

# Day 15

Students work in groups of 3

- each student assumes the role of either a colonist, Indian or the crown
- individually they read and annotate documents on the goals and concerns of the colonists, Indians or the crown
- as a group they identify the potential problems that might result from their interaction (two for each group)
- as a group they negotiate a treaty to prevent conflicts caused by these problems (five articles)

- they test their treaty to see if it would have worked to prevent the War of Jenkins Ear and King George's War

Treaty Format:

Paragraph 1: Preamble, establish two goals of each party and identify how these goals may cause conflict

Body: Five treaty articles presented as bullet points aimed at allowing each party to accomplish its goals without causing conflict with another party to this treaty.

# The Navigation Acts, colonists

Throughout the colonial period, after the middle of the seventeenth century, the one great source of irritation between the mother country and her colonies was found in the Navigation Acts. The twofold object of these acts was to protect English shipping, and to secure a profit to the home country from the colonies. As early as the reign of Richard II steps had been taken for the protection of shipping, but not before 1651 were there any British statutes that seriously hampered colonial trade. The Long Parliament, in 1642, exempted [New England](#) exports and imports from all duties, and a few years later all goods carried to the southern colonies in [English](#) vessels were put on the free list.

In 1651, however, while Cromwell was master of England, the first of the famous Navigation Acts was passed. The chief provisions were, that no goods grown or manufactured in Asia, Africa, or America should be transported to England except in English vessels, and that the goods of any European country imported into England must be brought in British vessels, or in vessels of the country producing them. The law was directed against the Dutch [maritime](#) trade, which was very great at that time. But it was nowhere strictly enforced, and in New England scarcely at all.<sup>1</sup>

In 1660 the second of these memorable acts was passed, largely embodying the first and adding much to it. This act forbade the importing into or the exporting from the British colonies of any goods except in English or colonial ships<sup>2</sup> and it forbade certain enumerated articles -- tobacco, sugar, cotton, wool, dyeing woods, etc. -- to be shipped to any country, except to England or some English plantation. Other goods were added at a later date. Such goods were to pay heavy duties when shipped to England, and in 1672 the same duties were imposed on goods sold from one colony to another. Had these laws been strictly enforced, the effect on the colonies that produced the "enumerated" articles would have been disastrous, for they enjoyed a flourishing trade in these goods with other countries. Other articles, such as grain, salt provisions, and fish, were not put on the list, because these were produced in England, and, had the entire colonial production been sent to that country, the English producer would have been ruined.<sup>3</sup> Rice was also allowed to be shipped direct to all ports south of Cape Finisterre. Some things, however, the Parliament did purely to favor the colonies, -- it prohibited the raising of tobacco in England and kept Spanish tobacco out by high duties, it kept out Swedish iron by a high tariff, to the advantage of the colonies, and it paid a bounty on various colonial products.

In addition to these laws there were two other classes of laws, all, however, belonging to the same system, which tended to impede the development of the colonies, -- the corn laws and the laws against manufacturing. The corn laws in the interest of the British farmer, beginning about 1666, practically shut out from England grain raised in the colonies. This drove New England and [New York](#) to manufacturing, and this again led England to forbid manufacturing in the colonies. These laws were far more effective than the Navigation Acts. It is stated that in 1708 New York manufactured three fourths of the woolen and linen goods used in the colony, and also fur hats in great numbers, many of which were shipped to Europe and the West Indies. This trade was largely suppressed by English laws passed at various times. In 1732 an act forbade the exporting of hats to England, to foreign countries, or from one colony to another. It also limited the number of persons a maker of hats might employ. Iron was found in all the colonies, and forges and furnaces were established in many places. But in 1750 Parliament enacted a law declaring that "no mill or other engine for rolling or slitting iron," "nor any furnace for making steel shall be erected in the colonies"! After this only pig and bar iron could be made. Parliament also enacted laws at various times restricting the manufacture of woolen goods. These laws bore heavily on the northern colonies, but were little felt in the South, where manufactories were rare.

Probably the harshest of England's laws in the suppression of colonial trade was the Molasses Act of 1733. By this act prohibitive duties were placed on molasses and sugar, from the French West Indies to the colonies.<sup>4</sup> New England enjoyed a great trade with the islands, receiving molasses and sugar for flour, stock, lumber, and fish, part of which could not be sold to England owing to the corn laws. Had the Molasses Act been enforced, the prosperity of New England would have been at an end.

The northern colonies, which produced the same kinds of goods as England produced, and consequently were barred from the English trade, suffered deeply by the trade laws, while the southern colonies, which raised commodities, such as tobacco and rice, which could not be duplicated in England, suffered far less.

The Board of Trade and Plantations, established as a permanent body in 1696,<sup>5</sup> kept account of the acts of colonial legislatures, corresponded with the governors, and informed itself thoroughly concerning all matters of colonial trade. But in spite of all efforts the Navigation Acts could scarcely be enforced at all. It may be said that the whole people became lawbreakers, and often the customs officials and even the governors connived at their practice. Smuggling was universal. It went on regardless of the admiralty courts established in most of the colonies. "Juries found their verdicts against the most undoubted facts."<sup>6</sup> The Molasses Act was certainly an economic and a political blunder; it not only made the people lawbreakers, it led them to hold Parliament in contempt, as not able to enforce its own laws.

But the colonists were not without examples in smuggling. It was estimated that forty thousand people in Great Britain were engaged in smuggling. The illegal imports of French silks, of India tea, and the like exceeded the legal imports.<sup>7</sup> On moral grounds, therefore, England could not reproach America.

In fairness to England it must be said that not all her colonial trade laws were unfavorable to the colonies. As we have noticed, the raising of tobacco in England was forbidden -- at first under James I, because the weed was offensive to that monarch, but later for the protection of the colonies. But further, at the beginning of the eighteenth century there was a heavy balance of trade against England with Norway, Sweden, and Russia, from which she purchased large naval stores. To correct this and to discourage manufacturing in the colonies, Parliament offered bounties on American hemp, lumber, tar, turpentine, etc. So effective was this law, passed in Anne's reign, that England was soon exporting a surplus of these articles received from her colonies.<sup>8</sup>

In viewing the subject of England's colonial policy during this period, two things should be borne in mind; namely, that the subject has usually been treated, on this side of the Atlantic, from a purely American point of view, and that England was no more severe in the treatment of colonial trade than were other countries having colonial possessions. The British government acted throughout on the ground, taken by all European countries at the time, that the existence of colonial possessions was for the purpose of benefiting the mother country. The system involved the subordination of the interests of the colonies to those of the mother country.<sup>9</sup> The aim of Great Britain was to export manufactured goods to America, and to import raw materials, and at the same time to retain the balance of trade in her own favor. This she usually succeeded in doing. In 1759 New England sent to England goods to the value of £38,000 and purchased goods to the amount of £600,000<sup>10</sup> -- chiefly with money made by smuggling. But in one respect the British policy greatly stimulated American industry. It made New England a shipbuilding community. This was brought about by the fact that the Navigation Laws placed the colonial-built ship on the same footing with the English-built ship.

On the whole, the British policy was unfortunate for British interests; it served to alienate the colonists, little by little, and prepared them for the final break with the mother land. Lecky, one of the ablest of the British historians, says:<sup>11</sup> "The deliberate selfishness of the English commercial legislation was digging a chasm between the mother country and the colonists."

## ECONOMY, Adam Smith, British

The plenty and cheapness of good land, it has already been observed, are the principal causes of the rapid prosperity of new colonies. The engrossing of land, in effect, destroys this plenty and cheapness. The engrossing of uncultivated land, besides, is the greatest obstruction to its improvement. But the labour that is employed in the improvement and cultivation of land affords the greatest and most valuable produce to the society. The produce of labour, in this case, pays not only its own wages, and the profit of the stock which employs it, but the rent of the land too upon which it is employed. The labour of the English colonists, therefore, being more employed in the improvement and cultivation of land, is likely to afford a greater and more valuable produce, than that of any of the other three nations, which, by the engrossing of land, is more or less diverted towards other employments.

Thirdly, the labour of the English colonists is not only likely to afford a greater and more valuable produce, but, in consequence of the moderation of their taxes, a greater proportion of this produce belongs to themselves, which they may store up and employ in putting into motion a still greater quantity of labour. The English colonists have never yet contributed any thing towards the defence of the mother country, or towards the support of its civil government. They themselves, on the contrary, have hitherto been defended almost entirely at the expence of the mother country. But the expence of fleets and armies is out of all proportion greater than the necessary expence of civil government. The expence of their own civil government has always been very moderate. It has generally been confined to what was necessary for paying competent salaries to the governor, to the judges, and to some other offices of police, and for maintaining a few of the most useful public works....

Fourthly, in the disposal of their surplus produce, or of what is over and above their own consumption, the English colonies have been more favoured, and have been allowed a more extensive market, than those of any other European nation. Every European nation has endeavoured more or less to monopolize to itself the commerce of its colonies, and, upon that account, has prohibited the ships of foreign nations from trading to them, and has prohibited them from importing European goods from any foreign nation. But the manner in which this monopoly has been exercised in different nations has been very different.

## Indians

### Colonial Times and the Clash of Cultures

In Virginia, the first colony, very tense relationships existed between the English colonists and the Indian confederacy headed by Powhatan, whose daughter, Pocahontas, became an intermediary between Englishmen and Native Americans. Upon the arrival of Lord De La Warr in 1610, war was declared against the surrounding native peoples, who signed a peace treaty in 1614. It was sealed by the interracial marriage of John Rolfe and Pocahontas, who died in England three years later while preparing to return to Virginia. In 1622 the Indians, who were continually harassed by whites greedy for land and whose numbers were dwindling because of disease, had had enough and began striking back, killing over 300 settlers, including John Rolfe. In the Second Anglo-Powhatan War, the Indians made one final futile attempt at driving the Virginians out. The punitive peace terms denied any further attempt at assimilating Indians into the white culture or allowing them to exist peacefully side-by-side with the whites. The Chesapeake Indians were banished from their land and were formally separated from white settlement areas, a forerunner of the modern reservation system. By 1669, only two thousand Indians remained in Virginia and by 1685, the Powhatans were considered by the English to be extinct. (Bailey, pages 19-20)

The Powhatans, like Native Americans in other locations, had been the victims of several factors, each of them beginning with the letter D: Disease, Disorganization and Disposability.

(DISEASE) 'they were extremely susceptible to European-imported maladies. Epidemics of smallpox and measles raced mercilessly through their villages.

(DISORGANIZATION) The Powhatans also lacked the unity with which to make effective opposition to the relatively well-organized and militarily disciplined whites.

(DISPOSABILITY) Finally they provided no reliable labor source and, after the Virginians began growing their own food crops, had no valuable commodities to offer in commerce. They therefore could be disposed of without harm to the colonial economy. Indeed the Indian presence frustrated the colonists' desire for a local commodity the Europeans desperately wanted: land.' (Quoted in Bailey, page 29)

Not all policies toward Native Americans were as systematically cruel as De La Warr's in Jamestown. During the early period of colonization, whites and Indians lived in scattered settlements that were, for the most part, peaceful. In New England missionaries offered the Indians the opportunity to settle into "praying towns" where they were encouraged to pray to the Christian God. Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island, and William Penn in Pennsylvania both fought the barbaric ways the Indians were often treated. Williams was an advocate of humane treatment when it was unpopular to be so. During the bloody Pequot War of 1636, he had the courage to write:

'Boast not proud English of thy birth and blood,  
Thy brother Indian is by birth as good.  
Of one blood God made him, and thee, and all,  
As wise, as fair, as strong, as personal.'

(Quoted in Bordewich, page 36)

Indians were often cruel to their enemies. Although it is often claimed that the whites invented scalping as evidence of having killed an Indian, words for ceremonial scalping (as well as other forms of dismemberment) existed in many Indian languages prior to the white man's arrival. Also, there were many strictly Indian wars among cultures such as the Iroquois who fought the Hurons, and the Navahos who colonized the Hopis. The Sioux on the Great Plains ruthlessly put down and subjugated smaller groups who dared oppose their empire building. It was the norm for members of each tribe to consider themselves "the People" and everyone else something less. For example, the Catawbas of South Carolina considered other natives to be "dogs" or "snakes" and white colonists "Nothings." The name "Comanche" comes from a Ute nickname which means "those who are always against us." Apache comes from the Pueblo word for "enemy." (Bordewich, pages 36-37)

### Early Policies Toward Native Americans

The new republic realized the danger to the Native Americans, and tried to formulate policy that would protect the Indians. Early laws and treaties existed that attempted to safeguard Indian lands from encroachment by whites.

In 1791, the Treaty of Holston between the United States and the Cherokees warned that if any non-Indian should "settle on any of the Cherokees' lands, such person shall forfeit the protection of the United States, and the Cherokees may punish him, or not, as they please." (Bordewich, page 37) Secretary of War Henry Knox proposed criminal action against violators. But the flood of settlers was unrelenting. The central government was too distant; the hunger for land too great. So, despite treaties and government warnings, American settlers streamed into Indian lands with little regard for the law.

Indians sometimes responded to the situation with an eye toward the future, realizing it was in their best interest to adapt to the changing times. In 1791, the Seneca chief Cornplanter wrote to Quakers in Philadelphia for financial help so that he could provide his people with the technical skills they would need in order for them to become more "Americanized" and less dependent on the "old ways." (Bordewich, page 38)

According to Thomas Jefferson and many early Christian missionaries, the way of the future was to teach the Native Americans the principles of property ownership, farming and cattle raising. In the early nineteenth century, government policy toward pacifying the Indians was to attempt to incorporate them into the American culture. Quakers, Methodists, Moravians and Baptists established "model settlements" along the frontier intended to attract Native Americans to a life-style in keeping with Protestant values. Along with Bibles, church groups supplied the Indians with plows, looms, spinning wheels and livestock, often courtesy of federal funds. Christian missionaries trekked into the wilderness hand-in-hand with government-paid carpenters and blacksmiths. The whites gave religious instruction along with house-building and tool-forging skills. David Zeisberger, who committed his life to working among the Delawares, and believed that all people had the right to a place in God's family, welcomed the Native Americans into the Christian community as equal members. He noted that "Those who come to Christ and join the church turn to agriculture and raising stock, keeping cattle, hogs and fowls." (Bordewich, page 39) There seemed to be a definite link between church and state policies of the time, since both intended to assimilate Native Americans into the Euro-American way of life. The government's task, then, was to convince the Indians to reject their old identity as antiquated and impractical and embrace new ways and skills that would better equip them to

survive in a land that was rapidly changing its identity. Among questions many Native Americans must have been asking themselves were: will it be worth it? Will the gains outweigh the losses? Is becoming a white-Indian and adopting white ways a good deal, or one that should be rejected on moral and other grounds? Will it work?