DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 003 SO 008 834

TITLE The Revolution and the Bicentennial: A Conference (Yale University, May 2, 1975).
INSTITUTION Connecticut Council for the Social Studies.; Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Hartford.; Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS American Culture; Art; *Colonial History (United States); Constitutional History; Essays; Historiography; *History Instruction; Local History; Primary Sources; *Resource Materials; *Revolutionary War (United States); Secondary Education; Social Studies; Teaching Techniques; *United States History; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS American Issues Forum; *Bicentennial; Connecticut

ABSTRACT

Nine essays, written by distinguished historians and scholars at Yale University, discuss both content and teaching techniques about the American Revolution and the Bicentennial. The essay titles include (1) What Not to Teach about the American Revolution, (2) The British Side of the Revolution, (3) Women and Revolution in the 18th Century, (4) Newspapers and the American Revolution, (5) Schools and the Constitution, (6) The Revolution in American Art, (7) Connecticut and the Revolution, (8) Bicentennial School Projects and the American Issues Forum, and (9) Epilogue: Thinking Large and Small in the American Revolution. Each essay contains a list of references or suggested readings. (DE)

THE REVOLUTION

AND

THE BICENTENNIAL

A Conference held at Yale University, May 2, 1975

Sponsored by the Yale Bicentennial Committee

and

The Connecticut Council for the Social Studies

in co-operation with

The Connecticut State Department of Education

Contents

What NOT to Teach about the American Revolution
by G.B. Warden, Assistant Professor of History, Yale

The British Side of the Revolution
by Herbert Atherton, Assistant Professor of History, Yale

Women and Revolution in the 18th Century
by Catherine M. Prelinger and Claude-Anne Lopez,
Assistant Editors, The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Yale

Newspapers and the American Revolution
by G.B. Warden, Assistant Professor of History, Yale

Schools and the Constitution Today
by John Simon, Professor of Law, Yale

The Revolution in American Art
by Frank Goodyear, Associate Curator, Garvan Collection, Yale

Connecticut and the Revolution
by Howard T. Oedel, Professor of History, Southern Connecticut

Bicentennial School Projects and the American Issues Forum
by J'Lene Mayo, Director, New Haven Bicentennial Commission

Epilogue: "Thinking Large and Small in the American Revolution"
Excerpt of remarks by Edmund S. Morgan,
Sterling Professor of History, Yale

What NOT to Teach about the American Revolution

by G. B. Warden

Despite war, depression, domestic strife and the underwhelming apathy of professional historians, the Bicentennial is upon us and Americans seem intent on celebrating and commemorating the American Revolution -- or at least whatever they can remember about the Revolution. If you and your students plan to join in the festivities, fine, but, to do it right, there are some important things to remember that may get lost in all the shouting, and there are an even greater number of things that need forgetting. Most of the latter are familiar to academic historians, but the students of today may not have heard the news yet. And when you try to find time in your busy schedules to catch up on the historical literature, you may have to do some weeding and pruning among the many myths and slogans that historians still let creep into the textbooks.

For example, the "triangle trade". This trading cycle of New England rum for African slaves for West Indian molasses for New England rum and so forth still appears prominently in many old schoolbooks and is the subject of a song in the musical 1776. At last year's conference, when I mentioned that the triangle trade is a myth, many teachers were shocked and surprised. I am now prepared to give you a definitive history of the triangle trade; in 1753 Captain David Lindsay in the brigantine Sanderson sailed along the route described above, and the next year he made a similar voyage in a vessel called the Sierra Leone. That's it. That is the entire amount of documented evidence for the triangle trade. But in the 19th century historians magnified Lindsay's two voyages into an all-encompassing economic activity upon which all of colonial commerce depended, despite the fact that there are several hundred thousand recorded voyages which did not go along the triangle trade route. Nonetheless, the myth seems to have a pleasing symmetry, if of course you and your students forget about the horrors of slavery.

"Salutory neglect" is one of the old schoolbook phrases which does seem to be holding up under historical scrutiny. It was the more or less official colonial policy in the two generations before 1760, when English leaders like the Walpoles did not interfere strenuously in colonial matters and let the colonies go their own way. There are, of course, some incidents like wars in which the colonial administrators were not neglectful and some English officials who did not act in a salutory way. But in general, in order to understand what happened in the wide array of colonial regulations after 1760, it is imperative to understand the policy of "salutory neglect" before 1760. In 1776, for example, Adam Smith published his Wealth of Nations which said that Britain's whole empire was "imaginary", a figment of British imagination, and that all of England's revenue laws and commercial regulations were not based on common-sense realities at all. James Henretta and Jack Greene have recently written detailed studies which affirm the basic truth of Smith's remarks and the policy of "salutory neglect". Indeed, Greene surmises that much of England's problems with the colonies after 1760 arose from a mistaken belief in two crucial fallacies -- one, that England had a real colonial administration, and, two, that it operated effectively. Upon these faulty premises, English leaders adopted new policies after 1760 and, as you all know, found that they were sadly mistaken. Indeed, in many revolutions including the American one, you can attribute much of the anxiety, violence and opposition to the fact that the old regime began to change the normal rules and accustomed policies.

As for the "Navigation Acts", there is still some debate over whether or not England's wide-ranging commercial restrictions hurt the colonies and contributed to the origins of the Revolution. Lawrence Harper and Louis Hacker say, "Yes". According to them, the Navigation Acts suppressed the normal growth of colonial commerce, manufacturing and agriculture by preventing the colonies from exploiting their own resources and trading in open world markets. Oliver Dickerson, however, argues that the Acts gave protected monopolies for many American goods like tobacco and sugar, and that New England enjoyed many advantages of European trade under the Acts; Dickerson says that the real hurt caused by the Acts came after 1767 when English customs commissioners began to harass colonial merchants like John Hancock and Henry Laurens. The Navigation Acts only brought in about £2500 in revenue every year, which was hardly enough to pay for collectors under the old system; according to Dickerson, they resorted to bribery and extortion to increase revenues and their own salaries. Thus, to Dickerson, it was the enforcement of the Acts by corrupt officials using Admiralty Courts without juries, rather than the Acts themselves, which caused revolutionary unrest. Personally, I think that the Acts did suppress colonial trade for a long while, mainly because they drained the colonies of hard cash which always went to pay English creditors. The Acts and other English policies before 1767 prevented the colonists from having any reliable paper money, any banks or corporations; everything was done by personal I.O.U.'s, and I think that eventually had a negative effect on the colonists. But at the moment economic historians are devising models and computer programs to estimate what the overall gains and losses of the Acts were in terms of their effect on England and the colonies.

Lawrence Gipson has tried to show in his sixteen-volume history of the British Empire before the Revolution that the French and Indian War was a major cause of protest and Revolution. That still seems a safe thing to teach, although it does not tell you much. The war began in America, it plunged England deeply into debt, and, after many decades of "salutory neglect", the war illuminated many anomalies and contradictions that had developed in the colonial system, particularly about co-operation between colonies and with England. English leaders seem to have discovered for the first time what the value and problems of the American colonies were, in terms of administration and revenue. It was to resolve the old anomalies and to solve post-war debt-financing that England began its new revenue measures after 1763, stricter enforcement of the Navigation Acts, and, for the first time, actually getting information about the colonies, their population, their laws and the effectiveness of routine imperial administration. I would caution you not to attribute all of the revolutionary protest to the French and Indian War, as Mr. Gipson tended to do, but you certainly cannot leave it out in your teaching.

Taxes: Many people still seem to think that the Revolution occurred because the English increased taxes on the colonists and that the colonists rebelled solely because of the amount of taxation. As I noted above, the Navigation Acts before 1760 brought in only about £2500 a year on colonial trade totalling several hundred thousand pounds sterling, so that in pounds and shillings the taxes in the Navigation Acts were not a heavy burden in and of themselves. And it is extremely difficult to argue that England's other colonial taxes were oppressive in numerical terms. The stamp duties passed in 1765 were repealed in 1766. The taxes in the Townshend Acts of 1767 were repealed in 1770, except for tea. The tax on each gallon of imported foreign molasses was actually reduced from six pence in 1763 to three pence in 1764 to one penny in 1766. And, the Tea Act of 1773 actually reduced the cost of imported English

tea. The English hoped to get about £100,000 a year in revenue from the colonies, mainly from the molasses duty and tea duty. In fact, they rarely got more than £40,000 a year. The English seem to have miscalculated their budget in spectacular fashion. By my calculations, if the British wanted £100,000 per year from the colonies, every able-bodied drinker in the colonies would have had to consume over a pint and a half of rum made from molasses, every day of the year. Or every tea drinker would have had to increase his or her consumption of legally imported tea twenty-four times. The colonists would have been awash in a mixture of tea and rum. As it was, however, almost all of England's taxes after 1760 caused only a slight dent in the colonists' pocketbooks.

If England was repealing or actually lowering taxes after 1760, what then was all the fuss about? The answer, of course, is the old familiar phrase: "No taxation without representation". That slogan is still good to teach. Indeed, it is probably the absolutely crucial ingredient in the protests leading up to the Revolution. It was not the amount of taxes that mattered. It was the constitutional principle involved in the new taxes which angered the colonists. It is a great injustice to the colonists to leave students with the idea that the Americans rebelled mainly or solely for economic reasons. They believed very strongly in direct representation and popular consent to taxation in all forms. Indeed, once the Revolution did break out, the colonists even refused to let the Continental Congress have direct taxing powers on the people. It is also important to remember that the slogan, "No taxation without representation", did NOT -- I repeat, NOT -- mean that the colonists wanted to be represented in Parliament. The colonists had their own legislatures and wanted to be taxed by their own representatives in those legislatures.

Ever since Thomas Paine called him "the royal brute of Briton", George III has not had a good "image" in America. Richard Pares and Herbert Butterfield have written important studies putting George III in his proper political context and showing how historians themselves have painted him to be somewhat worse than he may have been. Indeed, George III was not responsible directly for English colonial policies until 1774; most of the new taxes and policies after 1760 were adopted and pursued by various English leaders amidst a bewildering array of factions and cliques in Parliament. Most of the nasty things listed in the Declaration of Independence were actually Parliament's responsibility, not George III's. Though he may not have been so good as Prince Charles believes, he was probably not so bad as English and American historians have said. Many people believe that, good or bad, George III was crazy, meaning psychologically insane. Ida Macalpine and Richard Hunter, however, have studied the records of George III's doctors and argue that he suffered mainly from an hereditary metabolic disease which distorted his perceptions, made him irritable and produced hallucinations in times of stress. Some of the argument is conjectural; and opinion is still divided among doctors and historians of the problem. Whether George III was psychologically insane or physiologically upset, it is important to notice that almost all of George's fits of mental trouble occurred in the 1780's long after the Revolution was over. So, in a sense, it does not make much difference in the events before 1776. Whether he or Parliament was responsible for the formulation of colonial policy after 1760 or whatever his physical and mental health may have been, as "causes" of the Revolution, the results were still the same, either way.

Important as many of the ideas, concepts and principles are which I have sketched above, many people do connect the Revolution with the acts or sayings

of individuals at the time. I hope that in your teaching you can get students to consider seriously many of the over-arching themes, issues and problems of the Revolution without being distracted too much by some of the famous sayings taken out of context or proclaimed as immutable truth in textbooks and statues.

Patrick Henry is a prime example. From all accounts, he was an inflammatory orator who did leave strong impressions on his listeners. That is undeniable. What is debatable is whether he actually said many of the things attributed to him. Supposedly in 1765 Henry protested against the Stamp Act at the House of Burgesses, and, after making allusions between Julius Caesar, Brutus, Charles I, Cromwell, and George III, his colleagues cried, "Treason!", to which Henry supposedly replied "If this be treason make the most of it!" According to one eyewitness, however, Henry said that "if he had afronted the speaker, or the house, he was ready to ask pardon, and he would shew his loyalty to his majesty King G. the third, at the Expence of the last Drop of his blood;" he explained that the "Interest of his Countrys Dying liberty" and "the heat of passion might have lead him to have said something more than he intended, but, again, if he said anything wrong, he begged the speaker and houses pardon." Sorry about that. As for "Give me liberty or give me death!" which Henry supposedly uttered in 1775, there are other versions of the speech in question, and indeed it is hard to tell what Henry may have said about anything at any time. Most of the famous slogans attributed to him first appeared in 1817 in a book by William Wirt which was based on hearsay and fifty-year old memories. Wirt was Attorney General in 1817, but that does not make him an unimpeachable source. The slogans were embroidered somewhat in another biography by Henry's grandson. Henry's orations, whatever he may or may not have said, had important effects in 1765 and 1775 at crucial debates, but please treat his famous slogans with extreme caution.

Paul Revere is another case, memorable because of Longfellow's poem in the 19th century. Remember "One if by land, two if by sea?" It has a nice ring to it, but not much history behind it. Actually, the British went both ways. How many lanterns were needed then? Three? One and a half? Also, I hope most of you recall that Revere was captured that night and did not make it to Concord, which was his and the British main objective. He did get to Lexington, but the British were already there, by the time he arrived. His most famous ride, which should be remembered, occurred in 1774 when he took the Suffolk Resolves to the Continental Congress in nearly record time. Though he was almost court-martialled later on in the war, I hope everyone remembers that he was first and foremost an exquisite silversmith.

It may be somewhat sacrilegious to mention it, but it is possible that Nathan Hale did not say the famous last words attributed to him. There are two versions of his execution as a spy in 1776. The more familiar version appeared in a book published in 1848. It was written at some unknown time by a classmate of Hale's, and included a quoted statement obtained at some unknown time after the execution from a British officer, supposedly under flag of truce. The other version appears in the diary of another British officer under the date in question. According to Frederick Mackenzie, Hale "behaved with great composure and resolution, saying he thought it the duty of every good Officer, to obey any orders given him by his Commander in Chief; and desired that the Spectators to be at all times prepared to meet death in whatever shape it might appear." A rather forthright statement from an undeniably brave young man, but not quite the words to carve in marble.

"One third of the people were averse to the revolution, one third favored it, and one third were lukewarm." This is another familiar phrase, which has appeared most recently in Alastair Cooke's television series on America. It is a paraphrase of comments in a letter by John Adams in January 1815. Like the "triangle trade", dividing the country into thirds has a pleasing symmetry, and the phrase has worked itself into a number of textbooks and popular writings about the American Revolution. There is one slight, technical problem, however. In the letter Adams wasn't talking about the American Revolution. He was talking about the French Revolution, specifically American reactions to the war between Britain and France. In 1775 Adams surmised that 90% of the Americans were wholeheartedly in favor of the Revolution, a more reliable estimate. In some scattered localities at various times in the war, loyalists and their sympathizers may perhaps have numbered as much as a third of the local population, but in general Adams' estimate in 1775 seems closer to the mark. Historians are still debating how many men were serving in loyalist regiments during the war, but at the end only about 9,000 people out of two or three million filed claims for compensation as loyalists.

"The Critical Period" is a phrase emphasized by John Fiske in his 19th century studies of the 1780's. According to that view, the Continental Congress and the Articles of Confederation were unworkable, ineffective, disorganized, and chaotic, supposedly crying out for the Federal Constitution to come along and save the Republic. This seems mainly a case of reading history backwards. Merrill Jensen in particular has argued very convincingly that the Continental Congress and the Articles were not so bad or so ineffective as the Federalists and later historians may have said. The Congress, after all, did manage to fight a long and costly war to a successful conclusion, when, as John Adams put it, there was a continual problem of getting thirteen clocks to chime at once. The Confederation was a normal, expectable government based directly on the principles expressed in the Declaration of Independence. Congress and its agents did manage to get credit, treaties and assistance from France which were crucial to the American victory. Chaotic as Congress' finances and currency may have been, they were still better than those of the individual states in most cases. Finally, the Confederation did approve the Northwest Ordinances which provided the first workable arrangement for future western expansion, a solution which eluded all other European imperial administrations in America. So, once again, while the Confederation may not have been an ideal government, it was still not quite so bad as historians have said.

Debate still rages among historians about the degree of class conflict or middle-class consensus in the origins of the Revolution, and, in related fashion, whether the Federal Constitution was a conservative counter-revolutionary attack on the democratic tendencies of the previous years. Compared with revolutions in other countries, the American Revolution looks undeniably tame in comparison. There were confiscations of loyalist property, but none of the mass purges, terror and wholesale proscription associated with France or Russia. In parts of New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey there were outbreaks of agrarian revolt which look like peasant uprisings, but even so, they were pretty tame. The Regulator movement in the Carolinas and the Green Mountain "boys'" doings in Vermont may look like a Marxian attack on private property, law and order, and the upper classes, but in fact, such frontier uprisings were directed not so much at large landowners at all; rather, they were directed against corrupt public officials wielding arbitrary power. The Regulators did not want to destroy law and order; they wanted public officials to be more diligent and effective in suppressing crime on the frontier. No matter how much Marxian

socio-economic class conflict one might be tempted to read into such internal disputes, most of them, in fact, were mainly about political power and constitutional principles. Indeed, Marx himself said that America had never had a true social revolution and probably never would have one, because poor people in America enjoyed such a high standard of living. Like other 19th century statements, that, too, must be taken with heaps of salt, but, as far as historians are concerned, the verdict about socio-economic class conflict during the Revolution is still out. I wish I could give you some definitive answer, but like a lot of the other problems I've been describing, the historical process is one of endless, ongoing inquiry, and I hope you can discuss such problems with your students, even though you and they may be disappointed at the lack of answers for the moment.

If so many familiar elements of the Revolution are forgettable, what then is memorable about the American Revolution? I cannot speak for you or other historians, but for myself what impresses me most is the physical and mental courage of the people involved in the long ordeal. To be sure, there may be other revolutions more bloody, cataclysmic and visibly earth-shaking. The American Revolution seems to me more of the change which John Adams described as occurring in the "hearts and minds" of the people than simply of the riots, protests, battles, and slogans. Adams said that change occurred long before the actual war began, or, in other words, that unlike other revolutions, feelings of American identity and national consciousness and independence occurred before the war and were a cause of the war, not simply the results of the war. As many of you may recall, Benjamin Rush replied that to him the "true" revolution was beginning long after the war was over, but he did not deny that the new post-war revolution was also in the "hearts and minds" of the people. To Rush, the experiments of the Confederation and of the Constitution were so new, fresh and free from the limiting restrictions of the past that they became part of the ongoing Revolution. In that sense, in the sense of experimentalism, the Constitution was a marvelous and miraculous continuation of the pre-war protests, the newly-awakened challenges to traditional policies and institutions, the proliferating experiments during the war resulting in written constitutions, and the still mysterious, exhilarating sense that America had set itself free from history as well as from the Old World. That experimental willingness in the "hearts and minds" of the people, their audacity in questioning previously sacrosanct traditions, their eagerness to say -- "No, that is the way things have been for the Old World. We don't have to do it that way anymore. We can do it differently, and we can do it better. Nothing can stop us except the limitations of our own imagination and our own common sense" -- those feelings of exploration with all their hopes and fears, with all the risks, anxiety and insecurity which come from such an overwhelming revelation of endless possibilities -- all those, I think, come close to some of the important and memorable elements of the American Revolution. It may seem heretical for a professional historian to stand here and say that one of the most memorable elements of the American Revolution was that the Americans declared their independence of history itself and freed themselves from much of the inhibiting mental blocks of tradition and custom, habit and memory. But that, I think, is what did happen, and, in case you have not noticed it before in these remarks, part of that mental experimentalism included a healthy curiosity about many of the slogans, myths and comforting yet fanciful illusions in the history books. Professional historians are, after all, teachers, too, and in celebrating the Bicentennial I do not think it's especially educational to stop asking questions. Asking questions and pursuing curiosity wherever it may lead are near the heart of what we call the Revolution, what we call history and what we call education. Valuable

as it may be to see where we have been, perhaps the Bicentennial can encourage us to keep asking who we are, what we are doing and where we are going. One memorable moral of the story may be not to believe everything you hear or see, especially from historians, but another and better lesson is to continue the inquiry about what was American and, indeed, what was revolutionary about the American Revolution.

References

Gilman Ostrander, "The Making of the Triangle Trade Myth", William and Mary Quarterly, October 1973.

James A. Henretta, Salutory Neglect, Princeton University Press, 1972.

Stephen Kurtz and James H. Hutson, eds., Essays on the American Revolution, University of North Carolina Press, 1973.

Lawrence Harper, The English Navigation Laws, Octagon Press reprint, 1964.

Louis M. Hacker, "The First American Revolution", Columbia University Quarterly, 1935.

Oliver M. Dickerson, The Navigation Acts and the American Revolution, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951.

Lawrence H. Gipson, The Coming of the American Revolution, Harper & Row, 1954.

Edmund S. and Helen M. Morgan, The Stamp Act Crisis, University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Richard Pares, King George III and the Politicians, Oxford University Press, 1953.

Herbert Butterfield, George III and the Historians, Macmillan, 1959.

Ida Macalpine and Richard Hunter, George III and the Mad Business, Pantheon, 1969.

William Wirt, Sketches of the Life and Character of Patrick Henry, 1817.

"Journal of a French Traveller in the Colonies, 1765", American Historical Review, XXVI (1921), 745, quoted in Edmund S. Morgan, ed., Prologue to Revolution, University of North Carolina Press, 1959, pp. 46-47.

G.B. Warden, Boston, 1689-1776, Little, Brown & Co., 1970.

Diary of Captain Frederick Mackenzie, Harvard University Press, 1930, I, 60-62, quoted in David Potter and Thomas Manning, eds., Nationalism and Sectionalism, pp. 30-31.

Charles F. Adams, ed., The Works of John Adams, X, 110-11.

Merrill Jensen, The New Nation, Knopf, 1950.

Charles Beard, An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution; Forrest McDonald, We the People; Robert E. Brown, Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts.

The British Side of the Revolution

by Herbert M. Atherton

About the time I agreed to speak at this bicentennial conference, a news item appeared in the media, which ordinarily would have passed through my attention as a piece of anecdotal trivia, but which caught my interest because the reaction to it seemed particularly relevant to my subject today. The item was a story saying that Prince Charles had declared George III to be the monarch whom he admired the most among his mother's predecessors, a model perhaps for the future king. The reaction here, as intoned by Walter Cronkite and noted in Time magazine, was one of alarmed bewilderment at so eccentric a statement; not altogether frivolous questions were raised about whether or not yet another difficulty would be added to Britain's already troubled future.

How hard dies the myth in popular lore about the king who lost America, despite two generations of professional research that have clearly undermined it. That we over here should cling to the notion that George III was, in some significant and personal way, responsible for the American Revolution is perhaps understandable, if not justified: it rests on certain assumptions that made our original case for independence. More surprising, however, is the fact that the myth also thrives in England. There are several reasons for this. The British, though monarchists, are not sentimental monarchists. They can be especially cruel in the memorializing of their kings. "Mad King George" is for Englishmen the source of many uncharitable anecdotes, some of them even true. In addition, the American Revolution has always been regarded as the single greatest failure of the British imperial experience -- with the exception of Ireland, of course. Especially in the nineteenth century, it was convenient to write off this tragic episode as the fault of an aberrated monarch. Finally, and most important, Englishmen have generally been very ignorant about American history. It is not and never has been a subject of major interest in British schools. All of this is to say that British contributions to the historiography of the American Revolution are disproportionately low to what has been produced on this side. The economic school of Beard and Hacker, which had a very great impact on my learning of the Revolution in secondary education, has been an American one. So has been the imperialist school of Andrews, Beer, and Gipson.

The British contribution to the historiography of this subject has been largely political; it is largely indebted -- we can say fifteen years after his death and after many of his conclusions have been revised -- to the work and inspiration of one man, Sir Lewis Namier.

It is true that Namier and his protogées have not produced much work on the Revolution itself, a fact which is surprising when one considers that the impetus behind Namier's work, when he began it fifty years ago, was to understand why and how the Revolution came about. This interest launched him into an exhaustive study of the nature of British politics in the middle of the eighteenth century. He immersed himself in the world of England in the age of the American Revolution (which happens to be the title of his second book). The end result has been a thorough, meticulous examination of British domestic politics from the accession of George III to the fall of Lord North's ministry. Within this twenty-two year stretch there are but few gaps (I have noted some of the titles which Namier and his pupils have produced in this series) and these gaps will no doubt be closed eventually.

The work of the Namierites, as we may call them, is momentous, its ramifications have extended well beyond the subject itself. I can only comment on a few of their conclusions here. As many of you may know, the work of these historians has demolished the old Whig interpretation of the accession of George III and the causes of the American Revolution. They have banished the traditional view which held that Britain was, in 1760, a constitutional monarchy with political power decisively in the hands of Parliament and with the sovereign little more than a figurehead; a view which held that George III, upon his accession, was determined to undo this by reviving Tory principles of independent prerogative and a Tory party, by making the crown under his personal sway into a disruptive political force, by turning his ministers into abject tools, Parliament into a rubberstamp, and, in the arrogance of his accumulated power, infringing upon the liberties of his subjects, a move which, when extended to the colonies, led to the War of Independence. This old scenario the Namierites have effectively rewritten. With a thoroughly professional calibre of research through masses of evidence, they have dramatically enlightened the political and constitutional structure of England at the time.

Certainly their most important achievement was to show that the structure of English politics in the eighteenth century was quite different from what it had been under the independent, semi-absolute monarchy of the Stuarts and what it was to become in a constitutional monarchy with a parliamentary government under Victoria. The monarchy in the eighteenth century was a transitional constitution, in which political power was rather ambiguously shared between the king and the House of Commons. It was a constitution that is often described as "mixed monarchy". The distribution of power would of course vary slightly according to personalities and circumstances, but always the government of England depended on these two sources of power working together. The executive remained independent under the Crown and, to a certain extent, under the sovereign's personal control. Yet, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, the Crown could not get along without the consistent, on-going cooperation of Parliament. A modus vivendi was possible because of the existence of certain political conditions. With a substantial amount of patronage and other favor, the Crown could influence the Commons. A workable arrangement was also possible because there existed a very limited notion of the functions of government. There was an absence of major divisive issues, which meant that men entered politics more for profit and glory than for cause. Parties were personal, flexible, and ephemeral. Governments were coalitions of these parties, conveniently given to minor change and readjustment. And all of this went on in a rather tight little world of a political establishment, which comprised a fraction of the nation; a world where politics was more personal and social than public and political. Excellent summary statements of this system of mixed monarchy can be found in Namier's "Monarchy and the Party System" and Richard Pares, King George III and the Politicans.

The system worked well, but it worked better at some times than at others. It functioned best when there existed a "prime" or "first" minister -- which was more a political achievement than an office in the eighteenth century -- who could make the various elements work more efficiently. In the years preceding the Revolution the system didn't function very well: the mid-1750's until the rise of North in 1770 were years of chronic instability, witnessed by a dramatic turnover in ministries. The accession of George III merely added to an already existing problem. A young and inexperienced king perhaps tended to make things worse, but primarily the difficulties of mixed monarchy in the first ten years of the new reign were attributable, according to the Namierites, more to imper-

sonal changes and accidents in the structure of politics.

The events which led to revolution, therefore, tell us more about the nature of British politics than the shortcomings of British statesmen. A coherent and consistent policy for America after 1763 was rendered impossible by the revolving-door succession of ministries: Grenville to Rockingham to Chatham to Grafton to North. The Namierites have, in the concatenation of events and men leading to the Revolution, perhaps taken an unseemly delight in dissecting the failures of the governments of Rockingham and Chatham, men who were heroes to the old Whig school. During the crucial period, 1765-67, there came the repeal of the Stamp Act, the Declaratory Act, and the Townshend duties: a disastrous succession of measures which only bred mistrust; a total confusion of policy that was the direct by-product of a weak, leaderless, and confused situation in parliamentary politics. The Namierites' research has shown that these imperial measures were not so much prompted by the colonial problem itself as by concern on the part of the ministries for their own survival in Parliament. Their legislation was essentially a product of domestic political weakness.

Those of us who teach eighteenth-century British history have found it difficult to ignore the implications of what Namier is saying. It can be said that in the best of political situations, the British government would have had considerable trouble in solving the problems of a widened empire. Imperial governance was perhaps beyond the capacity of eighteenth-century government. At the best of times the confused division of responsibility within imperial administration, the difficulties of communication in space and time, and the vagaries of parliamentary politics might have made the problems insurmountable. Men who saw the functions of government as scarcely extending beyond the management of an existing machine -- the collection of taxes, enforcing of law and order, and protecting trade, and who lived in a political world where private property was sacrosanct, where mob rioting and other forms of popular outcry were hardly to be credited with serious political significance, such men would certainly be handicapped and insensitive to the events which confronted them from America after 1765.

Such a conception of British politics at mid-century has led Namier to argue that the Revolution was inevitable, in the nature of the Empire:

> The basic elements of the Imperial Problem during the American Revolution must be sought not so much in conscious opinions and professed views bearing directly on it, as in the very structure and life of the Empire....Those who are out to apportion guilt in history have to keep to views and opinions, judge the collisions of planets by the rules of road traffic, make history into something like a column of motoring accidents, and discuss it in the atmosphere of a police court....there is no free will in the thinking and actions of the masses, any more than in the revolutions of planets, in the migrations of birds, and in the plunging of hoards of lemmings into the sea. At the moment of supreme crisis, in March 1778, Governor Thomas Hutchinson, a loyalist refugee in England, wrote in despair: 'It's certain the political clock of Great Britain stands still.' He was wrong; the political clock of Great Britain was ticking the seconds and striking the hours, as it always does, no slower and no quicker; it was a clock, and not a seismograph.
>
> England in the Age of the American Revolution, p. 40.

A solution was impossible, Namier says, because it was not latent in the circumstances. The proposed "Solutions" were irrelevant for, as he says, "no great historic problem has ever been settled by means of a brilliant idea." Most of the theories which appeared at the time were either anachronistic and ignored, as in the case of Burke, or were disastrous, as in the case of Charles Townshend. Though Namier did not involve himself directly in the study of the causes of the Revolution, his views were very much in harmony with the then prevailing schools of thought over here, which sought an explanation in the nature of imperial administration and in the conflict of principle.

The old empire school of Charles M. Andrews demonstrated that it was a fact of major significance that the first British Empire was born in the seventeenth century, when England was undergoing great political and constitutional changes. While most of the colonies were establishing an allegiance to the mother country through the royal prerogative, that same prerogative was being transformed at home as a result of the Glorious Revolution. Colonial administration, in one sense, existed in a state of arrested constitutional development, as it was never made harmonious with the Revolution Settlement of 1689. Thus was laid the basis for the later confusion and debate over the nature of imperial authority. The same confusion expressed itself in the make-shift, haphazard division of responsibility in the administering of the empire, shared by the Board of Trade, the Secretaries of State, the Secretary of War, the Treasury, Admiralty, and other offices.

A similar development can be seen in constitutional and political thought, where colonial ideas were either, depending on one's view, arrested in the seventeenth century or developed along a course different from that followed in England. American political thought was profoundly influenced by the libertarian and common law theorists of seventeenth-century England. Viewing their colonial assemblies' relationship to the Crown in much the same light as the seventeenth-century Parliament saw itself in relationship to the Stuart monarchy, they drew upon ideas which had championed Parliament's cause, especially the theories of fundamental law. Britain's own constitutional thought had developed away from such ideas. Partly as a result of the Glorious Revolution, the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty became Whig orthodoxy in the eighteenth century. The American colonists, clinging to a theory of allegiance which emphasized the royal prerogative and the ideas of fundamental law which served as a check upon such prerogative, professed what most Englishmen had come to regard as an eccentric Tory position. Between the theories of fundamental law and sovereignty there could be no compromise. The American Revolution was, by this view, inevitable because England had failed to extend her Revolution Settlement to the colonies until it was too late.

Much of the more recent historiography of the American Revolution has carried on within the broad context of the old imperialist school. To the extent that long-run, impersonal developments within the structure of the Empire continue to be emphasized, there remains an air of determinism and inevitability. This recent work, however, has departed significantly from such a view. Michael Kammen's Rope of Sand and Alison Olson's Anglo-American Politics, 1660-1775, for example, see the Revolution as being, in a sense, the break-up of one community, a great transatlantic empire. They have, in a sense, "imperialized" Namier by extending his methods and subject across the Atlantic and, more important, incorporating the colonies' political structure into that of England. They have shown how a breakdown within this structure -- in the system of colonial agents in Kammen's book, the party ties and

communications in Olson's -- helped precipitate the Revolution. Though their books have to do with long-range developments, both historians emphasize the crucial turning-points in the years immediately preceding the final break.

These books are part of a reaction against the old determinist position, a reaction which began about twenty years ago. Edmund Morgan, in his "The American Revolution: Revisions in Need of Revising", pointed out how such theories had "de-Whigged" the Revolution, de-humanized it and, by suggesting ineluctable determinants, minimized the role of immediate events and thereby somehow denied the Revolution of some of its justification. This observation was, in part, a criticism of the work of Namier, who was at the same time undergoing revisionist criticism at home by such historians as Herbert Butterfield. These anti-Namierites, as we may call them, saw Namier's work as being too dogmatic and impersonal in its emphasis on structural factors, too narrow in its focus, which largely ignored the political world outside Parliament (including public opinion), and simply unrealistic in its denial of human free will and of the role of ideas in history. Those of us working in the field today, for example, pay greater heed to public opinion and intellectual currents than did our predecessors a generation ago, when Namier's influence was at its height.

All of this has led some British historians to call for new thinking about how the American Revolution fits into the fabric of eighteenth-century British politics and government. One of them is I.R. Christie, a protegée of Namier's, who has moved away somewhat from the perspectives of his mentor. In a book, Crisis of Empire: Great Britain and the American Colonies, 1754-1783, and a more recent article, "The Historians' Quest for the American Revolution", Christie appears to argue the older view of the Revolution as a failure in statesmanship. Given the limitations which affected all the king's servants, some failed more than others. It is therefore important, he says, to examine the reasons for these mistakes, much as it is important to look at how the colonists responded to them. Though Christie doesn't say so, I think he has something in mind which is akin to what some recent historians of nineteenth-century British imperialism have offered as a way of bringing the varied and conflicting theories of empire into some meaningful synthesis. Look to the decision-makers, they say, to the statesmen of empire, to the men at the center who were faced with the task of governing it, to the contents of their dispatch boxes. Only in this way can we see how the economic, political, administrative, military and intellectual factors played against and with each other in making, extending, and ending an empire. And the decisions themselves are important. Namier's remark about police-court history to the contrary, there is utility in what has often been the historian's obligation to affix responsibility.

In this view, George III cannot escape examination or judgment. If as we now know, kings were more than figureheads in the eighteenth-century, George III certainly figured in the decisions which led to rebellion and in the conduct of the war which attempted to suppress it. Whatever conclusions such an inquiry may lead to, however, will not likely coincide with the myth of a malevolent and corrupt tyrant who lost an empire by attempting to undermine English liberty. As we know, the historical judgment of George III was long entrapped in the contrived theories of the Declaration of Independence. Consistent with the colonists' theory of imperial allegiance to the Crown, the Declaration, in justifying independence, appeared to suggest that George III was to a significant degree personally responsible for the mistakes of the British government. Hence the long litany of charges: "He has obstructed

the administration of justice....He has made judges dependent on his will alone....He has kept among us, in time of peace, standing armies....A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people." As Namier and such recent biographers of George III as John Brooke have shown, the King would have hardly agreed with such Tory assumptions about the status of the Crown in the constitution of the Empire. He was, if anything, too good a Revolution Whig in his allegiance to the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. Whatever failings of personality or mistakes of judgment belong to him, it would be difficult any longer to impugn his intentions or his principles.

I emphasize this point not only out of what is perhaps undue attention to an old myth, but also from an awareness of certain pedestrian but I suspect unavoidable analogies with which we who teach the subject of the American Revolution are likely to be confronted during the period of the Bicentennial. Though I am one who is deeply suspicious of reading present-day concerns into the past and who has a marked distaste for the politicizing of history, I can scarcely overlook the ironic coincidence of living, at the two hundreth anniversary of our birth, in the wake of a ruined presidency, a political system shaken by what many take to be the arrogance of power and corruption. Whatever our views in this matter, I would be surprised if an analogy between our recent president and our last king is not presented to us in the classroom sooner or later. In testing the analogy we may not be able to put recent events in adequate historical perspective, but we are certainly obligated to render an informed historical judgment on the political world of George III.

A related analogy is also likely to occur to many of us. With an eye to the events of recent days, we might do well to consider it. Having just witnessed the final act of a futile and agonizing war and, with it, a humiliating diminution of our world power, we now face the prospect of living with perhaps the first unmitigated failure in American history (irretrievable in the sense that the Civil War was not). Coming within two weeks of the anniversary of Lexington and Concord, this tragic finale seems extraordinarily ironic to me. I am reminded of a poem by Piet Hein, which a student of mine included in a discussion of the American Revolution five or six years ago, when events in Southeast Asia had reached a crisis on our domestic scene. The poem seems even more apposite today. It is entitled "Losing Face".

> The noble art of losing face
> may one day save the human race
> and turn into eternal merit
> what weaker minds would call disgrace.

References

John Brooke, The Chatham Administration, 1766-1768
King George III

I.R. Christie, Crisis of Empire: Great Britain and the American Colonies, 1754-1783
"The Historians' Quest for the American Revolution", Statesmen, Scholars, and Merchants: Essays in Eighteenth-Century History presented to Dame Lucy Sutherland, A. Whiteman, et al., eds.

Bernard Donoughue, British Politics and the American Revolution: the Path to War 1773-75

Michael Kammen, A Rope of Sand: the Colonial Agents, British Politics, and the American Revolution

Paul Langford, The First Rockingham Administration, 1765-1766
Sir Lewis Namier, England in the Age of the American Revolution
"King Cabinet, and Parliament in the Early Years of George III", the Ford Lectures, Crossroads of Power
"Monarchy and the Party System" and "King George III: a Study of Personality", Personalities and Powers
Alison Olson, Anglo-American Politics, 1660-1775: the Relationship between Parties in England and Colonial America
Sir Richard Pares, King George III and the Politicians
C.R. Ritcheson, British Politics and the American Revolution

Women and Revolution in the 18th Century

I. Catherine M. Prelinger

This workshop resembles the tune which the British played on the way to their surrender at Yorktown: "The World Turned Upside Down". Mrs. Lopez is from the French part of Belgium, but she knows more about the American Revolution than I do, and, though I am an American, my studies have been mainly about European women. Between us we will try to explore the topic of "Women and Revolution in the 18th Century" on both sides of the Atlantic.

Those of you who are already teaching Women's History are probably very familiar with some general points I'd like to stress as important. For example, it is important to remember that Women's History like any discipline is evolving, and, though it is a relatively new discipline, it has evolved in a very significant way since it first started. In its early stages, Women's History was "compensatory". It tried to compensate for the past neglect of women by scholarly historians, usually by focussing on individual women, showing how much they accomplished and how unwarranted the neglect of them was. But such an approach did not try to redefine the accepted categories of historical importance -- which was then defined as what was important to men.

The new Women's History tries to do something else as well. It tries to find out simply what was happening to women and asking questions which are important to women. For instance: At what age did the average woman marry? How many children did she have? What happened to her if she didn't get married? What were her opportunities for work? Her place under the law? Some of these questions get into issues of concern to modern feminists, but in history such issues are not the main focus. Part of the new Women's History simply tries to find the materials for studying women in the past -- diaries, letters, demographic data.

This brings me to another point about the new Women's History: It is a co-operative effort, much more than conventional individual scholarship. This is partly because the scholarly establishment has excluded many women and forced them into mutual support and action. Also, the kinds of information and data needed to reconstruct the history of women simply cannot be processed by scholars working individually. Many of the new books in Women's History are anthologies rather than books by single authors. Mrs. Lopez's book is co-authored with Eugenia Herbert. This workshop, as you have noticed, is the only one with two leaders, as if the people running the conference didn't think either of us could do it on our own.

To be more specific about the 18th century, I'd like to say a few words about work being done on women in Revolutionary France before zeroing in on women in the American Revolution. Please consult the attached bibliography. The Reinhard article is important for showing a 25% increase in marriages at some places during the French Revolution. The apprentice system had been abolished, so that age no longer limited people's ability to marry. Moreover, the disestablishment of the church meant that people could marry at any time, not just the approved times imposed by the church. However, the birth rate does not seem to have increased, which is partly expectable due to the war and revolutionary dislocations. The abolition of primogeniture and the ascendancy of bourgeois ideals of the family also played their parts in changing the status

of women and the family unit. Hufton's article emphasizes that when the government failed to organize food deliveries, it obviously antagonized many women into revolutionary protests. Reforms of the church also changed the ways in which poor relief was handled in communities. Taking poor relief away from priests seriously affected women's roles in times of crisis. Moreover, priests and the church played important roles in midwifery, which were disrupted by revolutionary events. Most important, the disestablishment of the church destroyed the lace industry done by women in almost all parts of France. Abray's article shows how feminist leaders in France were thwarted by politically sympathetic male leaders. As a result, women really lost out. There was no possibility of voting, where it had existed in a few places previously. Patrimonial justice which had protected many women's rights also went. The abolition of convents reduced opportunities for the education of women, and for the non-religious occupations that nuns had previously. A long, long time passed in France and the rest of Europe before secular reforms replaced what women had lost in the Revolutionary Era.

Looking at studies about women in the American Revolution, you will notice that many of them still omit examination of black or Indian women and that most of the works are still concerned with the accomplishments of women in male-defined categories of importance. Moreover, any bibliography now is ipso facto incomplete, certainly until the July conference in Washington. In looking at the bibliography below, I would point out the usefulness of Notable American Women, especially if you and your students compare the sketches in it with those in Ellet's older compendium. Ellet's sketches are very dubious historically, and she emphasizes too much the masculine heroics of the women studied. Most of the other titles are in your public libraries or accessible in other ways. It is more or less up to you how useful you would consider them for your own preparation or for your students' discussions and essays.

Turning to the issues which concerned women in the American Revolution, I think it is valuable to draw attention, not only to the achievements of individual women in the Revolution but also to the vast range of issues which were of concern to women as women in those times, distinct from those of male-defined importance.

In general, I would say that the American Revolution reinforced and accentuated the tendencies already apparent in the lives of women in colonial America.

For example, throughout the colonial period, the ratio of men to women had been high, and women, in other words, were at a premium. Although by the 1770's this disparity was correcting itself -- along the eastern seaboard the ratio was evening out -- in New York it was still 106.1 men to 100 women, and in the marriageable ages between 16 and 60, the general ratio was 160.8 men to 100 women. This situation naturally meant that there was great pressure on women to marry. In Connecticut, 73.5% of women between the ages of 20 and 69 were married. Also because of the newness of the country there was equally a great pressure to have large families. The average women of completed fertility had had eight children. Likewise, there was both the pressure and the necessity for everyone to be socially and economically productive. The contrasts between married life and singlehood, between productive work at home and productive work outside the home which are such basic distinctions in the lives of women today, simply do not pertain in the period we are considering.

The colonial period offers a panorama of women working in all varieties of occupations. The revolutionary war simply accentuated this activity because of necessity and the absence of men. Through colonial times there are, for example, women representatives among the professions: Law, the Clergy, and Medicine, to name the obvious ones. Law, of course, was less narrowly defined then than now, but the example of Margaret Brent in Maryland comes to mind. She acted as executrix of the Governor's estate after he died in 1647, and exercised power of attorney for the Proprietor, Lord Baltimore. She also tried to get two votes in the Maryland Legislature, one for herself as holder of property and one as a proxy for him.

Female Ministers were particularly a Quaker phenomenon, although there were other sects which also permitted women to act as ministers. The Benson book gives a great many examples: two whom I followed in Notable American Women were Sophia Wigington Hume and Jemima Wilkinson, both late eighteenth century figures. Because of the Quaker emphasis on the Inner Light rather than on Scriptural or Doctrinal sources of authority, women shared with men the preacherly vocation. An even more important contribution of the Quakers to the equality for women was their version of the marriage contract.

As to medicine, there was no limitation on the entrance of women into the practice of any kind of medicine, including surgery. The books you should consult if the subject of colonial women in medicine interests you are the two Dexter books, and Julia Spruill. Midwifery was not only practiced by women: it was monopolized by women. Men could be taken to court -- and occasionally were -- for practicing midwifery. Historians who have worked with colonial newspapers such as Dexter and Spruill, cite obituaries where midwives dying at advanced ages are credited with having delivered 2, 3, and 4 thousand children each. Besides the practice of midwifery there were, of course, many more informal practices of medicine, again usually handled by women, such as the making and administering of various potions. Although nursing was both a man's and a woman's occupation, there was a particularly acute call for nurses when the war broke out: The Virginia Gazette for July 26, 1776 says: "Wanted at the Continental Hospital at Williamsburg, some NURSES to attend the sick. Any such coming well recommended, will have good encouragement by applying to the Director of the Hospital."

Mortuary work was also a female profession. Lydia Darragh who has earned a probably undeserved fame as a presumed non-pacifist Quaker who acted as a spy -- one of the heroic stories in Mrs. Ellet's book -- actually was a mortician for awhile as well as a nurse, advertising that she could "make grave clothes, and lay out the dead in the neatest manner."

Other occupations which the Revolution specifically generated were of course camp-following, which had a somewhat different meaning in those days than now. "Molly Pitcher" was the generic name given to camp-followers, but the woman usually associated with the name was a Mary Ludwig Hayes.

Having mentioned Molly Pitcher, I guess I should not leave the subject of occupations generated by the war for women without mentioning Deborah Sampson, who enlisted as a soldier in 1782 at Bellingham, Mass., and was discharged a year later when she was hospitalized and her sex was discovered. Nonetheless she was given a pension.

Incidentally, if you are interested in a more conventional view of soldiers and soldiering from a young girl's standpoint, I would recommend Sally Wister's Journal. Her household outside Philadelphia was a veritable headquarters. Elizabeth Cometti in her article has other examples of women in war-related work, including munitions making and tanning.

But a more common phenomenon was the woman who took over her husband's occupation while he was in military or government service as a result of the war. This practice was really just a continuation of the very common custom of widows assuming responsibility for their husbands' business at death. There are a striking number of women printers, for example. Anne Catherine Green printed the Maryland Gazette for a decade after her husband's death in 1767, and also did the public printing for the government. The Virginia Gazette and the Maryland Journal were among other newspapers published and printed by women during the revolution.

One of the principal points which Elizabeth Dexter makes in her work, cited in my bibliography, is that there were actually more women shop managers in colonial times than there were at the beginning of the twentieth century. She claims that 9-10% of all shop keepers in the 18th century were women, whereas there were only about 4% listed in the 1900 census. Wartime demanded ingenuity from those women who wanted to keep their shops open since imports were drastically reduced, but Dexter gives advertisements from the Boston Gazette promising "sprigs and flowers, Italian and French Gauzes of all sorts and colors" to the lady who would stop in Back Street -- this, in 1779! Innkeeping, traditionally a women's occupation, seemed to have flourished during the war, and it also afforded the opportunity for courageous, patriotic conduct. An historian of Southold, Long Island tells the story of Hannah Brown, who, after her husband's death in the revolutionary war, turned her home into an inn. I quote: "It was in the autumn of 1777, on a pleasant evening, that a file of armed soldiers, without ceremony, entered the house of Mrs. Brown. The officer ordered Mrs. Brown to open the door of the room containing the liquors instantly, or he would stave it down. At this threat, accompanied by a horrid oath, she rushed between them and the door, against which she placed her back. He appeared a moment astonished at such fortitude, but collecting himself swore her instant destruction, and with great violence thrust the muzzle of his gun against the door, on each side of her person, as near as he could without hitting her. She stood facing and thus addressed him: "You unfeeling wretch, you hired tool of a tyrant, your conduct is worse than a savage, my situation you see here is lonely. I am without a human protector, but you know, Mr. Officer, surrounded as you are with men and arms, that I despise your threats, and if you pass the threshold of this door, you will first pass over my lifeless body."

This is not what you'd call the New Woman's History, but it's fun!

With occupations like inn-keeping we can see one clue to the enormous participation of women in the colonial economy. Many of the occupations did not take them from home. There was not the split we associate with working women today nor the conflict -- in a pre-industrial society. This of course is especially clear with women who managed lands. We have already mentioned Margaret Brent. Another example is of course Eliza Lucas Pinckney who not only managed her family's plantations in South Carolina, but succeeded in creating a strain of indigo on her estates which ultimately captured the market for the American colonies from the French Indies. Abigail Adams managed John Adams' farm during his absence, and wrote, "I hope in time to have the Reputation of

being as good a Farmeress as my partner has of being a good Statesman." Actually she became so adept that when they were both in Europe during the 1780's, it was Abigail who managed the dairying and farming operations by correspondence.

For most women, the war was fought on the home front. Even when there was no war, the colonial household was a busy place. Abigail Foote as a young girl in Colchester, Connecticut in 1775 describes her day's work as follows: "Fix'd gown for Prude,--Mend Mother's Riding-hood,--Spun short thread,--Fix'd two gowns for Welsh's girls,--Carded tow,--Spun linen,--Worked on Cheese basket,--Hatchel'd flax with Hannah, we did 51 pounds apiece,--Pleated and ironed,--Read a Sermon of Dodridge's,--Spooled a piece,--Milked the cows,--Spun linen, did 50 knots,--Made a Broom of Guinea Wheat straw,--Spun thread to whiten,--Set a Red dye,--Had two Scholars from Mrs. Taylor's,--I carded two pounds of whole wool (and felt Nationaly)--Spun harness twine,--Scoured the pewter." [This quotation comes from the Alice Morse Earle book which I heartily recommend for its descriptions and pictures of domestic utensils and activities.]

The war made things much more difficult. Claude will give you specific examples from the lives of the Franklin women. Let me just mention such problems as inflation, and the extreme shortage of manufactured goods. Elizabeth Cometti mentions the number of dependents of fighting men who were thrown onto charity because there was no general law until 1780 giving dependents support: by then, they were ostensibly provided with half pay (Cometti does not say how much this would be), but the law was virtually impossible to implement.

Many women tried to be patriotic by not using imports, such as tea -- they published mixtures for herb blends in the newspapers. More elaborate patriotic endeavors were of the kind that Sally Bache was involved in, making shirts for soldiers in the continental army. 2200 different names were sewn into these shirts.

Obviously many women siffered very specific losses as a consequence of the war. Besides the death of men in the war, some were themselves killed, particularly on the frontier -- Ellet has examples -- some were refugees from their homes, some suffered miscarriage, or couldn't take proper care of infants.

Loyalist women were in an especially difficult predicament. In this connection I want to draw your special attention to the forthcoming article of Mary Beth Norton, which will be in the WMQ in July, 1976. It has a value far beyond the specific topic of Loyalist women.

Certainly during the course of the Revolution, a feminist position did emerge. We see it in the work of Judith Sargent Murray, and in the work of Mercy Otis Warren. We see it in the question that Hannah Lee Corbin asked her brother Richard Henry Lee in 1778 when she disputed the justice of women paying taxes if they were excluded from the vote. We see it in the famous letter of Abigail Adams to her husband John, in 1776: "Remember the Ladies, and be more Generous and Favourable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the Husbands. Remember all Men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the Ladies, we are determined to foment a Rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any Laws in which we have no voice or Representation."

All of these women felt strongly about the discrimination against women in schooling -- and if their hopes for a republican education interests you, I can highly recommend the article by Linda Kerber "Daughters of Columbia: Educating Women for the Republic, 1787-1805", in The Hofstadter Aegis, edited by Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick. There certainly had been some elementary education for girls in colonial times, and holding lessons was among the occupations where women were most frequently found, often, like some of the other professions we discussed, because they could conduct their work at home, but nothing comparable to what was available to their brothers.

The feminist voice, particularly insofar as it had to do with political participation, was not however respected by the founders of the Republic. The ratification of the constitution did not give women the vote or materially change their legal position. In her article called "The Land of the Unfree", Linda DePauw points out that there were four groups that were not enfranchised by the Revolution: Blacks, servants, women, and minors, and together they comprised 80% of the 2 1/2 million population of America. Add to this the 5-10% of white males who owned no property, and one can visualize what a small group really enjoyed anything resembling inalienable rights. Evidently for a while, women did vote in Virginia, and in some New England and Middle states; but Pennsylvania, Delaware, South Carolina, and Georgia specifically disenfranchised women who owned property and therefore otherwise might be qualified to vote.

DePauw points out that the only reason this was acceptable was that women, and other disadvantaged groups in America, did not compare their situation to the Lockean ideal but rather to the situations of comparable people in other countries. And in that context they really were better off. For the reasons we have noticed, particularly the numerical reasons, women in America were relatively well treated by the law. Although Blackstone's argument that women who married were legally merged with their husbands theoretically prevailed (so that a woman lost the control of any property she brought into her marriage, had no guardian rights over her children, and could not engage in any legal action on her own), many examples of pre- and even of post-nuptial contracts between spouses exist, recognizing women's continuing rights in their property. The Morris chapter is an excellent discussion of this. Furthermore, business women (whether actually single or not) could gain the status of the "femme sole", and thereby conduct legal actions on their own.

The Revolution enhanced those tendencies which had developed over the 18th and earlier centuries, but then afterwards for a while, progress for women seems to have reversed itself. A period almost like the 1950's seems to have occurred during the early decades of the 19th century, with the development of the so-called "Cult of True Womanhood". Prescriptive literature describing the joys of modesty and domesticity had existed before, but now it became enshrined. Even the new schools for girls which developed at the turn of the century promised not to threaten womanly arts and characteristics. For much of the 19th century, then, the picture no longer is one of productive cooperation of the two sexes at home and at work, such as we have seen, but rather of men chasing after material wealth, leaving their women as hostages to virtue, at home.

"Women and Revolution in the Eighteenth Century"
Bibliography

The French Revolution

Abray, Jane, "Feminism in the French Revolution", The American Historical Review, Vol. 80 (February, 1975): 43-62.

Hufton, Olwen, "Women in Revolution, 1789-1796", Past and Present, No. 53 (November, 1971): 90-108.

Reinhard, Marcel, "Demography, the Economy, and the French Revolution", in Evelyn M. Acomb and Marvin L. Brown, eds., French Society and Culture Since the Old Regime, New York, 1966, pp. 20-29.

The American Revolution

I. Bibliographical

Leonard, Eugenie A., Sophie A. Drinker and Miriam Y. Holden, The American Women in Colonial Revolutionary Times 1565-1800: A Syllabus with Bibliography, Philadelphia, 1962. Arranged topically. A huge literature surveyed.

II. American Women's History: General

James, Edward T. and Janet Wilson James, eds., Notable American Women: 1607-1950. A Biographical Dictionary, 3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1971. Invaluable.

Lerner, Gerda, The Women in American History, Specialized Studies in American History Series, Robin Winks et al. eds, Reading, Mass., 1971. Good general survey.

III. Women and the American Revolution: General

Cometti, Elizabeth, "Women in the American Revolution", New England Quarterly XX (1947): 329-47.

DePauw, Linda Grant, "The Forgotten Spirit of '76: Women of the Revolutionary Era", Ms. Magazine, July, 1974, pp. 51-56, and bibliography pp. 100-02. Excerpted from her Herstory 1776, forthcoming. For further information, write The American Bicentennial Administration, 736 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20276.

IV. Women and the American Revolution: Specific Aspects

Benson, Mary Sumner, Women in Eighteenth Century America: A Study of Opinion and Social Usage, New York, 1935.

Butterfield, L.H. ed., The Adams Papers: Adams Family Correspondence, 4 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1963-73.

DePauw, Linda Grant, "Land of the Unfree. Legal Limitations on Liberty in Pre-Revolutionary America", Maryland Historical Magazine, Winter, 1973.

Dexter, Elizabeth Anthony, Career Women of America 1776-1840, Francestown, New Hampshire, 1950.

Colonial Women of Affairs: A Study of Women in Business and the Professions in America before 1776, Boston and New York, 1924.

Earle, Alice Morse, Home Life in Colonial Days, New York, 1898.

Ellet, Elizabeth F., The Women of the American Revolution, 3 vols., New York, 1848-50.
Biographical sketches. Use with caution.

Gordon, Michael, ed., The American Family in Social Historical Perspective, New York, 1973.

Kerber, Linda, "Daughters of Columbia: Educating Women for the Republic 1787-1805", in Hofstadter Aegis, ed. S. Elkins, N.Y. 1974.

Moller, Herbert, "Sex Composition and Correlated Culture Patterns of Colonial America", William and Mary Quarterly, 3d Series, II (1945): 113-53.

Morris, Richard B., Studies in the History of American Law, New York, 1930, Chapter 3, "Women's Rights in Early American Law".

Musto, David, "The Youth of John Quincy Adams", Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 113, no. 4, August, 1969.

Myers, Albert Cook, ed., Sally Wister's Journal, Philadelphia, 1902.

Norton, Mary Beth, "Eighteenth Century American Women in Peace and War: The Loyalists as a Test Case", William and Mary Quarterly, 3d Series forthcoming July, 1976.
Superior discussion.

Spruill, Julia Cherry, Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies, Chapel Hill, 1938.

The Conference on Women in the Era of the American Revolution at George Washington University, Washington, D.C. July 24-26, 1975, will deal in depth with the concerns of black women, native American women, urban women, literary women, "ladies", "heroines", as well as a variety of social issues. For information, send a stamped self-addressed envelope to Linda Grant DePauw, Department of History, George Washington University, Washington, D.C. 20052.

II. Claude-Anne Lopez

Catherine has given you the historical approach, the large picture, and the over-arching themes of the Revolution. My own approach is more biographical, concentrating on letters and diaries as pieces of a puzzle to be put together for an understanding of the lives of men and women in the past.

With that approach in mind, most of what happened to women in the Revolution, I think, can be illustrated by what happened to the women in Benjamin Franklin's own family -- his wife Deborah, his sister Jane Mecom, his daughter-in-law Elizabeth Downes Franklin and his daughter Sally Bache. In their stories (and in the book which Mrs. Herbert and I have been working on which will appear this fall), you can find very real, human, sometimes typical, sometimes sad and sometimes courageous examples of what women went through during the Revolution.

Franklin's wife Deborah had to bear more than most women the trials of a woman whose husband is endlessly absent from home. Between 1757 and her death in 1774, Franklin spent only two years in Philadelphia. During the Stamp Act crisis in 1765, her trials became even more acute when she had to suffer political attacks aimed at her far away husband. Franklin was against the Stamp Act but he wrote his friends in Philadelphia to submit to it until a repeal could be arranged. Unfortunately, Franklin's enemies in Philadelphia considered his moderation unacceptable and took out their frustration in very real, physical threats against Debby. As the anti-stamp and anti-Franklin agitation grew in Philadelphia, Debby's friends urged her to leave town for safety. But she had always been afraid, even of leaving the house, so she decided to stick it out. She did send young Sally to New Jersey where Governor William Franklin (Benjamin's illegitimate son) lived. As the bonfires and street parades in Philadelphia grew more ominous, Debby did ask a cousin to come, bring a gun and stay in the house. More relatives and friends appeared, and they turned the house into a small fort. Debby reported these trials and tribulations to her husband by letter, and at least he was considerate enough to commend her bravery, albeit vicariously. He also took the trouble to speak out more firmly against the Stamp Act. Every year, though, Franklin would write, promising to come home on the next ship, but he never did until after Debby had died in 1774. What's even more galling, Franklin would always postpone leaving and would never tell Debby about it, so the he was expected by every ship from England. Even Washington and Adams were a little more considerate when they were away from home for long periods.

Franklin's sister Jane Mecom in Boston offers another example of how women were caught up in the difficulties of man-made political crises. By the 1760's Jane and Benjamin were the only survivors of Josiah Franklin's seventeen children. She remained a very staunch Puritan while he wandered off further and further into free-thinking deism. Their letters were full of grumpy religious disputes, with stern lectures from her and gentle teasing from him. Like Debby in Philadelphia, Jane in Boston had to suffer from the disputes raging beyond their control. Jane frequently rented rooms to members of the General Court, but the royal governor ended that income for a while by moving the General Court to Cambridge. Even worse, Jane had a millinery shop, and for three years, there was a boycott on English imported goods, many of which Jane used to make hats. Here was a dilemma for her and her brother. He wanted to help her, as a good brother should, but he couldn't send any millinery materials lest they both fall under suspicion of being unpatriotic. When the war broke

out, of course, Jane had to flee the British occupation of Boston with grandchildren, no way of making a living and dependent on friends in Rhode Island, like the thousands of refugees in Indo-China today.

Franklin's daughter-in-law Elizabeth Downes Franklin had even more complicated and sadder story. She was a high-strung woman of good family from the West Indies. She had married William Franklin in London in the early 1760's just after he had been appointed to be royal governor of New Jersey. Though Burlington and Perth Amboy were hardly the opulent societies or centers of cosmopolitan culture, Elizabeth enjoyed playing the First Lady of New Jersey, receiving important visitors, planning social galas, and presiding at ceremonial occasions related to her husband's work. William Franklin was a capable governor and managed to retain his office for several months after the Revolution broke out. Imagine, though, what he and Elizabeth felt when one dark night a troop of soldiers surrounded their house and put him under arrest. Or later when he was moved northward to Connecticut for imprisonment.

Elizabeth remained dutifully loyal to her husband. Her letters rarely mention issues, war and politics. She may not really have understood what was happening. Her husband's arrest and forced travels seem in her letters extremely distressing interruptions of her household and former social life. She was no giddy, starry-eyed creature, but she suffered some of the attitudes that I remember women having when France was occupied: an immense concern to carry on life as usual, as if the war was not occurring, and an intense concern over petty details that one would not normally have noticed in peacetime. To be dutifully loyal to a loyalist in the Revolution put Elizabeth under greater strains perhaps than the other Franklin women suffered. William depended heavily on her concern for him, her help in trying to make his imprisonment comfortable. He was deeply concerned over the trials of being separated from her, her near hysterics at times, and wanted to send her to safety in Barbados. But to her, it was the details that bothered her most: the rude manners of soldiers, their plucking apples from her trees, the difficulties of getting someone to help move furniture. She died during the war while her husband was still in prison, and the cause of her death could only be attributed to a broken heart.

Franklin had always had difficulties with the younger members of his family. Jane's son Benny had been a sore trial to his uncle, failing as a printer, going bankrupt and insane. Franklin's relations with his illegitimate son William of course grew more and more strained as the Revolution progressed. Franklin took William's illegitimate son Temple to Paris as his secretary and sent Sally's son Benny Bache off to a very cruel boarding school in Switzerland. During the war Sally Franklin Bache received an inordinate amount of fatherly concern from Paris. Her husband Richard was away from home a lot supervising the postal service. The Revolution like all wars tended to accentuate the woman's role to the highest degree. If she spun or wove in peacetime, now she had to do even more, for her family and for the boys away on the front lines. Married women were expected to be even more faithful to their absent husband than in peacetime. Single women were supposed to be even more passive, romantic and supportive of the male. Courtships that took months in peacetime now took weeks or days. Sexual expectations became even more intense, extreme and tension-filled. As wartime shortages rose, women were still expected to be even more frugal yet even more feminine for the fighting men on leave. There were intense pressures for the women to stay at home with an endless round of domestic chores and yet find time for galas and dances to cheer up the officers

and soldiers. In the midst of this, Philadelphia was captured by the British, and Sally again was exiled from home for a year. To celebrate the return of the exiles after their ordeals, Sally innocently wrote her father in France if he could please send some laces and frills. Franklin replied with an absolutely stinking letter full of parental outrage and the patriotic virtues of simplicity that he preached more often than he practiced. Didn't she know there was a war going on? How dare she even think of laces and frills at such a time, when armies of men were fighting and dying for the cause of liberty? And on and on like that. Sally replied dutifully apologizing for angering him but listing the weaving, spinning and sewing of thousands of shirts, refusing to be bullied by his unfairness. Franklin eventually sent some cloth -- but not the lace.

These are a few of the stories that one can find in the correspondence of men like Franklin, Washington, Jefferson and Adams during the war. They may depict women in a more subservient role than the new Women's History might like. But these examples do point out what was happening to women because of and apart from the war and politics that the men saw. And when you look around you today and see thousands of women still trying to be loyal to their husbands and families, still being homeless, workless refugees, and still being subjected to the cruel personal dilemmas and conflicts of being a woman accentuated by the extremes of war, I think perhaps you and your students can learn much about yourselves and women in the past that is not in the usual history books.

Newspapers and the American Revolution

by G.B. Warden

We might as well begin with a cosmic thought from -- who else? -- Marshall McLuhan. In his rather odd and provocative book, The Gutenberg Galaxy, McLuhan surmises that the printing press was an essential ingredient in the growth of the modern nation-state in the sixteenth century and of nationalistic feelings among the literate public. The printing press allowed the leaders of government to reach a wider audience than had been possible before with handwritten proclamations or word-of-mouth orders. The uniformity of printed texts would necessarily influence the uniformity of language, thinking and mass values so crucial to governments, nations and cultures. The uniformity of the printed word tended to erode regional dialects and to arrange local cultural differences around unifying common denominators. Moreover, the printing press allowed the wide-scale publication of laws, statutes and proclamations in a uniform manner comprehensible to the citizenry. Government control of presses and the public's limited access to printing devices created tensions between the legitimizing authenticity of the government's utterances, on one hand, and, on the other, the means by which the public at large could know what the laws were and begin to question them. Thus, printing like other inventions had a double-edge; it could legitimize governments but it could also destroy them. Which is why governments ever since have only reluctantly agreed to guarantee the freedom of the press.

In case you have difficulty accepting McLuhan's orphic and gnomic sayings, you might prefer the more solid hypotheses of someone like Karl Deutsch who likewise argues that, among the many definitions and characteristics of nationalism, communication is an absolutely indispensible unifying force in any government, culture or nation-state. Indeed, Deutsch uses examples from Revolutionary America to show the networks of private and public communication among the leaders of different colonies which provided unity in the midst of thirteen revolutions. Richard Merritt has explored the subject in more detail with an intriguing method of using colonial newspapers. In Symbols of American Community, he took sample issues from the major colonial newspapers in the last forty years of the colonial period and counted up the number of times words and phrases appeared mentioning England, America or the colonies. Sure enough, as the years went on, there was a remarkable and dramatic decline in the frequency of words relating to England with a corresponding increase in the frequency of words relating to the colonies and then to America. Such a study raises the usual chicken-and-egg questions: were the newspapers creating a feeling of national identify and independence by such a shift of language or were the newspapers merely reflecting a shift in the language and nationalistic consciousness among the people at large? The question, as usual, does not allow any easy answer, but Merritt's study does show how the dull, staid and somewhat colorless colonial newspapers can be put to imaginative use.

Another such technique using word-counts from colonial newspapers appears in the work of David McClelland at Harvard. He is a sociologist and has devoted his major work to the study of values in society relating to what he calls the "achievement motive". McClelland's work fits in with the larger trend in sociology to trace the origins of modern civilization with special emphasis on trends in popular values from, say, spiritual and supernatural values of the Middle Ages to more modern values of secular, tangible, concrete material success

and naturalism. Part of that trend is a movement in western culture away from values related to the possession of social status or redeeming spiritual qualities toward values emphasizing achievement, exploration, aggressiveness acquisitiveness, and the pursuit of material success. McClelland has compiled a long list of words and symbols expressive of the achievement motive and has tried to find the increasing development of such secular achievement in a wide, bewildering variety of literary, artistic and cultural media. One element in his work is a brief survey of achievement-symbols appearing markedly in 18th century New England through the use of newspaper ads, diaries and other accessible materials. McClelland's statistics, formulae and interpretation are rather complicated and by no means unquestionable, but his work like that of McLuhan and Merritt does make incandescently clear how essential colonial newspapers are to any understanding of the nationalism and cultural values of the Revolutionary Era.

If any of you have ever seen any colonial newspapers in their original form, you may find it somewhat surprising that anyone could read them, much less derive any larger feelings of nationalism and cultural values from them. For students with reading problems the physical appearance of the colonial newspapers is extremely forbidding; they make the good gray Times look like the Daily News. But there are some interesting elements about the format of colonial newspapers which teachers should know about, before we discuss the role of the press in the Revolution.

For one thing, the colonial newspapers appear to have been printed on nearly indestructible paper; even the thinnest sheets had a heavy rag content, so that they could be read by several people during the course of a week. The colonial newspapers were weeklies, and were printed in towns and cities like Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Williamsburg, Charleston, Newport, and New Haven -- none of which exceeded 25,000 in population. Thus, a printing run might not go over a thousand copies. They were a single large sheet folded once, so there were four sides of print. The price per copy might run from a few pence to over a shilling; since two shillings were a laborer's daily wage, not everyone could afford to buy the issue. Printers depended more on subscribers than casual one-time buyers. But those subscribers might include tavern-owners and inn-keepers who would keep the issue on display for regular patrons, who would often read items aloud to each other (and perhaps to other tipplers who also had "reading problems"). During the course of a week a single copy would go through many hands, hence the need for durability, and the news in them would be conveyed to many readers or listeners. Looking at the dull format with a modern eye, we might not see why such drab sheets could convey any interest or meaning. I suppose the best way to appreciate the impact of such papers is to imagine how you might read a newspaper today, if perhaps you were forbidden to have any other source of public information, if you had no other extensive contact with the outside world, or if you were forbidden to watch television newscasts except once a week. I dare say that you would devour every word of the newspaper under such conditions and reread them several times. In that case, the format need not be interesting; what counted was not so much the appearance but the actual content of the messages being conveyed. In a world of mass communication, television, mail, telephones and the almost endless noise appearing as "news", you and your students might appreciate an imaginative exploration of life in a news-less world.

So, in looking at colonial newspapers, there was no need for gimmicks, pictures, cartoons or fancy layouts. The colonists took their news straight,

hard and seriously -- much more so than we could do today. And it was perhaps that no-nonsense approach to reading in colonial times which made the newspapers such a powerful source of unifying information, shared values and political arguments.

What then was in the newspapers? The first page would be devoted mainly to "foreign" news, usually lifted from English newspapers which the printers received eight weeks or so after publication in London. Obviously, there was no means to get the up-to-the-minute flashes or "the news before it happens". The foreign news in colonial papers was a bewildering variety of gossip, rumor, speculation and third-hand hearsay mixed in with "reliable" information. We today might think that there are clear distinctions between fact and rumor or between fact and editorial opinion (despite some of the evidence to the contrary in our newspapers). There would be fanciful reports of population statistics, grossly distorted, from Asia or Africa, court intrigues in Constantinople, endless skirmishes in eastern Europe, bizarre corruption in Madrid, politicking among England's many factions and so on. How then, you might ask, did the colonists detect fact from fancy in these journals? The answer might be that they could not; in a world without much of our scientific knowledge and with no reliable source of steady information, colonists in their daily lives could not and perhaps did not try to separate fact from fancy or opinion as seriously as we might do (or say we do). Only experience, common sense and a long process of waiting to see what subsequently happened might give a clue about which reports were reliable and which weren't. On reading a newspaper, the colonists would have to accept many things at face value but with some skepticism and reserved judgment. In colonial days matters of life and death were precariously balanced, and economic well-being depended heavily on whims of nature and ocean voyages, so that I think the colonists had a healthier tolerance of ambiguity and life's fragility than we today might tolerate. In those terms, the peculiarities of news in the colonial press fit in rather well with the unique pre-modern world-perceptions of colonists in a "remote" and unfinished part of the civilized world. Everything was in the process of becoming, everything could hinge on a precarious balance; news took so long to travel from place to place and depended so much on unforseeable contingencies that the colonists would have been better able to cope with problems of fact, rumor and opinion than we do today.

The first page and the rest of the newspaper would have advertisements mixed in with official proclamation from the local government, short one-paragraph or one-line news blurbs, ship sailings, letters to the editor (usually composed by the editor himself), sermons, treatises on agronomy (lifted again from English magazines), the current prices of many commodities, and more rumor or opinion.

Though each newspaper looks the same, there are some peculiarities to look for, if you use colonial newspapers. For one thing, you will rarely find any local news whatsoever. This can be very frustrating. But remember in a town of 10,000 or 20,000 people, there would be no need to tell the local readers what was happening locally; the news had already passed by word-of-mouth, so why waste space in a weekly? But newspapers would sometimes include news from other colonies, so that if you want to find something happening in Philadelphia, a good place to look is a Boston newspaper dated a few weeks later.

Another peculiarity is the relative absence of crime news in the colonial press. If you look at London newspapers, the inner pages blossom with every

purse-snatching, mischief, mayhem and violent crime. In the colonial newspapers, you will find "remarkable providences", by which I mean some natural occurrence, like a severe thunderstorm in Charleston which destroyed a house but did not touch the family inside, a remarkable harvest of marsh hay near Newport, the birth of twins, some peculiar accident usually with a happy ending, a lost horse being found and so on. At first glance, it looks as if life in colonial times was too good to be true or that someone was censoring out all the bad news. But, in fact, 95% of America was rural and agricultural rather than urban, so indeed much of the news is connected with matters bucolic and pastoral. There was crime in America, but none of the crime waves we know today or appear in every daily issue of the London press at that time. The most serious and persistent crime reported in colonial newspapers was counterfeiting -- almost no murders, muggings or robberies. And court records confirm the impression that colonial America was not a criminal or a violent culture, despite some of the myths.

Another peculiarity of the articles or letters in the colonial press was the use of pseudonyms. There were rather strict laws against libel and seditious writings, as Benjamin Franklin and John Peter Zenger learned. The usual way to avoid incrimination of the editor and the author was to disguise the author's name with some pseudonym; Hamilton, Jay, and Madison used "Publius" for the Federalist articles; John Dickinson called himself the "Pennsylvania farmer" though he was a lawyer from Maryland; Samuel Adams used "Vindex"; others include "Agricola", "Monitor", "A Well-wisher" and so forth, depending on the tone and vitriol of the article or letter. With a little help from diaries and other sources, you can usually find out who wrote such articles, especially for the Revolutionary period.

The newspapers contain a wealth of socio-economic information, but, though it is right there on the page, it is not sometimes obvious and requires some deciphering. For example, from the ship sailings and ship clearances, you can estimate the communities' contact with the trans-atlantic world and other colonies, as well as the distance and time involved. You can figure out trade routes and patterns at different times of the year, and, after correlation with ads, what the community was buying and selling at what times, how fads and fashions changed, and what the local people's world horizons may have been. Though very isolated geographically, the colonists, I think, had a much wider world-view than one might imagine at first. The foreign news and the flow of commerce kept them concentrating intensely on the whole maritime community, in contrast with much of the insularity one finds in English newspapers of the time. If one of the miracles of the Revolution was when people began to think "continentally", it is clear that the newspapers provided the means by which localism was eroded.

Reading colonial ads may seem a dreary and unrewarding endeavor. They usually mention only the general type of goods being sold, rather than any specifics. And the ads never mention any particular prices. You never find any fresh food for sale, and only occasionally any salted or dried food. You rarely find any finished clothing, though cloth appears frequently. The prominent part of the ads is not the goods being sold but the name of the merchant selling them. Boston's merchants refused to let the newspapers print the prices of food, but the other newspapers did so, without saying who was selling what for how much. Today, we think of advertising in terms of appeals to various images and values. At first glance, the newspaper ads in colonial times look very primitive, but in fact their rather plain, simple message tells us something about colonial economic values. In the days when the quality and quantity of goods was so uncertain and when, because of imperial restrictions on currency, most business

was done by IOU's and credit, what apparently counted most to colonial consumers was the name and reputation of the merchant or seller, rather than what he was selling. In small maritime communities, merchants (and everyone else, for that matter) were extremely visible, and their success depended exclusively on their good name and probity. Though material values were doubtless important, the colonists and merchants still depended greatly on the human element, personal character, faith and trust. So, the rather laconic ads do tell us much about the community's socio-economic values. And, doubtless, the merchants' "exposure" in ads contributed to their prominence in local affairs and their leadership in the protests against English revenue policies after 1760.

Speaking of the Revolution (at last), it is important to notice that the first major crisis occurred over stamp taxes in 1765 which put a few pennies' tax on each newspaper. It is not quite coincidental that the most vociferous opponents of English taxes were printers and lawyers (whose legal documents were also taxed). Though the amount of the stamp tax was not large, it did add to the printers' difficulties in running a newspaper in a cash-less society and it set a dangerous precedent for future taxes. Though Benjamin Franklin opposed the Stamp Act, he took the precaution of ordering a cheaper brand of paper for his newspaper. In 1767 a year after the Stamp Act was repealed, the press suffered another blow when the Townshend Acts taxed paper itself. As before, printers and lawyers were rather vehement in their protests.

Bernard Bailyn is in the process of editing the major pamphlets of the Revolution and puts great emphasis on the pamphlet as a primary source of revolutionary ideology. It should be noted, however, that most of the pamphlets appeared first in serial form in the colonial newspapers. John Dickinson's "Farmer's Letters" appeared in twelve issues of the Pennsylvania Chronicle, edited by William Goddard. John Adams' important "Novanglus" essays in 1774 and 1775 appeared first in the press. And, of course, the Federalist Papers in 1787 were serialized in the weekly press. Along with the other conditions mentioned above which made colonists read their newspapers seriously and intensely, the serialization of many of the Revolution's major arguments contributed significantly not only to the extent of colonial opposition but to the timing, growth and development of a "common sense". The newspapers not only provided intellectual, constitutional arguments; during the many periods of nonimportation, the newspapers carried recipes for home manufacturing, substitutes for imported goods and by that means reached every household, man, woman, and child. These "do-it-yourself" programs not only enlisted many people in the colonial cause; they helped to convince Americans that they were, could be and should be economically independent of England long before independence was actually declared.

Bostonians were especially sensitive to problems of communication. The town was the center of revolutionary unrest, but the townspeople and their leaders for many years faced the unpleasant fact that many others in their own colony and elsewhere did not sympathize with much of the extremism going on in Boston. Long before the Bostonians invented the committees of correspondence in 1772 as one means of solving this dilemma, the Bostonians recognized the importance of newspapers to the success of their cause. To be sure, much of the town's journalism in 1765 or 1768-70 might be dismissed as cheap propaganda, but there is no denying that it was effective propaganda. In particular, while British troops were stationed in the town in 1768 and 1769, the Bostonians produced one of the most remarkable documents of the era. "The Journal of the Times", as it was called, was noteworthy not only for printing nearly every injury, real or

imagined, inflicted on the defenceless, virtuous, law-abiding townspeople by the venal, corrupt, depraved and bestial redcoats; more remarkable was the fact that the Boston writers had the weekly list of "atrocities" printed in the New York papers, enlisting the New Yorkers in the cause and down-playing the impression that the Bostonians alone were the source of all troublesome news.

One should note, too, that not all colonial newspapers, even in Boston, promoted the American side of the argument. In Boston John Mein's Chronicle was an effective organ for the loyalist position and attacked the Whigs as savagely as they attacked the English sympathizers. Mein was attacked physically on occasion for his unpopular views (he eventually had to leave town because of his debts), but Edes and Gill, publishers of the inflammatory Gazette, were also mobbed by friends of customs officials. In New York the Rivingtons' newspapers defended England very consistently and effectively. In Philadelphia, Goddard's Chronicle was originally financed by conservatives like Joseph Galloway and William Franklin. So, it is important to remember that, though the majority of the colonial newspapers contributed effectively to the spread of American values and American unity, others achieved the same purpose of unifying loyalists in opposition, contributing to the growing antagonism.

Most colonial newspapers are listed in Clarence Brigham, American Newspapers. Philip Davidson, Propaganda and the American Revolution, printed in 1941, and available in paperback, surveys the techniques and content of the Revolutionary press. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., Prelude to Independence, is a more sedate survey, also in paperback. Oliver M. Dickerson, Boston under Military Rule, is in fact a reprinting of the "Journal of the Times" and is filled with every possible nuance of revolutionary protest, personal and political. Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in Revolt, is based almost exclusively on newspapers. Leonard Levy, Legacy of Suppression, traces the freedom and tribulations of the press through the late colonial period to the Bill of Rights and the Alien and Sedition Acts.

The New York Times School Service has prepared facsimiles of colonial newspapers about famous themes and events; contact Carol Zack. Many of the colonial newspapers are on microcards and microfilms in the Newspaper Room, Historical Manuscripts Collection, and Beinecke Library at Yale. You need no special permission to use them for your own research; they do not circulate, but you can get copy-flo copies from those on microfilm. An even better way of using colonial newspapers for studying the Revolution is for your students, individually or in groups, to make up their own broadsides or newspapers. Library work or homework can provide research for a day-by-day school journal of the Revolution, like CBS's nightly vignettes. The format provides an offbeat way of getting students to read carefully, write straight news stories succinctly, compose editorials on various issues of those days, draw cartoons, dream up advertisements, and in general do an awful lot of reading and writing in some more interesting ways than the usual book reports or oral presentations. Perhaps you might even get students of different viewpoints to make up both Whig and Loyalist newspapers, to generate classroom discussion or a formal debate. Having seen students work on their own school newspapers often with more energy than they put into their class work and having seen students using their own imagination in developing material in something other than the usual report or paper, I heartily recommend that you consider having students think about colonial newspapers seriously and have a try at composing their own. Who knows? Something revolutionary might happen, for all concerned.

Schools and the Constitution Today

by John Simon

I should apologize to you in part because my remarks here have only a tenuous relation to the Bicentennial or the Revolution of 1776. Obviously, though, the Revolution did produce the United States Constitution, and those of you who teach in public schools are required by the state to offer courses on the Constitution. So there is some connection, but what I'd like to talk about today is not so much the usual content of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights in their historic development since 1787 but the ways in which the Constitution affects you, your students and your neighbors as citizens of the republic on the basis on some cases and issues which are of recent concern.

You may recall that Lyndon Johnson used to say that he wanted to be known in history as "the education president", because of all he had done to promote the federal government's role in elementary and secondary education. It is not for me to say if history will oblige him with that title. But it is clear that if courts had such titles, certainly it would be easy enough to pin the title of "The Education Court" on the Supreme Court of the United States under its last two Chief Justices. Both the Warren Court and the Burger Court have dealt with an unprecedented traffic of school cases. These courts have made the federal judicial presence felt in every school in the land.

President Johnson wanted the federal government to make its impact on schools through legislative and executive action. But despite all the money spent by the executive through legislative programs like Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the school lunch program, the free milk program, the special impact program, Head Start, Follow Through, bilingual education, and, as of last August, the safe schools program, the athletic injuries program and many others -- it is still doubtful if all these programs and billions of dollars have had the same impact as Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, the school prayer decision of 1963, the parochial school cases of 1973, the student free-speech decision of 1969, the disciplinary due-process case of 1975, and the long-term implications of a compulsory education case involving the Amish in 1972. Even the cases like the school-finance equalization case in 1973 and the Detroit metropolitan desegregation case in 1974 may have an equal impact.

This impact of the Court on the schools is also unprecedented in our history. In the last 21 years of the Warren and Burger Courts, the Justices have decided at least 63 cases involving elementary and secondary schools. If you look back to the Revolutionary era, the first 21 years of the Jay and Marshall Courts, exactly zero cases about education came before the Supreme Court. That, you will say, is only expectable since common, public education was yet to be developed at that time. But the comparison points up the fact that in those days no one even considered that the judiciary might have any remote role which might possibly affect the relationship among parents, teachers and students. That view prevailed throughout most of the 19th century, as far as the Supreme Court was concerned. But in the 21 years between 1918 (when the last state adopted compulsory education) and 1939, the Supreme Court decided only 9 cases involving schools. Between 1939 and the Warren Court in 1953 there were only four education cases decided by the Supreme Court. Obviously, a massive shift of attitude has influenced the different judges on the bench in recent years, as well as a massive shift of attitude in the minds of teachers, parents, students and admin-

istrators in looking to the Court to consider elements of education that previously had been taken for granted.

In the Brown case in 1954, black parents said they no longer wanted it taken for granted that their children would be prevented by law from going to school with white children.

In the Schempp case in 1963, parents said they no longer wanted it taken for granted that their children must be exposed to religious indoctrination through morning prayers in the schools.

In the Tinker case in 1969, children (speaking through their parents) said they no longer wanted it taken for granted that schools could limit the right of the students to engage in peaceful expression during school hours, specifically by wearing armbands protesting the Vietnam war. The Court responded by saying that school children brought their First Amendment rights with them into the school.

In the Lau case in 1974, parents of Chinese-American school children said it should no longer be taken for granted that, because this is America, all children come to school speaking English. The Court held that the failure to offer special English language instruction to these children denied them equal educational opportunity and discriminated against them in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In the Goss case last January children who had been briefly suspended from school without notice or hearing said that they did not want it taken for granted any longer that schools could punish them at will without observing rules of fundamental procedural fairness.

In the Yoder case in 1972 parents from an Amish farming community in Wisconsin said that it should not be taken for granted that their 14-to-16 year-olds should go to school at all, when the Amish parents had deeply-held religious views on how their children should be raised at that age. Weighing the intense religious beliefs of the Amish against whatever advantages two years of schooling might offer, the Court held that compelling the Amish children to attend school after the 8th grade would violate their rights to free exercise of religion under the First Amendment.

In the Epperson case in 1968 a teacher said that it should no longer be taken for granted that the Arkansas state legislature could control his teaching by ordering him never to teach about Darwin and evolution. The Court held that the legislative order reflected the religious preferences of the state legislators, violating the First Amendment. And Justice Stewart added for himself that such a legislative veto would violate both the free speech and religious clauses of the First Amendment.

In the Pickering case in 1963 a teacher said it should no longer be taken for granted that his activities outside of school hours were any of the school board's business, specifically being fired because of his complaints about the school board spending too much money on athletics. The Court held that where the teacher's complaint does not impair his performance or the operation of the school, punishing him for these activities violated his freedom of speech.

In the LaFleur case in 1974 other teachers said that it should no longer

be taken for granted that another out-of-school activity -- getting pregnant -- was the school board's business or cause for being discharged after the sixth month without any hearing if pregnancy hurt their teaching. The Court held that such discharges without hearing violated the right of due process.

What do all these cases have in common? It should be clear, especially in the midst of a Bicentennial, that the cases and decisions have in common a spirit of liberty. I do not mean by that simply the positive freedom to choose one's own expression, religion or life-style. What I mean is the related but more complicated idea of autonomy.

In many of the cases above, autonomy meant the right of parents to control important aspects of the schooling their children receive. In the context of compulsory education -- which is perhaps the most coercive governmental system we have in our free society -- autonomy means the ability to have some measure of personal or group control, some island of parental autonomy, in the midst of a system forced upon everyone of school age. My friend and colleague, the late Professor Alex Bickel of the Yale Law School was deeply concerned about autonomy and its relation to liberty in compulsory education. Years ago in 1925 in the case of Pierce v. The Society of Sisters, the Supreme Court said that an Oregon law prohibiting parents from sending children to private schools was a denial of liberty under the due process clause. Thus, parents did have an island of autonomy, in this case the right to send their children to private schools. Among other reasons, the Pierce case prompted Professor Bickel and others to become greatly attached to the educational voucher system, which with some administrative difficulties would permit parents who were too poor for private school tuition to have state-paid money vouchers to shop around and have the same freedom affirmed in the Pierce case.

All of the cases above involve autonomy and denials thereof for reasons which are religious, linguistic, racial, economic, sexual and disciplinary. Two other cases involve autonomy conflicting with simple geography but with vastly extensive social consequences. In the Rodriguez case, the Court held that it was not a denial of 14th Amendment equal opportunity for children in a wealthy Texas school district to have less spent on them than on children in a poorer school district. In the Detroit desegregation case, the Court confronted the fact that there were simply not enough white people within the city boundaries to provide a satisfactory plan of racial balance. The Court held, however, that busing across city lines could not be imposed on suburbs which had not by themselves been directly responsible for the problem through any school segregation practices of their own.

The autonomy in both these cases is translated as "local control". In the school financing case, the Court emphasized that "local control over the educational process gives citizens an opportunity to participate in decision-making and encourages experimentation, innovation and a healthy competition for educational excellence." And in the Detroit case Chief Justice Burger stated: "The notion that school district lines may be casually ignored or treated as a mere administrative convenience is contrary to the history of public education in our country. No single tradition in public education is more deeply rooted than local control over the operation of schools; local autonomy has long been thought essential both to the maintenance of community concern and support for public schools and to the quality of the educational process." There may be a considerable price being paid for honoring this notion of autonomy in school financing and school segregation. The claim of urban -- and increasingly black -- school districts

is that they cannot do their job well because of two important commodities being monopolized in the suburbs: money and white students. In this connection it is noteworthy that both sides in the current busing dispute in Boston advocate solutions which in various degrees involve the suburbs. In other states, the courts and legislatures have modified school financing and encouraged voluntary city-suburb co-operation. But in most states neither is occurring, and the Supreme Court has stated that neither can be legally compelled to occur at this time. Valuable as autonomy is, there is always the question of whose autonomy is at stake in any conflict and that claims of autonomy necessarily clash with the claims of distributive justice.

For example, in the school armband case, Justice Black dissented: in weighing students' First Amendment rights against the values of discipline in education, he preferred the latter and said, "One may, I hope, be permitted to harbor the thought that taxpayers send children to school on the premise that at their age they need to learn, not to teach." Justice Powell in the school suspension case dissented, saying that formal application of due process which may invite students to challenge teachers' authority did a disservice to students whose conduct merited swift censure. And in the Amish case both the majority and minority opinions raised the question whether it was wise to confirm a religious right which in effect defeated the educational purpose of having students learn a broader exposure to the world than parental autonomy and control could provide.

A child's autonomy in wearing an armband clashes against parental autonomy. Teachers' autonomy to teach while pregnant clashes with the autonomy of parents who believe such a state would provoke immature sexual distractions among students. Teachers autonomy to teach clashes with the religious autonomy considered important by anti-evolution Arkansas legislators or anti-Vonnegut West Virginia parents. Such clashes, as you teachers well know, pose the autonomy of one group against another with students caught in between. Teachers may prefer to see the school as a model of the free market place of ideas, but parents prefer to see the school as a model of institutionalized parental nurture.

Can we have it both ways? Is there any way of resolving clashes between respective autonomies? The voucher system or some free choice arrangement where money goes direct to parents rather than direct to schools may provide one alternative. Teachers' unions oppose it because it would play havoc with collective bargaining arrangements. Civil rights advocates oppose it since it would impede integration, although others say vouchers are the only way to help poor black children pay their way into better schools. Other people oppose vouchers because they devoutly believe in the "common" school for all. Perhaps the most formidable opponent of the voucher scheme has been the Supreme Court itself. Two years ago in the Nyquist case, the Court struck down a tuition reimbursement plan and tax credits to non-public schools, because such plans have the effect of furthering the religion of sects which operated the schools. The case may have struck the death-blow to the voucher system, though footnotes to Justice Powell's majority opinion might open a door for the argument that such a plan might be applied to a whole community's non-sectarian as well as sectarian schools. On the other hand, it could be argued that such a publicly supported voucher plan in both sectarian and non-sectarian schools would require the sectarian schools to stop teaching religion in accord with the First Amendment.

But a far more serious problem of autonomy appears in the implications of Justice Douglas' dissent in the Amish case -- namely, what about the children's autonomy, compared with that of their parents? Justice Douglas posed the question

of what happens if the children do not want to follow their parents' ways which might in effect stunt and deprive the children of opportunities available to other children. The Supreme Court will probably have to confront that problem head on in the coming years.

The Court has been ducking many cases involving haircuts and students' life-styles, but in the circuit courts decisions have been building up. Five circuit courts have decided that students do have rights to assert in haircut cases; four circuit courts have held that no constitutional issue is involved. The Supreme Court will probably have to resolve such anomalies soon. Courts in Mississippi and in South Dakota have issued divergent opinions on sequels to the pregnant teacher case, one dealing with an unwed teacher and another dealing with a teacher who is living with her boyfriend without benefit of matrimony. If Arkansas cannot tell its teachers to avoid mention of evolution, can a state like Michigan prevent its teachers from any mention of birth control, as a statute there states, which the Supreme Court refused to contest on procedural grounds? If Chinese-American children can claim special English language teaching in California, it will not take long before the Court will have to decide cases involving retarded children, handicapped children, and Spanish-speaking children or, for that matter, gifted children -- all of whom need some "special education."

Another implication of the Yoder case goes as follows: In that case the parents' compelling religious beliefs outweighed the state's requirement of compulsory school attendance; the First Amendment contains other rights and liberties of a non-religious nature that are intrinsically opposed to compulsory schooling. Compulsory attendance involves a very substantial deprivation of liberty. Doesn't a state have to come up with a pretty strong case before it deprives someone of liberty? That's what parents might say. The Supreme Court might not respect such an argument very much, but I wouldn't be surprised if they had such a case coming up in the foreseeable future.

Perhaps that last argument is where this talk has some potential relevance to the Revolution, in a somewhat unintended fashion. Before closing, I would like to point out one final element in the relation of the schools to the Constitution and the Supreme Court today. The point is that in these recent cases the Court has been operating in relative ignorance of the data which educational research and the social studies can provide. The Court makes all sorts of assumptions about education in the cases recently decided without a glance at the growing literature on child development. What impact does it have on a child to be disciplined without a hearing, to be exposed to a pregnant teacher, to a black armband or to a prayer? Except for some social psychology brought to bear in the 1954 Brown case, the courts have largely ignored material on educational development and socialization which you and your students probably know of. Partly, it is the courts' fault for not seeking help where they should. Partly, it is the lawyers' fault for not presenting such material before the courts. Partly, it is the fault of the researchers who do not present their material in a way which is easily adaptable to courtroom consideration. Partly, it is the fault of the disciplines as a whole, which turn out studies and evidence diametrically opposed to one another.

The fact remains, however, that the courts need help in tackling difficult and explosive issues in education. They not only need help in research. They also need help in figuring out what our schools are really all about. Until they do, the least we can do is hope and pray -- as long, of course, as you don't do it in public schools.

The Revolution in American Art

by Frank Goodyear

I should mention first that as part of Yale's celebration of the Bicentennial, the University Art Gallery is preparing a major exhibition called "American Arts in the Age of Independence, 1750-1800", which will begin on April 1, 1976. We are doing it in conjunction with the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, opening on July 4, 1976. It is the first major show of American art ever to travel to England. It will include over 200 objects of the period. The selection was based on aesthetic quality. We wanted to show the English that American arts were every bit as good as English arts of the period. So, it will have a very important sociological and cultural overtones for Anglo-American culture, even though the major emphasis is aesthetic. Those of you who are teaching American history and courses on the Bicentennial should make plans to see this important exhibit next spring.

The American Revolution provided a great catalyst for American artists to seek out heroes of the times, to memorialize them, and the prime example was, of course, George Washington, even as early as 1772 when he was still a colonel in the Virginia militia. One of the most famous portraits of Washington was done in 1779, depicting him after the victorious battle of Princeton. It was painted by Charles Wilson Peale and commissioned by the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania. Peale painted Washington at least seven times from life, and made at least thirteen replicas of this particular picture.

Peale himself like other artists of the period symbolized much of the spirit of those times. There is a full-length portrait of him, done in 1822, pulling back a curtain on the second floor of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, where he exhibited works of art, stuffed animals, and a series of portraits of everyone he could find who contributed to the Revolution. He was in fact the first director of an art museum in the nation and a Renaissance man with interests in archaeology, anthropology, and plants. In Peale's portrait, you can see the mastodon bones which he unearthed in Ulster County, New York, in 1809 and moved to Philadelphia. He had extensive gardens around his house. He not only founded the first museum in 1795 but later helped to establish the Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts in 1805.

In addition to several portraits of Washington, Peale also did a striking portrait of Benjamin Franklin in 1789 as an old, tired man at the age of 83 after his years as a diplomat in France. Peale painted such portraits of Washington and Franklin as commissions from public groups which wanted to memorialize the leaders of the Revolution, attesting to the importance of art as an adjunct of early national feeling. But Peale also did private commissions including a double portrait of Robert Morris and Gouverneur Morris, painted in 1782. The first was the influential financier who helped finance the Revolution.

As much as Peale, Gilbert Stuart was famous for his portraits of Washington. Stuart painted at least six other versions of Washington on public commissions. In all Stuart did over forty-seven replicas of these commissioned portraits, another example of how Washington was glorified in the young republic. Stuart painted Washington almost like George III or Louis XIV with royal surroundings. Though very famous, Stuart's portraits of Washington were not very successful treatments of his face; it is said that Martha Washington preferred a portrait

done by Colonel John Trumbull which showed Washington astride a horse after one of his victories. The original portraits of Washington are worth a few million dollars apiece.

Of more importance to Connecticut citizens is the Ralph Earl portrait of Roger Sherman, which hangs in the Yale Art Gallery. Sherman was the only man who signed the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation and the Federal Constitution. Earl painted Sherman's portrait in 1775, before he left to study art in England. In fact, he was run out of New Haven and did not distinguish himself as a patriot. Earl refused to join the militia. But after the Revolution he returned and painted many heroes of the war. Earl's portrait of Baron von Steuben in 1787, shows how Earl's style changed after his severe portrait of Sherman and after studying a softer style of painting in England, especially how Earl gained a greater fluency in technique and better handling of anatomy.

Even more important to Connecticut was the work of John Trumbull from Lebanon. Most of Trumbull's famous portraits were given to Yale by Trumbull himself as the first university art museum in the country. Some have never left Yale. Perhaps his most famous work was a group portrait of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, which will be going to the National Gallery in Washington for an exhibition on "The Age of Thomas Jefferson". After serving in the war and studying in Benjamin West's studio in London, Trumbull returned to America and started this picture in 1787. It took him over twenty years to finish, since he had to travel around painting the individuals from life or from death masks. Here in one picture is an accurate depiction of almost all the major figures of the Revolution -- Franklin, Jefferson, John Hancock, Robert Livingston, and in one group the Connecticut delegation including Roger Sherman. The painting itself is only about 24 inches high by 36 inches wide.

Trumbull lived until 1843. Congress commissioned him to enlarge paintings he did of Revolutionary scenes. The smaller, earlier versions are at Yale and are far better in technique than the huge versions done for the Rotunda at the Capitol in Washington. Trumbull was blind in one eye, so much of his best work is done in miniatures or small paintings.

Other artists after the Revolution felt the need to escape to England and study with the artistic masters of the day, Benjamin West in particular had gone to London before the Revolution, became George III's painter and president of the Royal Academy. Young Americans at West's studio like Trumbull could use London techniques for American purposes. Trumbull was at the battle of Bunker Hill and his painting of the death of Joseph Warren during the fighting is a very successful depiction of the drama, excitement, grief and anguish at the time. This and other of Trumbull's battle portraits captured the spirit and trauma of the American soldiers in action, just as his painting of the signing of the Declaration of Independence caught the seriousness of political events. And aside from replicas, such scenes and portraits went through various engravings for copies in the thousands like that of Trumbull's painting of Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown.

The artists of the Revolution went into the field to capture the action of momentous events. Thus, the Revolution inspired and furthered the development of American art, rather than interrupting or hindering it. But away from the battlefields and the development of national feeling in monumental portraiture, there was another artistic Revolution going on involving the style of furniture,

silver, architecture and other cultural objects. The old Chippendale style in furniture relied on tender, curving, extensively carved lines, with elaborate and sensual decorative motifs. The same style appears in the carving around mirrors, exemplary of the apex of the rococco style and transported to America in Chippendale's style books. The reverse curve was Hogarth's line of beauty symbolizing the unity of opposites as in the S-shape, and it appears frequently in Chippendale decorative designs as in the curved legs of chairs and tables ending in the familiar claw-and-ball foot. These pieces of furniture and decoration would have appeared only in a few homes, in the best rooms, as status symbols, mainly in the major colonial cities, which had close cultural ties with English. Colonial craftsmen had design books by which you could order any design or combination of designs, if of course you could afford it, as opposed to the simpler and more durable Windsor designs in lower classes or in the countryside, in the period before the Revolution.

Furniture and decorative pieces from the Federal style around 1800 show how far Americans had changed in their styles and sophistication during and after the Revolution. The pre-Revolutionary curve then became a straight line. The naturalism of early curves became more abstracted. Inlays replace carving for decoration. The inlays emphasize the straight flat surface rather than deep carving; the Federal designs were more geometrical and classical, evocative of the Americans' adoption of cultural examples from early Greece and republican Rome, rather than high English imperial styles like Chippendale.

The Revolution in style affected all American arts. Portraits of the earlier era with courtly, rococco, soft, sensuous, delicate touches became by 1800 sharper, straighter, with clear vivid solid bright colors. Portraits which were the rage before 1776 subordinated landscapes, history scenes, classical scenes. In 1770 Sir Joshua Reynolds in London severely criticized Benjamin West's painting of the death of General Wolfe at Quebec because it was of a contemporary event, not the proper and approved classical history scene. So, even then, the American artist from the wilderness had produced a small revolution by painting a dramatic contemporary event outside the accepted canons of art at the time. West was also breaking away from the heavy emphasis on portraits. Even George III came to see the value of the new American approach, and a replica of West's painting still hangs in Buckingham Palace. West's painting of William Penn's treaty with the Indians -- a year after the Wolfe episode -- was widely accepted, as an example of a successful depiction of a relatively contemporary event, rather than a classical scene. Like Trumbull, West was interested in a faithfully accurate scene, rather than one embellished by extraneous and irrelevant, romantic, classical touches, favored by aesthetes in England, even though West took the liberty of including himself at Penn's treaty.

In the works of West, Earl, Trumbull, Peale and Stuart, therefore, you can see the Revolution depicted in art. But you should also recognize the more subtle way in which a revolution changed the style from English or English provincial to a more nationalistically American emphasis on simplicity, structure rather than ornament, realism more than romantic naturalism or sensual detail.

The literature describing this artistic revolution with profuse illustrations includes:

Edgar Richardson, 450 Years of American Painting
Neil Harris, The Artist in American Society
Oliver Larkin, Art and Life in America
James T. Flexner, First Flowers in the American Wilderness
Allan Burroughs, Limners and Likenesses

Connecticut in the Revolution

by Howard T. Oedel

There are four areas of concern we might do well to consider this afternoon. The first involves the question of why Connecticut joined the radical or patriot cause (1763-1775). There is some reason for thinking that Connecticut's natural conservatism and her favored status within the empire might have prompted her to remain steadfastly loyal to the Crown in these troublesome years had it not been for a serious internal split within the colony itself. During the Great Awakening of the previous generation, New-Light radicals, particularly in Eastern Connecticut, came to challenge the religious and political views of the Old-Light conservatives of Western Connecticut. As Eastern Connecticut was especially overpopulated and her land overcultivated, it is to be expected that in this area would be the greatest discontent with the status quo. Such, indeed, was the case, and with the election of 1766 in which Easterners gained control of the colonial government, one might say that Connecticut then chose the path to Revolution.

A second area of concern is Connecticut's role in the Revolution. We had leaders of great stature, like Trumbull and Sherman and Wolcott. And we provided much more than population or wealth warranted, relative to the other colonies, in the war effort. We became famous as the Provisions State.

A third area of interest, I submit, revolves about certain of our leaders who might best be considered as controversial: people like Israel Putnam, Benedict Arnold, Silas Deane, Ethan Allen. Just because they are controversial, interest in them is heightened.

A fourth aspect of Connecticut's role in the Revolution, which interests me particularly, is some concern for the living heritage of the period. We can by visiting a variety of historic sites and houses, come to appreciate the life-style of 200 years ago or even, in the case, say, of a visit to Fort Griswold, reenact, in our minds at least, a Revolutionary war battle. This part of our heritage is something that not all states share, at least not in such an abundant way as Connecticut.

In 1763, after the last French and Indian War, Connecticut had little to complain about relative to the empire as a whole. She had supported the last war wholeheartedly; one man in five of arms-bearing age (16-45) had served at one time or another. Connecticut had raised some £260,000 for the war effort -- largely in supplies and services -- and England had immediately reimbursed her for the expense. No taxes were raised in Connecticut for a three-year period, thanks to this prompt payment by the Mother Country.

Connecticut had a most liberal government. Her Charter of 1662 provided her with a thin strip of land over which she was entitled to jurisdiction from sea to sea. Connecticut had virtual self-government within the empire; she elected her governor and all other officials. Her towns were fully represented in the Assembly. Aside from Rhode Island, Connecticut was the only colony blessed with a private charter. And she had one privilege no other colony had: she was not obliged to submit legislation to England for possible royal disallowance.

Connecticut was the most homogeneous of all the colonies. Ninety-six percent of her people were of pure English stock. Presumably there should have been little bickering -- such as one would find between the Germans and Scotch-Irish, on the one hand, versus the Quakers in Pennsylvania; or between the Scotch-Irish and the Eastern establishment in colonies like North or South Carolina.

There was little friction between Connecticut and England because of trade regulations. Connecticut's trade was very limited; it consisted mainly of coastwise-trading to New York and Boston and some few products (meat, barrel staves, fish, etc.) to the West Indies. There was almost no direct trade with England. Of all the colonies, Connecticut was the least troublesome to the Mother Country, primarily because she had the least trade and the freest charter.

Connecticut also seemed relatively relaxed in 1763 about a situation that had worried her considerably before 1763: overcrowding. Her population at this time was nearly 200,000 and growing at a rate which would more than double in the next generation. Now with the opportunity to expand northward into Vermont -- once the French had been driven out -- she found a much needed safety valve.

Despite what appears to have been a rosy picture in 1763, storm clouds were definitely gathering. In the first place, that very overcrowding just alluded to had been restricting Connecticut for some time. Stone walls one sees so often running seemingly aimlessly up rocky hillsides today testify to the fact that much marginal land had been cleared. Over half the land cleared by 1763 in Connecticut has now reverted back to woods.

But the restrictions on migration from Connecticut, before 1763, seemed to stem from French power rather than from imperial regulation and created no particular discussion with Great Britain.

The area that felt the greatest population pressure was east of the Connecticut River: the Eastern upland. These people of Eastern Connecticut had a subsistence agriculture with only some towns providing a surplus for sale elsewhere or to meet the needs of a burgeoning population. A student has just recently completed a study of Old Lyme at the time of the Revolution. The population was 4000 in 1763, having doubled, through natural increase, in twenty-five years. The average age of the people was twenty. Where were these young people to find lands to farm?

In 1753 the Susquehannah Company had been formed to speculate in land and to settle in what is the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania, near Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, where the Connecticut Charter of 1662 had presumably given them title to the land. Of course, these Connecticut expansionists were overlooking Pennsylvania's 1681 charter rights to the area, much to the consternation of the Pennsylvania Proprietors.

The Susquehannah issue had badly divided Connecticut as well. The Connecticut Valley residents, more prosperous than Eastern Connecticut, and the people west of the River generally, were in opposition to the pretensions of the Susquehannah Company and resisted its encroachments on the grounds that the Charter of 1662 might very well be put in jeopardy. In a knock-down, drag-out fight with the Pennsylvania Proprietors, whether it be a physical or legal contest, western Connecticut politicians saw only a losing battle.

With England's Proclamation Act of 1763 forbidding further westward expansion and Connecticut conservatives' stand against further movement into the Susquehannah, the Easterners were little short of enraged. Especially galling was England's apparent concern for French institutions in the trans-Appalachian west, including hated Roman Catholicism, and concern as well for Indians which Connecticut militiamen had just spent seventy-five years of nearly constant warfare trying to subdue.

What is most significant, however, is this most deadly split within the colony itself -- east and west. The Westerners had been in political control for years. They had, as moderates and conservatives, thwarted Eastern Connecticut in many ways. One of these was to prohibit the issuance of bills of credit, paper money, which New London and Norwich merchants had asked for as early as the 1730's to help their trade. To some extent the Westerners' refusal was a selfish move by Hartford, Wethersfield and New Haven merchants to protect their own interests. But it can also be regarded as sound currency policy, applauded definitely by English merchants who had excellent reasons for distrusting depreciating colonial paper money.

Another major issue splitting East and West was the Great Awakening which had taken place a generation earlier (in the 1730's). The revivalist spirit that threatened the Congregational establishment was largely popular in Eastern Connecticut. Needless to say, in New England, any religious controversy had political overtones. The split that occurred within Connecticut over this new Enthusiasm, as it was called, was not so much within towns -- although that did occur certainly -- as it was between sections of the colony. By 1763, the New Lights, or liberal reformers, were in Eastern Connecticut and the Old Lights, or Conservatives, were in Western Connecticut.

In 1764, the Sugar Act, which was designed to replace the old Molasses Act of 1733, had little effect on Connecticut. It did not cut off trade with the Dutch, French or Spanish sugar islands, although it would have affected profits were the duties on foreign sugar collected. But Connecticut's West Indian trade, though significant, was small.

With the Stamp Act, however, there are deeper considerations. Governor Thomas Fitch of Norwalk was a moderate Westerner. He was, however, as upset as most Connecticut people at the constitutional threat posed by Parliament that it could tax the colonies directly without acquiescence from the colonial assemblies.

In line with the consensus of opinion in Connecticut, Fitch sent New Haven merchant and lawyer Jared Ingersoll to England to protest the Stamp Act. Ingersoll was warmly received by Grenville himself, who listened attentively to his comments and even changed the Act in many ways to conform with Ingersoll's objections, and then, of all things, prevailed on Ingersoll to accept the office of Stamp Agent for Connecticut.

When Radicals -- and that means Easterners, by and large -- heard of these developments, they protested vigorously. Eliphalet Dyer of Windham, prime-mover in the Susquehannah Company, Jonathan Trumbull of Lebanon, a leading Connecticut merchant with thirty-five years of experience in Connecticut's General Assembly, Major John Durkee of Norwich, and Colonel Israel Putnam of Pomfret -- among others -- organized the Sons of Liberty in the summer of 1765.

In September 1765, as most people are aware, Jared Ingersoll was confronted by a hostile mob of 500 in Wethersfield and forced to give up his stamp agency and to suffer other personal indignities as well.

In the election of 1766, the Easterners had sweet revenge against their old-time political opponents. With the help of the Sons of Liberty they swept the elections. William Pitkin became governor, a post he would hold until his death in 1769, and then his lieutenant-governor, Jonathan Trumbull, would take over and continue as governor throughout the Revolutionary War, until 1784.

So really this is the Revolution in Connecticut. All that follows is insignificant relative to this election of 1766. If the Revolution were in the "hearts and minds" of the people, as John Adams said, it took place in Connecticut in 1766.

England's policies regarding trade and especially the attempt by the Mother Country to raise revenues in the colonies would now be most bitterly opposed by Connecticut. Her closest friend and neighbor was also England's most obstreperous colony -- Massachusetts. So deep-seated was Connecticut's concern for Massachusetts' plight in the following years that Connecticut really needed no issues of her own. She felt Massachusetts' issues were really hers -- and indeed they were. Had Massachusetts not had such elegant spokesmen as James Otis and the Adamses, Connecticut might well have provided them. As it was, she made an excellent follower and accepted their words of wisdom as if they were divinely inspired.

The main issues, as so well expounded by authorities like Edmund Morgan, involve the sanctity of the charters, the right of Parliament to raise revenue in the colonies without the acquiescence of the assemblies, and the right of Parliament to legislate in all respects for the colonies.

Massachusetts' experience with British vengeance after the Tea Party was felt most poignantly by Connecticut, even if vicariously. The fact that the Port of Boston was closed could mean that Parliament might choke off the economy of any colony if it saw fit. The Massachusetts Government Act instituted a military government. It could happen here! The ancient privilege of town meetings were limited now by Parliamentary decree. These and other threats to charter rights disturbed the people of Connecticut almost as much as they did the citizens of Massachusetts.

With the Lexington Alarm the die was cast, and Connecticut supported her northern sister wholeheartedly. Thirty-six hundred men left for Cambridge in the next few weeks and were instrumental in the Battle of Bunker Hill in June of '75, and did yeoman service in finally forcing the British from Boston in March of '76. Ethan Allen and Benedict Arnold both had key roles in the reduction of Ticonderoga, and Arnold's abortive Canadian Campaign in the winter of '75 and '76 is a good indication of Connecticut's wholehearted effort in the colonial cause. After the decision for independence in the spring of '76, she will support the cause even more vigorously than any of the other states.

There are many reasons for this strong support. The most important is that there was no political upheaval in Connecticut in the years 1775/76. The upheaval had come ten years earlier in 1766. Trumbull, a minister turned merchant, was a most competent governor with the kind of dedication that only one with a Puritan background might possess. In addition, the government in Connecticut did

not have to concern itself with dissent. The Sons of Liberty had seen to that years earlier. Nor did the politicians have to concern themselves with constitution-making, as so many other states did; the Charter of 1662 was adequate for all needs and it continued as the instrument of government for forty-two more years, until 1818. One other key issue also is that Connecticut was never occupied for long by British troops. The government could concentrate its attention on the war elsewhere.

Connecticut's support for the Revolutionary War effort has never been fully acknowledged. Some 40,000 men from Connecticut served at one time or another in the war. The State Bicentennial Commission reports from information provided by the Lebanon Historical Society that of some 25,000 war dead, perhaps as many as 12,000, and certainly as many as 6,000 were from Connecticut. Connecticut's contribution may better be understood when one realizes that of 17,000 men at the Battle of Long Island in 1776, 13,000 were from Connecticut; of 6,000 Continental troops at Saratoga in 1777, 5,000 were from Connecticut; of 5,000 American troops at Yorktown, 4,000 came from Connecticut. At least one Connecticut regiment was present at all three of the disastrous winter encampments: Valley Forge, Morristown and Redding. And Connecticut men will be among the last to be mustered out of service when the army is finally disbanded at Newburgh in 1783.

Just as important as our military commitment, however, was Connecticut's steadfastness in supplying Washington's armies. For the Bicentennial we have adopted the name, "Provisions State". The General could always count on "Brother Jonathan" for something extra, and Governor Trumbull was tireless in his efforts to provide supplies, whether they be Salisbury chain for cutting off the Hudson or beef cattle for soldiers at Valley Forge. Trumbull's War Office in Lebanon was a beehive of activity in rounding up materials for carrying on the war. Some 900 meetings were held here for the purpose of finding supplies for the Continental Army and generally supporting the cause. That would be an average of one meeting every three days for eight years!

Although not occupied, Connecticut did suffer from military action within the state. There were four invasions of Connecticut -- easy to remember: one in 1777, two in 1779, and one in 1781. None of these British attacks were especially significant as far as the outcome of the war is concerned. For the most part, they were diversionary, although perhaps the attack on New London might be considered as punitive and as a trial command for the defecting Benedict Arnold. The Danbury Raid in 1779 was nearly a total British success, although some leaders like Benedict Arnold and General Wooster distinguished themselves for the patriot cause. But the stores lost at Danbury, especially flour and tents, were a devastating blow. In February 1779, the salt works at Greenwich were destroyed.

At New Haven in July 1779, the British were able to occupy the town briefly but for no apparent permanent purpose. Because of the defences of the Harbor, especially Black Rock Fort, the invasion had to be made well to the east and to the west. It is fitting that Black Rock Fort, soon renamed Fort Nathan Hale, will before long be reconstructed as a New Haven Bicentennial project.

The attack on New London, culminating in a spirited defense of Fort Griswold in Groton again did not do any permanent damage to the American cause; but it did give us more heroes, like Colonel Ledyard, and stiffened Connecticut's determination to support the war effort.

Connecticut's contributions include a very active privateering campaign as well. We had a number of commissioned ships, like the Oliver Cromwell, the Jonathan Trumbull, and the Defence, which captured dozens of ships and even on occasion took on a British man-of-war. But some two to three hundred privateers captured upwards of 500 British prizes -- a significant blow to the British war effort.

One issue of considerable significance involves Connecticut's handling of Tories during the Revolution. The fact that there were Anglican churches in Connecticut, especially in Fairfield County, posed a problem to the Sons of Liberty. As the English captured New York in 1776 it was somewhat more difficult for the patriots to keep control of southwestern Connecticut. There were actually only 2,000 adult males of Tory persuasion out of 38,000 in this area. But towns like Fairfield, Redding, and Newtown had sizeable and vociferous Tory minorities. So did New Haven. And there were a few towns like Hebron, where it took physical force to stifle the Tory minister, Samuel Peters. Generally speaking most Tories in Connecticut were, in due course, overawed. In Connecticut only one man was obliged to give up his life for his Tory connections. Some few found themselves forced underground with other notorious fellows at Newgate's copper mine. Connecticut also served as a place for confinement for out-of-state Tory-notables like the mayor of New York City and Benjamin Franklin's son, the ex-governor of New Jersey.

Appeals to Trumbull by Tories for "law and order" did little good. Trumbull believed "a man's right to protection by the State was qualified by his political opinions." When Tories asked for protection, he replied that it was beyond his power to restrain people from doing what they considered to be their duty! In March 1775, in an address to the General Assembly, Trumbull referred to the Tories as "depraved, malignant, avaricious and haughty." He called for "manly action against those who by force and violence seek your ruin and destruction."

We have already mentioned some of Connecticut's heroes. Ironically, our greatest military hero was Benedict Arnold. The tarnish can never be wiped from his name, but we can take pride nonetheless in his efforts while he supported the patriot cause, especially at Saratoga in October of 1777. This was undoubtedly the most vital battle of the war, as it brought the French in on our side. To say that we would not have won the battle without Arnold can not be proven, but his role in defeating Burgoyne was outstanding. A study of Arnold's defection -- a personal tragedy of Shakespearean proportions -- is a rewarding venture in itself.

Israel Putnam is another controversial character. An old Indian war veteran and always popular with his troops, he as much as anyone turned Bunker Hill into an American victory. But later at the Battle of Long Island he failed, as I believe anyone would have, in trying to halt the British Invasion. After additional unsuccessful campaigns in the Hudson Valley highlands, it was perhaps well that "Old Put" suffered a paralytic stroke. His military career ended rather ingloriously, to be sure, but his earlier exploits lived on in the hearts of loyal Connecticut soldiers.

There is no need to expand on Nathan Hale's contribution to the cause of independence, but to fail to mention him would be ungrateful, I suppose.

As to Silas Deane, here we find another controversial character that warrants careful study. Deane, a most ambitious young man, married into the prominent and wealthy Webb family of Wethersfield, was able to command positions of influence early in the deliberations of the Continental Congresses, and finally was commissioned to carry out the vital and secret negotiations with the French for aid to the American cause. Perhaps, knowing the nature of his assignment and the man himself, it was inevitable that his personal fortunes became involved with public funds, and the two could never be satisfactorily disentangled. It took fifty years of delicate negotiations for his family and political friends to clear his name from the charges of corruption levelled by his bitter political foes. Perhaps it is true that Deane was the victim of Arthur Lee's animosity. Deane himself spoiled his own record by going to England and writing vitriolic tracts against America. The truth of his peculiar story will never be known for sure.

There are, of course, less controversial Connecticut patriots: people like Huntington of Norwich, William Williams of Lebanon (no great friend of Governor Trumbull, although he lived across the street), Oliver Ellsworth of Windsor, Sherman of New Haven. These men gave sound advice and countless hours to the patriot cause in their roles as representatives for Connecticut to the Continental Congresses.

As I said earlier, there is so much that can be appreciated about Connecticut's part in the Revolution simply by keeping one's eyes open as one rides about our state. With historic houses and museums, of which we have an abundance, as well as historic sites, we can pick up much information as to the life-style not only of heroes and prominent people but of the common people as well. Perhaps there is no great point to listing places to visit -- and I would be glad to mention more in our discussion period -- but be aware of what we have in this remarkable little state of ours. Lebanon Common, with Trumbull's home and the War Office, is nearly unchanged 200 years after the Revolution began; one can easily follow the day's activities in the New London of 1781 by standing on the ramparts of old Fort Griswold. One can still visit "Old Put's" charming town of Brooklyn. The Webb House and Silas Deane House have been beautifully kept up and restored by the Colonial Dames. Revolutionary furnishings and memorabilia, including the incomparable Doolittle Prints, can be found at Hartford's Connecticut Historical Society. One can troop with family or friends to the site of Black Rock Fort. Newgate prison of Tory fame is still there, to see and visit. Oliver Wolcott's house in Litchfield is still lived in by direct descendants! The Redding encampment is a State Park -- and so it goes; we have a tremendous amount to offer in Connecticut. Be sure you and your students get in on all the good things!

One final word: perhaps the best kind of project to be concerned with in this Bicentennial Year is local history. If there is a local house of the Revolutionary period -- and what Connecticut town does not have one? -- it can be studied and its history unlocked. Exhibits of local interest can be gathered. Direct descendants of Revolutionary families can be interviewed, local sites explored. One of the most rewarding projects involves people and their lives at the time of the Revolution. How did families with soldiers in far-distant places fare? Who took care of them? How did wounded veterans get along? How did local government respond to the ever-increasing demands for taxes and supplies. These are but a few of the myriads of questions that can interest and excite all of us in this Bicentennial Year. Connecticut did a remarkable job helping to bring into being a new nation 200 years ago. We can -- and should -- take real pride in those achievements today.

Connecticut and the Revolution - Selected Bibliography
compiled by H.T. Oedel, Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven, Conn.

I. Useful general surveys of the coming of the war include:
Charles M. Andrews, The Colonial Background of the American Revolution (Yale U. Press, New Haven, first published 1924)
Bernard Bailyn, The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Belknap Press, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1967; paperback, 1973)
Lawrence Henry Gipson, The Coming of the Revolution, 1763-1775, Harper & Row, Harper Torchbook, TR 3007, 1953
Edmund S. Morgan, The Birth of the Republic (U. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1956)
Edmund S. and Helen M. Morgan, The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution, New York, 1963

II. Connecticut and the Coming of the Revolution:
A) Source Material:
Government records of the 1760's and 1770's in J.H. Trumbull and Charles J. Hoadly, compilers, The Public Records of Connecticut (15 vols. Hartford, 1850-1890)
Jonathan Trumbull Papers, Connecticut State Library, Hartford Press
Coverage: Connecticut Courant and Connecticut Gazette.
B) Useful Surveys:
Richard L. Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee: Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1765 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967)
Lawrence Henry Gipson, Jared Ingersoll: A Study of American Loyalism in Relation to British Colonial Government (New Haven, 1920)
Oscar Zeichner, Connecticut's Years of Controversy, 1750-1776 (Hamden, Conn. 1970)

III. General Surveys of the Revolutionary War:
John R. Alden, A History of The American Revolution (Harper & Row, Torchbook - TB 3011 - New York, 1962)
George Athan Billias (edit), The American Revolution: How Revolutionary Was It? American Problem Studies, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965
Mark M. Boatner, Encyclopedia of the American Revolution (New York, 1966)--comprehensive bibliography on events and personalities of the era
George F. Scheer and Hugh F. Rankin, Rebels and Redcoats (New York, 1957)
Christopher Ward, The War of the Revolution (2 vols, New York, 1952)

IV. Connecticut in The Revolution:
A) Source Material:
Royal R. Hinman, compiler, A Historical Collection, from Official Records, Files, etc. of the Part Sustained by Connecticut during the War of the Rebellion (Hartford, 1842)
Charles J. Hoadley and Leonard W. Labaree, compilers, The Public Record of the State of Connecticut (5 vols, Hartford, 1894-1943)
Trumbull Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections: Fifth Series IX-X, Seventh Series II-III
B) Useful Special Studies:
Christopher Collier, Roger Sherman's Connecticut, Yankee Politics and The American Revolution (Middletown, Conn., 1971)
Timothy Dwight, Travels in New England and New York (4 vols, New Haven, 1821)
Louis F. Middlebrook, History of Maritime Connecticut during the American Revolution, 1775-1783 (2 vols, Salem, Mass., 1925)

Louis F. Middlebrook, Salisbury Connecticut Cannon (Salem, Mass., 1935)
Forrest Morgan, et al., editors, Connecticut as a Colony and as a State or One of the Original Thirteen (Hartford, 1904)
Richard J. Purcell, Connecticut in Transition, 1775-1818, American Historical Association, 1918, reprinted by Wesleyan U. Press, Middletown, Conn. 1963

V. Still available (very reasonably!) through the Connecticut State Library bookstore are some of the Tercentenary pamphlets (1931-36) which pertain to the Revolutionary Period. Examples are:
Vol. I. Charles M. Andrews, Connecticut and the British Government
VIII. G.M. Dutcher, George Washington and Connecticut in War and Peace
X. L.H. Gipson, Connecticut Taxation, 1750-1775
XXVIII. Lois K. Rosenberry, Migrations from Connecticut to 1800
XXXIV. G.P. Boyd, The Susquehannah Company, Connecticut's Experiment in Expansion

VI. The American Bicentennial Commission (Bull House, 50 S. Prospect Street, Hartford) has published a number of paperback booklets on the Theme of Connecticut and the Revolution. With Glenn Weaver as general editor, those books presently available are:
Thomas C. Barrow, Connecticut Joins the Revolution
Matt Callahan, Connecticut's Revolutionary War Leaders
Christopher Collier, Connecticut in the Continental Congress
Chester M. Destler, The Provision State
Robert A. East, Connecticut's Loyalists
J. William Frost, Connecticut Education in the Revolutionary Era
Robert F. McDevitt, Connecticut Attacked: A British Viewpoint Tryon's Raid on Danbury
David M. Roth, Connecticut's War Governor: Jonathan Trumbull
Louis Leonard Tucker, Connecticut's Seminary of Sedition: Yale College
David O. White, Connecticut's Black Soldiers

The Bicentennial Commission hopes to publish 5 additional booklets each year for the next 7 years! Titles to watch for this year are:
Women in The Revolution
William Williams
The Connecticut Press
The Pitkin Farm
Col. Sheldon's 2nd Light Dragoon

VII. Regarding cultural materials of the period and Connecticut's architecture, two readily available sources are:
Robert Bishop, How to know American Antique Furniture (E.P. Dutton & Co., N.Y., 1973)
J. Frederick Kelly, Early Domestic Architecture of Connecticut (Dover Publications, N.Y., 1963)

VIII. Guides to historic sites in Connecticut are numerous. Two good ones are:
Edgar L. Heermance, The Connecticut Guide, What to See and Where to Find It (Project of the State Planning Board, Hartford, Conn., 1935)
Litchfield Associates, A Guide to Historic Sites in Connecticut, text by Eric Hatch, Conn. Historical Commission (Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Conn., 1963)

IX. Two films on Connecticut in the Revolution are:
Resolved to Be Free (28 min.) narrated by Katharine Hepburn, ARBCC.
Arrangements for showing by the Marketing Department of Society for Savings, 31 Pratt St., Hartford, Conn. 06101.
These States (90 minutes). This is a travelogue of sites of the Revolution. It is my understanding the film is not yet available, but will be divided into 3 parts (each covering a regional area). This is a project of the National Bicentennial Commission.

X. There is to be a new Official Map of Connecticut to be issued in early June, including Revolutionary sites in Connecticut. This is put out by the Connecticut Department of Transportation, Bureau of Highways, P.O. Drawer A, Wethersfield, Conn. 06109.

Bicentennial School Projects and the American Issues Forum

by J'Lene Mayo

A major difficulty exists in putting the Bicentennial celebration together. It resembles a difficulty that Mark Twain noted: "The only feature of the American character that he was ever able to discover was a fondness for ice water." That is what we are faced with in organizing enthusiasm for the Bicentennial on the national, state, local and community levels and in the schools, the essential microcosm of American society.

I believe that the Bicentennial is a serious matter, as well as a celebration. One part of America sees the Bicentennial as a mass birthday with sparklers and not much else. Another part of American society sees the Bicentennial as the scandals and mismanagement of the national Bicentennial Commission. Another part of America remains blissfully ignorant of what the Bicentennial is or what it is a Bicentennial of. Another part are hopefully growing in number, planning and organizing what could very well be a very important year in American history. Teachers belong to the last part, and even if we are divided as to what the Bicentennial is or should be, it is up to us to make this year an important one in American history. This endeavor is not quite the continual disagreements that one finds in philosophy or theology. We are agreed on many matters. America is the oldest successful experiment in democracy, and our Bicentennial should be a successful continuation of that experiment.

Among the specific projects for schools and the American Issues Forum, I hope that you will contribute information about you and your school or community are doing. We already know of many such projects. Woodward school in New Haven just finished a cultural celebration of the Bicentennial involving all grades in artistic, dramatic and literary projects in Class days, essay contests, athletic contests, local historical society programs, recreations of life in 1776. The New Haven Colony Historical Society has an education center where school students can go and live through a day in the life of a colonial child.

Scholastic Magazine reports that in Minnesota turned-off children are working on save-our-school, adopt-a-vacant-lot activities. In Springfield, Illinois, 4th graders are developing two-minute radio spots from cassettes on the Revolution. In Hanover, New Hampshire, second-graders are creating role plays for rustic America in the 18th century, emphasizing the skills needed for survival in the wilderness. In Prairieville, Pennsylvania, third-graders are studying 200 years of local history. In Laramie, Wyoming, students are developing slides about the diversity of life-styles, occupations and home life of the community at various times, by interviews with old-timers. In Baltic, Connecticut, 8th graders are adopting Revolutionary families as their own, to trace ancestors and show their history in the past 200 years.

One of the only worthwhile national programs beginning in September is the American Issues Forum, developed by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Led by Walter Cronkite and other national leaders in education, labor, and business, it is designed to engage the participation of ALL Americans through local, community, school and church groups. It offers a calendar of issues each month for nine months for all Americans to consider, discuss, and explore issues fundamental to American society -- a national dialogue on where we have been, where we are, where we are going and how things happen in America. It depends in large

part on people like you in every community to make the national program work. The potential is staggering, when you consider that in this program all Americans will be discussing the same issue at once, with necessary continuity. Even in Connecticut with 169 towns celebrating the Bicentennial, there can be 169 dialogues focussing on themes being discussed in every other community in America.

Among the issues are: What is America? How did it come to be what it is? What are the problems which disturb each of us today? We shall look at the past, its traditions, reviving or changing them. We shall probably find many issues of disagreement, conflict and compromise. We shall focus on the difference between preaching and practice. We may find some continuities and shared ideals.

The specific topics in the calendar are not so much current as abiding issues of continuing concern, past, present and future. They include timeless and immediate, dramatic issues for exploration by everyone with information supplied by media and by the people themselves. In the months ahead each topic can be broken down into weekly discussions.

First is the theme, A Nation of Nations, with a weekly focus on immigrants, assimilation and allegiance. Like other topics, there will be bibliography, specific topics, questions, quotes, and provocative issues.

Second: The Land of Plenty with discussions on the vanishing frontier, the sprawling city, uses and abuses, and the question: who owns the land?

Third: Certain Unalienable Rights -- freedoms of speech, assembly, religion, press, equal protection, searches and seizure.

Fourth: A More Perfect Government -- in Congress, the Presidency, the Bureaucracy, and the relation of the states.

Fifth: Working in America -- the work ethic, labor organization, the welfare state, and the benefits of labor.

Sixth: Business in America -- private enterprise, the market place, monopolies, regulations, advertising and the consumer.

Seventh: America in the World -- the American dream among nations, economic dimensions, power, a nation among nations.

Eighth: Growing Up in America -- the family, education, work, life, religious values, belonging.

Ninth: Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness -- the rugged individualist, dream of success, pleasure, and the fruit of wisdom.

These are the initial stimuli for national discussion. Different parts of the nation are contributing their insights and their materials to aid discussion. For example, WNET in New York is scheduling in-service school presentations monthly with student and teachers materials, from the Children's Television Workshop. A national news syndicate and 36 national figures will disseminate their views of the monthly issues. The University of California will issue newspapers as the materials for college credit courses on the themes of the Forum. Hindsight, Inc. will present 9 television documentaries on recent events in

America. Hearst-Metrotone will develop films on the Forum. The American Library Association will develop booklists for adults and children -- twenty million copies in all, every week for schools and local groups. The Speech Communication Association will sponsor debates among students. The American Association of State Colleges is adopting the Forum for academic credit. The AFL-CIO is developing materials on the monthly topics for their union members. The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs will develop and send out materials on ethnic issues related to the Forum's topics. Kiwanis International, Educational Film Library, Women in Community Services, National Council on Aging, National Urban League, NAACP, Campfire Girls, Foreign Policy Association, and even the Toastmasters International are developing materials, films, readings and bibliographies that will be available for you in your schools.

Almost all of these materials will be sent to your school systems or to your school or to you directly. There will certainly be nine formal lectures in New Haven on the topics of the Forum, and the lecturers will be available to go out and join in the weekly discussions in local communities, as a follow-up. The lectures will be videotaped and be available for schools and local public libraries. But many other related projects are possible. The 5th graders at Fair Haven in New Haven are developing their own interpretations of the Declaration of Independence and sponsoring a series of craft fairs dealing with colonial skills. Ridgefield and other school systems are offering elective or mini-courses just on the Revolution. The 4th graders in Ridgefield are putting together a history of the town. It is important in all these projects to appeal to as many levels and groups as possible. Some can be very scholarly, but others should be directed and organized to generate as much sheer enthusiasm as possible. Students in Waterford are helping to restore an old 1800's house on school property. Mansfield has an oral history project involving old and young people. Nature Centers throughout the state like at Litchfield are having programs on crafts using natural materials, dyeing, weaving, wood carving and growing food. Darien 5th graders have made a film on Paul Revere. Other towns have archaeological digs or are building log cabins. Other teachers plan field trips to Philadelphia, Independence Hall, and the National Toy Museum there. Grammar school students in Storrs have recreated a colonial village in miniature and recreated events from various periods of American history. The University of Connecticut will have a wagon travelling throughout the state with copies of rare materials for schools. Many local and national programs are available through the State Bicentennial Commission in Hartford.

The variety and enthusiasm possible in such projects are endless. With them, the intense and diverse discussions of themes in the American Issues Forum are only just a beginning to an ongoing celebration in the state of what has made life worth living in America.

EPILOGUE

"Thinking Large and Small in the Revolution"

Excerpt of remarks by Edmund S. Morgan

Most of the men who gathered in Philadelphia in September 1774 had never seen each other before. Some had never even been out of their home colony before. A few like Washington had fought outside their colony in Indian wars or had gone to the siege of Louisburg. Others like John Dickinson of Pennsylvania had travelled to England, studied law at the Inns of Court or even taken the Grand Tour of European capitals approved as a necessary part of a young gentleman's education.

When they arrived at Philadelphia, they found many issues to agree and disagree about. Historians usually divide them up into radicals, moderates and conservatives, depending on the delegates' views on independence from England, equality or democracy. Such a division has a certain value, but another important way of looking at the men who led the Revolution is to divide them up according to how large or small they thought about the issues of the day.

Admittedly, it is not easy to make such a nice distinction among them. In any age it is hard to tell when politicians are thinking large or small. In the period between 1760 and 1800, especially, people's horizons and mental perspectives changed under the pressure of events, but in a very real sense whether the Revolution and the Constitution succeeded or failed depended in large part on how large or small important people at the time were thinking.

Samuel Adams was a good example of a man who thought small. He had a formidable mind and when he got on a subject he pursued it relentlessly. But deep down he was basically a Boston politician, accustomed to the smoke-filled rooms, ward-heeling and local in-fighting of his native town. His horizon was large enough to include England, but what he heard from England he didn't like. He was obsessed with the idea of virtue, his own, Boston's, America's. He wanted everyone to be virtuous. This was a valuable obsession to have for attacks on royal policies, royal governors and moral back-sliders wherever he found them. But it was an obsession that often prevented him from communicating and sympathizing with the not so virtuous friends and allies whom the Revolution required for success. On issues of national importance and unity he often could not see beyond the moral virtues or vices of the people involved. And in that sense he was what you might call a small-thinking man.

At first glance, Patrick Henry appears to have been a large-thinking man. He had made the first protests against Parliament's Stamp Act in the Virginia House of Burgesses and on the eve of the war his fiery oratory joined many of his reluctant neighbors to the common cause. In Congress he declared in ringing tones, "I am not a Virginian but an American!" but he said that to support a motion for the delegates to vote according to the population of their colonies -- which would, of course, have left Virginia with the most votes. He served as Governor of Virginia during the war but did not attend the Federal Convention because, he said, he smelled a rat. His horizon and his interests throughout the Revolution were those of a backwoods lawyer intensely devoted to his own region and its own interests.

John Adams, Sam's cousin, was another country lawyer, from Braintree. Nothing gave him more pleasure than puttering about his family's farm, mowing hay and mending fences. Given a choice in the matter, he would probably have stayed a country lawyer and farmer, had it not been for the Revolution. When he went to Philadelphia in 1774, he complained bitterly about the people there, their manners, their language, their morals, their women; in short, he declared, "Philadelphia is not Boston." But, unlike his cousin Sam, John Adams was one of those men who thought large. He saw beyond the confines of Braintree and Boston to the larger issues of the colonies' place in the British Empire, the colonists' arguments in the context of a larger tradition of legal rights. During the war, he served as minister to the Netherlands arranging loans and credit, and after the war as our first minister to the Court of St. James', defending in his writings the experiments of the young nation and particularly the new states' constitutions. He was one of the first delegates in Congress in 1774 and 1775 to be consistently in favor of independence as soon as possible. But so were other people like Henry or cousin Sam who were small-thinking men. John Adams saw the larger picture. He often didn't like what he saw or the people he met from other states, but he had the ability to get beyond his liking for a small region and consider the union as something more than a collection of separate colonies; he could see them as one nation. He could see what things they had in common and how their very differences contributed essential elements to the new nation, or, as he put it, "how thirteen clocks could chime at once."

Joseph Galloway of Pennsylvania was a Loyalist but he was also a large-thinking man. In 1774 he was one of the few people who could see the larger picture, how the colonies fit together and what their relations were with England. He was a friend of Franklin and in 1774 presented to Congress a plan of union based in part on Franklin's Albany Plan of 1754. It was not a bad plan, and it provided a framework for unity that other delegates could not visualize then or in 1787. But Galloway's plan included Parliament as a necessary ingredient and unifying force. That the other delegates would not accept, though it was defeated by only one vote.

George Washington was obviously an important leader who thought in large terms. During the war, though, when he was supposed to be running the army, his letters to Mount Vernon are filled with the most minute details of plowing, planting, healing a slave's hurt foot, and other agrarian concerns which at times seemed more important to him than the Revolution itself. But his position as commander in chief necessarily made him think large. He was the one who had to deal with Congress and the separate states every week, if the army was to survive. He and Jefferson lamented over the type of small-thinking men whom other states and even Virginia itself were sending to Congress. Despite his own love for Mount Vernon and his oft-expressed desire to retire from the national scene, he more than anyone else symbolized to other Americans what it meant to think large. If the Congress, the Confederation or the Constitution were to survive, they necesarily depended on men who, as Hamilton said, could think "continentally."

This was a very real problem, not simply for the material success of the national experiment. To small-thinking men after 1774 and to many European critics, it was not possible, theoretically or practically, for a republic covering a large area to succeed. The only successful republics, the small-thinking men said, were small like Holland or Switzerland. In their minds, republics which grew in size resembled the despotic empires of the ancient world and crumbled from their own expansiveness. Most important, large republics in classical theory were too centralized and too vulnerable to take-overs by a few corrupt men or a scheming

minority. But to large-thinking men in America like Adams, Washington and Madison it was possible to predict the success of the republic on a large scale by arguments which successfully modified classical theory. To them a republic like America with so many different interests covering such a large area meant that no one group could monopolize power or seize control without opposition from the other parts. The large size of the young republic was, therefore, ideally suited for success. And in that sense one must conclude that the large-thinking men of the Revolution were right, and the small-thinking men were wrong.

This is not to say that all large-thinking men are right all the time. As the Revolution progressed and gave way to the Federal government, a rather important development occurred which ultimately required the talents of small-thinking men.

The large-thinking men who helped create the Federal Constitution and a national government fell into an error which often happens in large, successful institutions. At any time in the last third of the 18th century, if you asked people who thought large or small what the Revolution and Constitution were all about, they all would probably have answered, "Liberty." How then could such people with such a nearly unanimous opinion and experience fall into the bickering and bitter divisiveness that occurred after 1789 with the Whiskey Rebellion, Hamilton's financial plan, the Jay Treaty, the Jacobin clubs, and the Alien and Sedition Acts?

The answer might be that, though small-thinking and large-thinking men agreed that liberty was the paramount value of the young nation, they disagreed about the means used to secure liberty. They had worked long and hard to make the national government work as the bulwark of liberty. But like the church in medieval times or other institutions created to preserve an ideal, the large-thinking men who were leaders of the national government began to mistake the existence of their institution with the existence of the ideal supposedly preserved by the institution. They believed that since their institution -- the national government -- was to preserve liberty, any criticism or attack on the national institution meant an attack on liberty. In short, preserving the institution became more important than the ideal supposedly preserved by the institution. So, the Federalists called out troops to suppress the Whiskey rebels, attacked the Jacobin clubs which criticized government policy, and passed the Alien and Sedition Acts which actually suppressed liberty -- all in the name of liberty and the national government.

When the large-thinking men like Washington, Hamilton and Adams began to confuse the national institution as the sole and only embodiment of an ideal like liberty and began to suppress or restrict liberty, it was the small-thinking men and localists who came to the rescue of the Republic. People like Jefferson and Madison who had been large-thinking men saw the mistake that the Federalists were making in defense of national institutions used to suppress liberty. They drafted the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions which for the time being set the balance straight between liberty and nationalism. They had allies in the Patrick Henrys and Samuel Adamses in every community who could not see larger, institutional issues. They cared intensely about liberty and how it was used or abused in daily life, not as an abstract imposed from above by some faraway national institution. Their smallness of vision which had made the Revolution a difficult process and had complicated ratification of the Federal Constitution now served the valuable purpose of redressing the imbalance of arbitrary power which abused liberty in the name of defending it.

Thus, in looking at the Revolution it is important to keep in mind how large-thinking men and small-thinking men played their parts in preserving both national unity and national liberty in precarious balance. Such men played similar parts in the triumphs and tragedies of the 19th century. And, of course, even in our own day we have had occasion to see at first hand how men with an intense concern for liberty could come to the rescue of the republic endangered by over-zealous men who mistakenly cared more for the protection of an institution than for the defense of liberty.