towns, to the number of five or six thousand, at 10 o'clock Thursday morning in the Old South Meeting house, where they passed a unanimous vote that the Tea should go out of the harbour that afternoon, and sent a committee with Mr. Rotch [the owner of the tea and its ship] to the Custom house to demand a clearance, which the collector told 'em was not in his power to give, without the duties being first paid. They then sent Mr. Rotch...to ask a pass from the Governor, who sent for answer, that "consistent with the rules of government and his duty to the King he could not grant one without they produced a previous clearance from the office."

By the time he returned with this message the candles were light in the [meeting] house, and upon reading it, such prodigious shouts were made, that induced me, while drinking tea at home, to go out and know the cause of it. The house was so crowded I could get no farther than the porch, when I found the moderator was just declaring the meeting to be dissolved, which caused another general shout, out doors and in, and three cheers. What with that, and the consequent noise of breaking up the meeting, you'd thought that the inhabitants of the infernal regions had broke loose. For my part, I went contentedly home and finished my tea, but was soon informed what was going forward: but still not crediting it without ocular demonstration, I went and was satisfied. They mustered, I'm told, upon Fort Hill, to the number of about two hundred, and proceeded, two by two, to Griffin's wharf, where [ships commanded by] Hall, Bruce, and Coffin lay, each with 114 chests of the ill fated article on board; the two former with only that article, but the latter...was freighted with a large quantity of other goods, which they took the greatest care not to injure in the least, and before nine o'clock in the evening, every chest from on board the three vessels was knocked to pieces and flung over the sides. They say the actors were Indians from Narragansett. Whether they were or not, to a transient observer they appeared as such, being clothe in Blankets with the heads muffled, and copper colored countenances, being each armed with a hatchet or axe, and pair pistols, nor

was their dialect different from what I conceive these geniuses to speak, as their jargon was unintelligible to all but themselves. Not the least insult was offered to any person, save one Captain Conner, a letter of horses in this place, not many years since removed from dear Ireland, who had ripped up the lining of his coat and waistcoat under the arms, and watching his opportunity had nearly filled 'em with tea, but being detected, was handled pretty roughly. They not only stripped him of his clothes, but gave him a coat of mud, with a severe bruising into the bargain; and nothing but their utter aversion to make any disturbance prevented his being tarred and feathered.

Document 9

Janet Schaw on the Mistreatment of North Carolina Loyalists (1775)

Janet Schaw, the sister of Scottish tobacco merchant living in North Carolina, visited Wilmington in the summer of 1775. She found the town's inhabitants divided between Whigs, who were determined to resist the imperial regime, and Tories, or loyalists, who continued to uphold it. Whig leaders drilled the militia, enforced the Association, and harassed the predominantly Scottish loyalist inhabitants of eastern North Carolina.⁹ The presence of a large enslaved population complicated divisions between Whigs and Tories in North Carolina, as in the other southern colonies, as Schaw perceptively noted.

We came down in the morning for the review [of militia] which the heat made as terrible to the spectators as to the soldiers, or what you please to call them. They had certainly fainted under it, had not the constant draughts of grog supported them. Their exercise was that of bush-fighting, but it appeared so confused and so perfectly different from any thing I ever saw, I cannot say whether they performed it well or not; but this I know that they were heated with rum till capable of committing the most shocking outrages. We stood in the balcony of Dr. Cobham's house and they were reviewed on a field mostly covered with what are called here scrubby oaks, which are only a little better than brushwood. They at last

however assembled on the plain field, and I must really laugh while I recollect their figures: 2000 men in their shirts and trousers, preceded by a very ill beat-drum and a fiddler, who was also in a shirt with a long sword and a cue at his hair, who played with all his might. They made indeed a most unmartial appearance. But the worst figure there can shoot from behind a bush and kill even a General Wolfe.

Before the review was over, I heard a cry of tar and feather. I was ready to faint at the idea of this dreadful operation. I would have gladly quitted the balcony, but was so much afraid the victim was one of my friends, that I was not able to move; and he indeed proved to be one, though in a humble station. For it was Mr Neilson's poor English groom. You can hardly conceive what I felt when I saw him dragged forward, poor devil, frightened out of his wits. However at the request of some of the officers, who had been Neilson's friends, his punishment was changed into that of mounting on a table and begging pardon for having smiled at the regiment. He was then drummed and fiddled out of the town, with a strict prohibition of ever being seen in it again....

After the review...I went into the town, the entry of which I found closed up by a detachment of the soldiers; but as the officer immediately made way for me, I...advanced to the middle of the street, where I found a number of the first people of the town standing together...As most of them were my acquaintances, I stopped to speak to them, but they with one voice begged me for heaven's sake to get off the street, making me observe they were prisoners, adding that every avenue of the town was shut up, and that in all human probability some scene would be acted very unfit for me to witness. I could not take the friendly advice, for I became unable to move and absolutely petrified with horror.

Observing however an officer with whom I had just dined, I beckoned him to me. He came, but with no very agreeable look, and on my asking him what was the matter, he presented a paper he had folded in his hand. If you will persuade them to sign this they are at liberty, said he, but till then must remain under this guard, as they must suffer the penalties that have justly incurred. "And we will suffer every thing," replied one of them, "before we abjure our king, our country and our principles."...Oh Britannia, what are you doing, while your true obedient sons are thus insulted by their unlawful brethren; are they also forgotten by their natural parents?...

At present the martial law stands thus: An officer or committeeman enters a plantation with his posse. The alternative is proposed. Agree to join us and your persons and properties are safe; you have a

shilling sterling a day; your duty is no more than once a month appearing under arms at Wilmington, which will prove only merry-making, where you will have as much grog as you can drink. But if you refuse, we are directly to cut up your corn, shoot your pigs, burn your houses, seize your Negroes and perhaps tar and feather yourself. Not to choose the first requires more courage than they are possessed of, and I believe this method has seldom failed with the lower sort. No sooner do they appear under arms on the stated day, than they are harangued by their officers with the implacable cruelty of the king of Great Britain, who has resolved to murder and destroy man, wife and child, and that he has sworn before God and his parliament that he will not spare one of them; and this those deluded people believe more firmly than their creed, and who is it that is bold enough to venture to undeceive them. The King's [proclamation that the colonies were in a state of rebellion] they never saw; but are told it was ordering the tories to murder the whigs, and promising every Negro that would murder his Master and family that he should have his Master's plantation. This last Artifice they may pay for, as the Negroes have got it amongst them and believe it to be true. Tis ten to one they may try the experiment, and in that case friends and foes will all be one.

Chapter 5

Document 1

The Mecklenburg Resolves (1775)

On 31 May 1775, just three weeks after the Second Continental Congress convened in Philadelphia, leading citizens of Mecklenburg County in western North Carolina adopted a series of twenty resolutions that in their view abolished royal and imperial rule in their community.¹ In so doing, they made explicit the process that was occurring gradually and on an ad hoc basis throughout the colonies: the establishment of new political and administrative entities to supplant an increasingly intractable and untenable imperial regime.

This day the Committee of this county met and passed the following resolves:

Whereas by an address presented to his majesty by both Houses of Parliament in February last, the American colonies are declared to be in a state of actual rebellion, we conceive that all laws and commissions confirmed by or derived from the authority of the King and Parliament are annulled and vacated and the former civil constitution of these colonies for the present wholly suspended. To provide in some degree for the exigencies of this county, in the present alarming period, we deem it proper and necessary to pass the following resolves:

1. That all commissions civil and military heretofore granted by the Crown to be exercised in these colonies are null and void and the constitution of each particular colony wholly suspended.
2. That the Provincial Congress of each Province under the direction of the great Continental Congress is invested with all legislative and executive powers within their respective Provinces and that no other legislative or executive power does or can exist at this time in any of these colonies.
3. As all former laws are now suspended in this Province and the Congress have not yet provided others we judge it necessary for the better preservation of good order, to form certain rules and regulations for the internal government of this county until laws shall be provided for us by the Congress.
4. That the inhabitants of this county do meet on a certain day appointed by the committee and having formed themselves into nine companies...eight in the county and one in the town of Charlotte do choose a Colonel and other military officers who shall hold and exercise their several powers by virtue of this choice and independent of the Crown of Great Britain and former constitution of this Province.
5. That for the better preservation of the peace and administration of justice each of those companies do choose from their own body two discreet freeholders who shall be empowered each by himself and singly to decide and determine all matters of controversy arising within said company under the sum of twenty shillings and jointly and together all controversies under the sum of forty shillings, that so as their decisions may admit of appeal to the convention of the selectmen of the county and also that anyone of these men shall have power to examine and commit to confinement persons accused of petit larceny,

6. That those two selectmen thus chosen do jointly and together choose from the body of their particular body two persons properly qualified to act as constables who may assist them in the execution of their office.

7. That upon the complaint of any persons to either of these selectmen he do issue his warrant directed to the constable commanding him to bring the aggressor before him or them to answer said complaint.

8. That these eighteen selectmen thus appointed do meet every third Thursday in January, April, July and October, at the Court House in Charlotte, to hear and determine all matters of controversy for sums exceeding forty shillings, also appeals, and in cases of felony to commit the person or persons convicted thereof to close confinement until the Provincial Congress shall provide and establish laws and modes of proceedings in all such cases.

9. That these eighteen selectmen thus convened do choose a clerk to record the transactions of said convention and that said clerk upon the application of any person or persons aggrieved do issue his warrant to one of the constables of the company to which the offender belongs, directing said constable to summon and warn said offender to appear before the convention at their next sitting to answer the aforesaid complaint....

16. That whatever person hereafter shall receive a commission from the Crown or attempt to exercise any such commission heretofore received shall be deemed an enemy to his country and upon information being made to the captain of the company in which he resides, the said company shall cause him to be apprehended and conveyed before the two selectmen of the said company, who upon proof of the fact, shall commit him the said offender to safe custody until the next sitting of the committee, who shall deal with him as prudence may direct.

17. That any person refusing to yield obedience to the above resolves shall be considered equally criminal and liable to the same punishment as the offenders above last mentioned.

18. That these resolves be in full force and virtue until instructions from the Provincial Congress regulating the jurisprudence of the Province shall provide otherwise or the legislative body of Great Britain resign its unjust and arbitrary pretensions with respect to America.

19. That the eight Militia companies in this county provide themselves with proper arms and accoutrements and hold themselves in readiness to execute the commands and directions of the General Congress of this Province and of this Committee.

20. That the committee appoint Colonel Thomas Polk and Dr. Joseph Kennedy to purchase three hundred pounds of powder, six hundred pounds of lead and one thousand flints for the use of the militia of this county and deposit the same in such place as the committee may hereafter direct.