

PATRIARCHS IN THE WILDERNESS: 17TH-CENTURY ORIGINS OF THE NORTH AND SOUTH: NEW ENGLAND AND CANADA

I. 20 Minutes on the French

Someone asked on blog, what about the French? Here you go. Think about comparisons and contrasts with other powers.

A. France in North America: an overview

- 1. Another latecomer that never transferred much population**
- 2. Intended only as a commercial/imperial enterprise – attempts failed in 1500s**
Cartier expeditions – searching for China or mineral wealth; 2d voyage went so badly that Cartier and his pirate-like crew snuck away in the middle of night when the nobleman actually in charge of the expedition showed up
- 3. Fur trade became profitable once beaver hats came into fashion in the late 16th century – Indians were key suppliers**
Beaver hats stayed drier and kept their shape better; European supply was about gone
- 4. 1st permanent colony at Quebec founded by geographer Samuel de Champlain, ca. 1606-08**
- 5. Told Pope that they intended to convert Indians; Jesuits began campaign to do so in 1625**

B. The French and the Indians

- 1. French alliances with the Indians allowed them to claim more strategic territory in North America than other powers**
Indians were also chief source of military manpower in North America, putting French at a huge advantage in many of their conflicts with the British in this part of the world
- 2. Started off badly when explorer Jacques Cartier kidnapped a chief's sons, & later the chief, made enemies of the Iroquois**
 - a) In 1609 battle, Champlain formally allied the French with their Algonquin & Huron trading partners against the Iroquois. "Beaver Wars" would continue for century.**
START HERE 9/21/06
- 3. Cultural sensitivity as key to French success**

Made virtue out of necessity: Indians actually far outnumbered the French during much of time of France's control. Also, like English, they had no other legitimate claims.

a) *Learned Indian languages*

This was actually one of Cartier's reasons for the kidnapping

b) *Lower levels of racism, higher levels of intermarriage*

[put next two points together but don't read from the outline]

c) *Adoption of Indian political and economic customs & language – did not assert patriarchal authority over them. Gained influence by not claiming power.*

d) *Claimed land through alliances & friendly relations rather than conquest or purchase; ceremonies expressed Indian "affection" & love for French, which was often genuine*

What the French didn't do was important as their active policy. Though the French claimed the territory they had "discovered" in the New World just as the other powers did, they did not treat the Indians as a conquered people, or assert the right to rule them. In doing this, of course, they were following Indian canons of leadership, and hence actually gained more sway over the tribes than Englishmen or Spaniards who tried to order Indians around. Thus in 1755, one British observer reported that he had discovered the "secret" of the French success in gaining Indian allies: "They know too well the spirit of Indian politics to affect a Superiority of government over them." By not assuming power, French gained much influence.

In entering North America, the French also did not try deal "fairly" with the Indians according to alien concepts, a la the English: They did not buy Indian land or ask them to give up their rights to the land in treaties. In that, they agreed with the Spanish, partly because neither of the Catholic powers recognized Indian sovereignty in the first place. Unlike the Spanish, the militarily and relatively weak French did not slaughter or enslave those who refused, nor did they impose their own laws and taxes on the Indians, or exact tribute or obligatory military service. Spanish did all of these things, and English certainly imposed their laws.

Seed on ceremonies: French ceremonies upon taking possession involved Indian participation in a ritual not unlike a Catholic procession or mass. French looked for Indian "sincerity and good affection" toward themselves, and sought to be *invited* to stay. Contrast this with a Spanish ultimatum or an English purchase.

What the Indians usually received when dealing with the French was treatment they could understand and respect. The French were apparently much more sensitive cultural observers than the English or Spanish, and able to act on their superior knowledge. Even at the highest levels of the leadership, the French were careful to observe the protocols of Indian politics in their diplomacy and trading. They conducted their dealings in the ritualized fashion that the Indians expected, and used the language of family and friendship toward them. Addressed Indians as children or brothers, Indians them as father.

~~[IF TIME: Let's look at an example of how the French worked, from the recent film "Black Robe." 5 minutes of Black Robe exchange scene here]~~

Why would the Indians do something so demeaning as call these conquerors "father"? They were couching economic relations in terms of kinship and friendship that the Indians valued and understood. One also needs to remember that father and child was not the master-slave type of relationship in Eastern Woodlands Indian society that it was among Europeans. The father role was that of an Indian "beloved man." Fathers were generous and resolved their childrens' disputes. That was the role that the French tried to perform for the Indians. They gave the tribes they traded with annual presents, and generally accepted the father's responsibility to supply the basic needs of his children. In return, the Indians retrieved furs and skins, and when necessary, fought for their father in wars against other Europeans and enemy Indians.

e) *French population rarely displaced Indians, who often moved closer to "Onontio"*

The Indians also turned to their French father, whom they called "Onontio" or "great mountain," to adjudicate quarrels and act as peace-maker in their relationships with each other.

Probably the most important thing that the French did not do, and this is obvious from the map, is "settle" their territory. That is to say, they did not transfer large portions of their population over to the New World, and establish them as farmers. Outside of small area around Quebec and Montreal, and in Acadia, New France and Louisiana were very sparsely settled. Between N.O. and Quebec, only a few isolated villages, forts, and trading posts, such as Ft. Detroit and Ft. Duquesne, only concentration in the "Illinois country," where Kaskaskia, Ste. Gen and other river stations were. French habitants and voyageurs were also much able to get along with Indians. They did not

fence in land, clear timber, or send out armed bands of hunters to nearly the same degree.

The French had no “frontier,” no constantly moving line of settlement that swept the Indians aside. Though Indians could become dependent on French trade goods and see their traditional economy collapse anyway, they were rarely displaced from where they were living by the French, and indeed many tribes moved to be closer to Onontio and his goods.

4. Downsides: unfriendly Indians dealt with harshly (Mesquakie, Natchez); impact of fur trade on Indians

Most Indians (besides Iroquois) preferred France to the other powers, but that doesn’t mean that it was good thing to be colonized by anyone. Indian who did go with the program could and were dealt with harshly. The Mesquakie from present-day Wisconsin and the Natchez from the area of present-day Natchez, Mississippi were completely exterminated.

~~[SKIP for 2006] ————— The French-Mesquakie Wars, 1712-1728.~~

~~Hence the so-called Fox or Mesquakie Indians from around the Green Bay, WI area got themselves hunted down and wiped out by the French. The Fox did not get along with some of the tribes that had gathered around French Detroit, and made mistake of allying themselves with the Iroquois, one tribe that French did not get along with. This looked to French like an attempt to bypass French for British centers in the East. At same time, Fox territory blocked the trade route west, to the Plains Indians and also the way from Detroit and the pays d’en haut to the Mississippi River. Beginning with a massacre of Foxes at Detroit in 1712, France launched the “Fox Wars,” a campaign of extermination that ended only in 1728, when Foxes finally decided to move in with the Seneca back east. The French gov got wind of this plan, chased down the Foxes on their “trail of tears” and massacred 400-600 of them. 300 or so more who went back to Green Bay got same treatment from some allied Indians. When a chief named Kiala (who had attempted to organize an Iroquois style anti-French conspiracy) begged for the last 50 warriors to be spared, the French gov had him sold into slavery on Martinique. Foxes only survived as a people when taken in by the Sauks, who were friendly to the French but horrified at what happened to Foxes.~~

Also bad for the Indians: involvement in white wars that made enemies out of the settlers, fur trade that ultimately made them dependent on whites by destroying nearby game and making their tradition subsistence patterns impossible and disorganizing them socially. Men who once hunted for meat in the winter now spent months away looking for furs and skins.

II. The Protestant Migration and the Origins of New England

Two views of Puritans and the Protestant movement of which they were key members: seekers of freedom fleeing from tyranny or repressive patriarchal tyrants themselves. The answer of course is that both views have some truth to them.

Understanding the New England migration requires first understanding a bit about one of the great events of world history, the Protestant Reformation.

A. The Protestant Reformation: attack on the worldliness and human-centeredness of the Catholic Church: begun by Martin Luther, 1517

The New England migrants were members of various radical Protestant groups who came to America to get away from conditions that had become intolerable at home. Why we will see in a moment.

"Protestant" refers to Christians who beginning in the 16th and 17th centuries, were rebelling against the Catholic Church. The broadest way to describe their set of criticisms is to say that Protestants felt that the Catholic Church and its teachings had become too worldly, too human-centered, too arrogant about the church's relationship with God. Protestants wanted to cut out the middleman and bring individual Christians into a much closer relationship with God and especially with God as he could be accessed through the text of the Bible.

1. Catholic doctrines & procedures under attack: sacramental powers, indulgences, tolerance of immorality.

Catholic Church did make some amazing claims for its own powers:

Though a human organization, it claimed a monopoly on Christianity and the ability to directly confer God's grace through its rituals. In other words, priests could, by administering sacraments -- by speaking certain words, and carrying out certain actions -- literally call God into the church and command him to perform miracles: absolve sins, turn water and wine into the body and blood of Christ. Most infamous example of the Catholic Church getting too arrogant with God's power was the practice of granting "indulgences," in which the Pope transferred a portion of the excess goodness accumulated by people like Jesus, the Virgin Mary, and the saints to the accounts of sinners who paid money. Church was funding itself by selling off God's grace! (Its own priests were big customers. Many of them lived openly "in concubinage" simply by paying a fine to their bishop.) The German scholar Martin Luther launched the Reformation in 1517 by making a public attack against indulgences, and from there the criticisms quickly spread (with the help of the printing press) to all aspects of the Church.

2. Basic Protestant doctrines: free grace; *sola scriptura*; strict personal morality; opposition to most Catholic rituals & holidays & institutions.

- Free grace: Grace or salvation or absolution of sins could come only from God, not from the church, and God could not be compelled to do. The human bureaucracy called the Catholic Church was powerless, and if you paid for it to save you or forgive you, you were being ripped off.
- *Sola scriptura* : “By scripture alone”; emphasis on biblical text as the only proper guide to Christian belief and practice. If wasn’t in the Bible, it shouldn’t be in the religion. That included most of the rituals and iconography and feast days that defined Christianity for the Catholic Church and most Christians. That meant plain churches, little stained glass, no Christmas, throwing out much of the mass, most of the cults surrounding the Virgin Mary and the saints. Touch of egalitarianism: “divine right of kings” was far too presumptuous on the part of the kings.
- “Priesthood of all believers,” meaning that clergy had no special powers or status & all believers must understand Bible, Christian faith, what was going on in church. The Catholic mass was said by the priest in Latin, with his back turned to the congregation, until the 1960s. One major Protestant innovation was giving church services in the local language, and preaching sermons that were intended to arouse and persuade people. Luther translated the mass into German and that was just the beginning. Protestant emphasis on the text also led to a greater concern for educating both clergymen and the general population.
- Related to the idea that all believers could be their own priests was the Protestant call for all believers to live like men and women of God, according to a strict moral code with no church to let you off the hook.
- ?IF TIME: Institutions: Luther was a savage critic of such prominent Catholic institutions as the monastery and the convent. (Girls from respectable families that families could not afford to marry off were commonly “cloistered” in Catholic countries, often at about the age that modern girls would start kindergarten.) In Protestant countries, including England, these institutions were forcibly stripped of their property and suppressed.

3. Persistent theme: faith must be a well-informed, rational choice.

- Christianity should be about believer considering his Bible, with the guidance from the preacher and inspiration through hymns, but without the idolatrous visuals and pagan festivities.
 - a) ***Some opposed infant baptism and “universal” church membership***
 - Other implications:
 - o opposition to infant baptism

o opposition to “universal” state churches, like England’s, in which every baptized person was automatically a member

Having said this, keep in mind that there were . . .

4. There were many different varieties of Protestants, differing on the most basic questions.

including the most repressive and the most tolerant groups that came to America, with vastly different ideas about the family and marriage. The tolerant branches ended up in other colonies. The people who migrated to New England and founded Massachusetts were in the repressive category, coming from the branch of Protestantism that followed the ideas of Swiss theologian John Calvin.

a) *New England settlers were strict Calvinists and thus great believers in the stern enforcement of patriarchal authority and Christian rules upon the whole community.*

While they did not believe in theocracy, the rule of priests or clergy, Calvinists did believe that Christian patriarchs – fathers of families and the “fathers of the towns” should rule strongly over and enforce Christian rules upon not only their own families but the whole community, **including those who were not church members**. Mass. Bay colony had some democratic institutions, but only property-owning male church members could vote. Calvinists not placed great stress on original sin, and the evil of the uncontrolled human will, but also subscribed to the doctrine of election, that God had already damned the vast majority of the human race to hell, except for a small Christian elect whose duty on Earth was to hold down the hellspawn all around them in God’s name. Does this sound like people who moved to America for “religious freedom”? It shouldn’t.

B. The Protestants Who Came to New England

1. Church of England was nominally Protestant, but still too Catholic for many people.

While nominally separate from the Catholic Church and somewhat distinct in its rituals, the Church of England was really just England’s version of Catholicism, retaining most Catholic doctrine and ritual. Though everyone in England was technically Protestant, a number of large radical Protestant movements developed in England that criticized the Church of England and tried to develop alternatives. These so-called “Puritans” and other similar groups saw the Church of England as little better than the Catholic Church. It was still too full of non-Biblical practices and too closely tied to the English state with its horrible idea of the divine right of kings, and too tolerant of the spiritual, moral and political corruption that characterized England in the 17th century.

2. Two types of religious colonists: Pilgrims (Separatists) and Puritans (Non-separating Congregationalists).

The two major colonies of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay (which remained separate for most of the 17th century) were founded by 2 different branches of radical English Protestantism: the Pilgrims or Separatists and the Puritans or "Non-Separating Congregationalists." They were quite different from each other: The Separatist side emphasized personal spirituality, the need to separate oneself from worldly things, which is what the group of Separatists led by William Bradford had done when they set out to live first in Holland, and then in America.

3. The rise of Puritan political power in Parliament, the 11 Years' Tyranny, and the origins of the English Revolution (beg. 1642).

The Puritans, on the other hand, stressed the need to stay in the world and the church and strive to purify it. As one Mass. Puritan put it, Puritans wanted to put the "righteous in authority" -- not only in the Church of England, but also in society itself. The Pilgrims were mostly humble, relatively poor people who desired only to worship and live amongst themselves, while the Puritan leaders were by and large big shots: merchants, lawyers, large landowners, and the like who had converted to Puritanism in England. While desiring to serve God, they were also men of the world who wanted to see the world live according their beliefs. Enough such people had converted that Puritans were a dominant force in the English Parliament by 1629, the first year of what English historians called the 11 Years' Tyranny -- when the Stuart King Charles I, a near-Catholic and a proponent of the divine right of kings, tried ruling without Parliament. At the same time, his Archbishop of Canterbury (head of the Church of England), William Laud, cleaned Puritans and other dissenters out of the Church of England and moved it back toward traditional Catholic doctrines.

Substantial Puritan gentlemen like John Winthrop, first governor of Massachusetts Bay, faced a choice. The more radical among them elected to engineer a rebellion and seize power in England. The result was the English Revolution of roughly 1642 to 1660 and the eventual rise to power of Puritan military dictator Oliver Cromwell.

4. Summary: Separatists wanted to live & worship according to their own understanding of God's word; Puritans wanted to make everyone else do so too.

a) Common misconception: That Puritans came for religious freedom.

They wanted freedom from the interference of the Church and King of England, but what they wanted to be freed to

do was have an orderly, Godly society. Not the same thing as a free one, in our sense.

C. The "Great Migration" to New England, 1630-1641

1. John Winthrop and the Massachusetts Bay Company.

A less radical choice, made by some 80,000 Puritans before 1642 was to leave the country -- this was option favored by the conservative Puritan gentlemen who formed the Massachusetts Bay Company (successor to the Virginia Company of Plymouth which had granted the land to the Pilgrims) in 1629. They elected wealthy attorney, officeholder and landholder John Winthrop as their governor -- Winthrop signalled this company's different purpose by taking the unusual step of moving the headquarters of the company (along with its charter) to the actual colony -- there would be no absentee management or crowd of impatient absentee stockholders such as hampered Virginia and other colonies started by joint-stock companies.

Winthrop and 1,000 other men, women and children reached the Boston area in 1630, beginning a "Great Migration" that would bring 20,000 more people by the time the Great Migration ended. BEGIN HERE 9/26/06

2. The communal, family-oriented structure of the Puritan migration.

Proportionally, this was the largest organized migration in American history. 17 ships, with 100 people apiece, arrived in 1630 alone, 21,000 over the whole decade of the 1630s. The original migration occurred in family groups. Approximately 3/4 or perhaps even more of the original migrants came over in complete nuclear families, the highest level in American history. This was not a crowd of unattached young adventurers like the first Virginians. More than 90 per cent of the immigrants to Massachusetts Bay were either mature men and women over 25 or children under 16. It was a family kind of migration, with patriarchs taking their little patriarchies with them. They were moreover, by and large middle class families -- prosperous artisans and yeoman farmers on the low end to merchants and professionals on the high end, as opposed to the stratified pattern of the southern migration (gentry on one hand, indentured servants on the other). These people immediately created regular governments and community institutions such as churches, courts and schools.

a) Tight, regimented, & very English settlement patterns.

The Puritan families settled in tightly-packed towns like those in East Anglia, the densely populated section of England where most of them had moved from. Land was centrally distributed, generally according to a ranking

drawn up by a land committee. Though most people farmed, they lived (initially) in houses ringed around a town green with a church, a school, stocks and a pillory all adjacent or nearby. [Show maps & New Haven] There was a common grazing pasture behind the settlement for livestock. A 1635 law forbid anyone from building a house more than 1/2 mile from the church without the express permission of the colonial legislature.

b) *Westward movement by town, not family.*

One thing New England had in common with other English settlements was aggressive westward expansion, particularly from Massachusetts Bay. Over the rest of the 17th century, Massachusetts expanded far to the west and south and north, planting several new colonies in present-day Connecticut, absorbing the Separatist colony of Plymouth, laying claim to what is now Maine, and sending it exiles to another new colony, Rhode Island. Unlike VA where planters moved rapidly up the rivers and into the woods, westward expansion in Massachusetts was methodical and communal. Individuals did not move into open land. Whole neighborhoods of people moved together to form whole new towns, and did so according to the standard procedures, getting permission from the colony & the town they were leaving.

3. English Civil War (or English Revolution) brought sudden end of the migration, lack of further immigration, and resulting lack of diversity in New England society.

Great Migration abruptly shut off in 1643, when Puritans stopped leaving England because they were now in command at home. Pretty soon King Charles I would be dead and Puritan general Oliver Cromwell would be dictator. Some Puritans even went back. This was the last significant migration that New England would see for another century, leaving this by far the most ethnically and religiously homogeneous region of the colonies. N.E. became a very conservative place where differences were looked on with great suspicion.

III. New England and the Indians

We can see some of this in action when we turn to the New England settlers relations with the Indians.

A. *Settling the “waste land” of New England*

1. Pre-colonization epidemics and Puritans’ “errand into the wilderness” (mission from God), sense of their colony as “city on a hill” (test case).

Both the Separatist Pilgrims who came to Plymouth in 1620 and the Puritans who set up Massachusetts Bay later on were, you

might say, extremely religious people. They saw themselves as part of test case in of whether humans could really living according to God's commandments or not. This was what the Mass. Bay colony's leader John Winthrop meant when he referred in his speech on board the ship to Massachusetts as a "city on a hill." Every success or failure was seen as God's doing, as God vindicating or condemning the godliness of the Puritans and New England. Their idea of themselves a chosen people on an "errand into the wilderness" for God was reinforced by the fact that God had seemingly cleared out New England just for them. Just before Puritan migration, European diseases brought over by fishermen had wiped out some 80% of the coastal Indians. Pilgrims and Puritans found abandoned villages, piles of bones, and mass graves, and concluded that it was God's will that they have this land.

The English settlers simply set up camp on sites that the Indians had cleared for their villages, and took over their fields as well. According to their way of understanding things, ownership wasn't even an issue, on several counts. Remember John Cotton's sermon about the vacuum domicilium. Here that seemed to be a literal description of the landscape. ~~Besides the lack of people, they could see nothing around that seemed properly occupied — no housing that looked permanent, no proper clearings, no rows of crops with men working in the field. None of the sort of markers that indicated ownership to the English.~~

Of course there were Indians around, as we will see here the Pilgrims might not have survived long without them:

2. Tisquantum (Squanto), Massassoit, & the long Plymouth alliance with the Wampanoags.

[500 Nations, "Invasion" on Pilgrims]

Such a long peace was very surprising and possibly not a good idea for Indians. The best explanation is that for much of Massassoit's life, it seemed like a good deal in terms of Indian politics.

Plymouth's help made the Wampanoags stronger vis-à-vis other Indians.

3. Basic incompatibility of Pilgrim/Puritan settlement patterns: density, towns, family farms, fences, livestock, private property & institutions to protect it.

Remember that even though the New England colonies were also founded by joint-stock companies, these colonies were not primarily business ventures like Virginia. Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth were started for religious and ideological reasons, with the express purpose of transferring families.

[Summarize the problem this posed for Indians.]

Indians ways of subsisting were destroyed & multiple ways to get in trouble were created. Livestock were a particular problem. Indians did not keep any work or food animals until after whites came. They also did not fence their fields. The pigs and cows (especially pigs) that whites kept were often allowed to roam relatively free. Pigs loved the dense Indian corn, bean, & squash fields, but woe betide any Indian who tried to retaliate for this threat to their food supply by killing English livestock.

B. *The Indians under New England rule*

1. Mission to Indians as an unfulfilled goal of Mass. Bay colony: colonial/state seal.

→Official Puritan policy was to convert the Indians to Christianity. As with the Spanish and French, this was part of their stated justification for colonizing the New World. The original Massachusetts seal has an Indian with a word balloon coming from his mouth saying “Come over here and help us.” Note that he appears to be a nearly naked hunter, in contrast to the fact that they all knew that the local Indians were farmers. Somewhat surprisingly for such a deeply Christian set of colonies, relatively little was done, much less than the hated Catholics of Spain and France did.

2. John Eliot and the “praying towns.”

One of the handful of exceptions was a minister called John Eliot who translated the Bible into an Indian language and established so-called “praying towns” of Christian Indians. (In effect the 1st reservations.) R.I. founder Roger Williams also did some good work in this area, and allowed some Indians to take refuge in his colony later. Praying Indians were ironically seen with great suspicion by many New Englanders, and they were often the first to be accused or to get hurt when trouble broke out between the whites and the Indians.

3. What Happened to Indians Who Got in the Way: The Pequot War, 1634.

→So mission was never a real priority in Mass. or Plymouth. The dominant attitude was that the “barbarous” Indians, “infidels,” and “wretches” were basically devil worshippers put in America to test whether the Puritans were tough enough to do God’s will. So they were more than willing just to slaughter Indians who got in their way. In 1636, a group of Puritans from Massachusetts moved west to found Connecticut, which they found dominated by the Pequots, one of the few New England Indian tribes that was still strong enough to resist the English. (Pequots were also enemies of Plymouth’s allies the Wampanoags.) After the Pequots attacked the town of Wethersfield in present Connecticut, the Puritans brought in reinforcements from Massachusetts, marched an army to the main Pequot town (a fort, the English called it), surrounded it, and

killed anything that moved. Some 400 Indians, mostly women and children, died in this so-called “Pequot War.” Notice the terminology. When Indians raided European settlements or successfully ambushed some European troops, it was called a massacre, a terrible, barbaric crime but when Europeans did the same or worse to an Indian settlement, it was a “war” or a “battle,” totally justified and fully moral as Europeans saw it.

C. *The End of the Pilgrim-Indian Alliance: King Philip’s War, 1675-78.*

Friendly relations between New England colonists and Indians lasted for 50 more years, even though Indian economy was destroyed by the numbers of English farmers who came, blocking hunting grounds, shooting up game, and letting their livestock ruin Indian fields. Eventually, the alliance fell apart, and then some, as New Englanders showed that they could easily match the Virginians in terms of hating the Indians.

Long delayed white-Indian war for New England occurred in the form of what the Puritans and Pilgrims called “King Philip’s War,” an Indian rebellion from 1675 to 1678 that almost destroyed the New England colonies in the late 17th-century. [Show clip here: disclaim reference to Indian laws and sovereignty, and mention that King Philip was also known as Metacom or Metamora. Or just mention that this is extensively covered in the textbook.]

[SKIP IF VIDEO SHOWN: Whole towns were wiped out, thousands of people were displaced, 100s killed or carried off into captivity. The rebellion led by Massasoit's son, Metacom or King Philip. Once he was finally killed, the Pilgrims’ less gentle and friendly descendants kept his head on display in Plymouth for years after.]

1. The Salem witchcraft crisis as a side effect of King Philip’s War.

Puritan ministers gave sermon after sermon in which the Indians’ success in this war interpreted as God allowing the devil to punish New England for failing in its mission to be an example for the world. That sense of the Indian war as the devil’s work – many Puritans considered Indian religion to be devil worship – also contributed heavily to the crisis that followed the war in New England a few years later in 1692: the Salem witchcraft scare. Many of the families affected had suffered in the war, and some of the girl’s visions used Indian-like imagery.

2. KPW & American Popular Culture

a) *Indian captivity narratives and the origins of the western and the action thriller*

KPW is not well known now outside of New England but was very influential in development of certain Indian and frontier-related aspects of American popular culture. Violent stories of the struggle for life on the American

frontier, the beginnings of our westerns and their descendants, the action thriller, first became popular in the form of published tales of Puritans in captivity, beginning with the often reprinted tale of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson, a minister's wife from Lancaster, Mass who was taken along with her 3 children and held for 3 months. [Show screen] A highly devout woman, she did not become one of Axtell's white Indians. Note how over the years the focus of interest in Rowlandson's tale and other captivity narratives shifted from religion to violence. This was the general trend of this type of story. The 1773 edition shows Mary blasting away at the attacking Indians with a big gun, a scene that does not appear in the book. Her more vital survival skill in the actual narrative is sewing rather than gunplay.

b) *Metamora and the myth of the noble savage*

A very different story that came out of KPW was the 1829 play by John Augustus Stone, *Metamora, or the Last of the Wampanoags*. Actor Edwin Forrest made *Metamora* (another name for King Philip) his most famous role, and the play one for most popular of the 19th century. In this story, the Indian leader was a tragic hero rather than the villain, the doomed defender of his people. The play helped popularize the view of the Indians as noble savages that city audiences could shed a tear for now that they were no longer threat.

[TITLE LEFT OFF: A little cultural cannibalism, anyone?] Note that both the captivity narrative and the tragic Indian hero have the effect of making whites look good. The Indians were here to challenge and improve Europeans, the stories seemed to say. Mary Rowlandson's story was promoted as a demonstration of the power of faith to overcome the dangers and temptations of the New World. It was originally titled *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*. The doomed noble savage may have been sad, but audiences were invited to identify his nobility with that of America itself. The noble savage image also said, look at impressive foes we defeated to take over this continent. We must be awfully impressive and deserving ourselves to have beaten them. It was a version of the old primal tradition of consuming or collecting an opponent's heart or head or other body parts after defeating him in battle. By eating your enemy, you got to take his power and bravery for yourself. To me some sort of figurative cultural cannibalism like this explains the paradox of Indian hating, Indian fighting American settlers immediately turning around and naming their town or county after some Indian

tribe or great chief: Pontiac, Tecumseh, Osceola, and many others, and later for dressing up or otherwise pretending to be Indians, as in the Boy Scouts, Indian Guides, Campfire Girls, etc. Americans got to kill their Indians and eat them too, you might say.

But enough modern pop culture, much as I love it. While I think the way that the colonies dealt with the Indians says a lot, we do need to deal some with New England culture itself.

IV. Life and “Liberty” in the Massachusetts Bay Colony

A. Additional social and economic contrasts with Virginia

1. Diversified economy.

There were no vast riches to be made in New England, no one cash crop, so a diversified economy had to be developed. Most engaged in diversified agriculture, small farms growing a variety of crops and raising animals, focused mostly on the production of food.

There was commercial farming in most places, but only to a very limited degree. In the interior regions especially, most New England farmers managed only to feed themselves. This was due partly to New England's inhospitable climate and topography: short growing seasons, poor & rocky soil, craggy, hilly terrain. Thus New England had to be creative economically. The first major industry was supplying newcomers (including colonists in South), but they also developed fishing, food and wood exports to the West Indies, a shipping industry, and a liquor industry that made rum from West Indies sugar. When the first American factories were built in New England generations later, a long tradition was being carried on.

**SPOKEN LECTURE WILL MOST LIKELY CUT OFF
HERE, IF NOT EARLIER**

B. Sovereignty of the Saints: Governing Massachusetts Bay

1. Aspects of English Puritanism as practiced in Massachusetts: Congregationalism, limited church membership (by examination only), and “visible saints.”

English Puritans who came over to Massachusetts placed special emphasis on a new way of organizing churches called “Congregationalism.” Congregationalism meant doing away most of the church bureaucracy of bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and such, and reorganizing religion around individual congregations (groups of believers who worshipped together) that would choose their own ministers. In New England, there was no central church hierarchy beyond a regional minister’s association – quite different from the Church of England which was actually part of the English government.

In the Congregational churches of Massachusetts Bay, a candidate for church membership had to go before a board of church elders

and be rigorously examined on three points: they had to prove their understanding and belief in Protestant doctrines, that they had achieved a godly life in all respects, and most difficult of all, that they had had some definite and demonstrable experience of conversion, of having been chosen as one of God's elect. Once this was demonstrated, the person became special and even privileged, a visible saint whose example and commands should be followed because you were pretty sure they were one of God's chosen.

2. "Established" (tax-supported) churches, membership in which defined political rights.

The major method by which they hoped to create their model society was by vesting power only in what they called the "saints" -- meaning those who had proven that they lived godly lives, held correct beliefs, and had received God's grace by becoming church members. Voting was limited to church members. Only the godly would have a say in ordering this "new" England, but everyone would have to obey the godly's commands.

Puritan churches were supported by taxes which even non-Puritans were required to pay. (All the colonies originally had some form of tax-supported church, known as the "established church." The established church in the South was the Church of England, sometimes known then as the Anglican Church, now called the Episcopal Church).

In early Connecticut, any other form of worship, even Christian worship, was actually illegal.

3. For white male church members, more political rights than in England: General Court, town meetings.

Possible to establish because Mass. was an independently chartered colony.

4. "The fathers of the towns" firmly in control

In reality, the real authority in Mass. Bay was limited to even narrower group, a tightly-knit oligarchy of ministers and officials nearly all of whom hailed from East Anglia in England and nearly all of whom were educated at Cambridge University in England and at Harvard College in the later generations. These people's children married each other, and handed down power and influence almost by heredity. While there was no nobility like in Europe, early was not a particularly open or equal or democratic society. Power and prestige was heavily concentrated in the hands of the few patriarchs whose families dominated local life, the "fathers of the towns" as the phrase went.

5. Influential role of ministers

The role of ministers may require some clarification. Technically they were less involved in worldly affairs than Anglican or Catholic priests. They were not allowed to hold office. They were

also not part of any organized hierarchy. Each church controlled its own affairs, and selected its own minister.

But ministers had very great influence -- usually he was the most influential man in town -- through their dominance of public opinion. Sermons were one of the few forms of entertainment or literature available, and ministers did not hesitate to give political directions, especially in yearly election sermons. The civil authorities likewise did not hesitate to legislate in religious matters. The ministers were consulted on everything, and all public events were understood in religious terms. Every session of the colonial legislature began with an "election sermon" in which a minister explained God's feelings about the present state of public affairs. When a stranger asked the minister in Andover, Mass. whether he was the minister who served there, the divine replied no, he was the minister who *ruled* there.

It was all part of a total system that expressed in which social hierarchy, obedience to patriarchal authority, and religious orthodoxy all reinforced each other. Here is how historian Richard Bushman described it, writing of Connecticut:

In nearly every dimension of life --- family, church, social hierarchy and religion --- [people] encountered unanimous reinforcement of governing authority. The total impact was immense, because each institution was an integral part of a monolithic whole. . . . The preacher's exhortation to submit to domestic government reinforced the father's dominion in his family. Church discipline added terrors censures were delivered before the neighbors and the town's most prominent families, and the assignment of pews in the meetinghouse according to social rank reminded everyone of the distinctions among individuals and of the deference due superiors.

6. Puritan "liberty" and the Puritan belief in government regulation of personal behavior.

The Puritan idea of "liberty" was different from ours. It was freedom from sin, and freedom to structure society according to God's laws, as their particular brand of Calvinism defined God's laws. Liberty was the freedom to do God's will, not to do anything one wanted. Moreover liberty was fundamentally a collective concept. In no way did liberty mean the freedom to follow one's natural interests and inclinations at will. Even more than other European religions, the Puritans held those things to be inherently depraved. Liberty also meant ordered liberty, a society that lived as God's family, an organic unit in which everyone fulfilled their role and everything kept to its ordained place and purpose. With this philosophy, the Puritan authorities certainly did not hesitate to regulate anything and everything, from where people lived to how much merchants charged their customers to how

children were raised to the private sexual practices and political and religious opinions of individual citizens. Keeping the Sabbath was the law of the land, as according to what came later to be called "blue laws," it was illegal to work or amuse yourself or be anywhere but home or in church on Sunday. In Connecticut, the government was charged with guarding the colony against "invasions of Atheism, Heresy, and Profaneness."

What Puritan government aimed especially to do was preserve order, not just public order, but also religious, moral and social order. Thus a servant who killed a master could be burned alive and a rebellious son who killed a father could be hung. Thus they were particularly harsh on suspected sexual deviants, people who seemed to be transgressing the most fundamental orders in nature, often without much evidence or on what we would regard as mystical evidence. They once executed a one-eyed mentally handicapped man because a one-eyed piglet was born.

7. Persecution of religious dissent: Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson.

Their persecution of divergent religious opinions is infamous, as in the cases of Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson, which you should know from the textbook.

Both Williams and Hutchinson got in trouble for taking certain Protestant beliefs further than the Puritan authorities wanted them to. Roger Williams, a minister at Salem, was banished in 1635 for advocating a greater separation of church and state. He thought that the church taxes and religious regulation of the colonial government made even the Mass. Bay government itself too worldly. Williams was really just extending the Protestant criticism of too worldly and too bureaucratized churches, but the authorities felt he had crossed the line.

Anne Hutchinson got in trouble for taking the Protestant doctrine of free grace, or salvation by grace alone, too far -- she thought Puritan government and churches placed too much emphasis on enforcing moral standards and other good works -- Hutchinson was also seen as suspicious because she, a woman, had gathered around her a number of followers, and was becoming a kind of minister herself. That was taking the "priesthood of all believers" too far. The Puritan magistrates cross-examined her for hours until, under pressure, she admitted to believing that she had had personal revelations from God. This was a heresy and they banished her in 1638. Both she and Williams went south to what is now Rhode Island, which became the first really open and tolerant society in North America -- it became an official colony in 1644.

8. Harshness of Puritan penalties.

When the Puritans set out to regulate they meant business, they were not afraid of harsh penalties. Adultery, sodomy, bestiality,

blasphemy, idolatry, and of course witchcraft were capital crimes in Massachusetts. Hanging was usual method but sometimes worse, such as Giles Corey, the accused Salem witch who was pressed to death with stones. Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson were lucky to just be banished from the colony. Less lucky dissenters (such as Catholics and especially the Quakers, another radical Protestant group that we will talk about later) were sometimes executed, sometimes whipped, and sometimes disfigured (nostrils slit, ears cut off, an "H" for heresy burned into their faces.) Those penalties also were used against other convicts, including political dissenters. Prisoners were treated harshly, confined in desert islands, holes in the ground, or abandoned mineshafts. Shame also used heavily, in form of stocks, or the wearing of a letter with the initial of your crime.

C. Upsides of Puritan tradition: education, community, institution building and socially responsible, activist government.

Now that you are all suitably horrified, we need to point out that there were many upsides to the Puritans' harsh, control-freak philosophy. They established a tradition of activist government that helped people and society as much as it oppressed them. If Puritan governments harshly regulated their subjects' morality and religious beliefs, the commitment to morality and community order led them to provide for the poor as few governments of the time did. The emphasis of their religion on Bible reading caused them to establish free schools and made New England one of the most widely literate societies in the world. (Modern public school movement starts in Massachusetts in the early 19th century, following in this same tradition.) Massachusetts Bay also led the way in higher education, founding Harvard College to train ministers in 1636, only six years after the founding of the colony. This would help explain why there are more than 50 colleges and universities in the Boston metro area even today. Same goes for just about any other kind of cultural institution or social service you can think, from libraries to hospitals. Generally these things started in New England.

Tax rates were high to pay for the many community institutions (including the churches), but people also regarded paying taxes as a moral and social obligation and paid with little complaint. The Puritans' harsh criminal code and rigorous childhood discipline resulted in the lowest violent crime rate in the colonies, much lower than in the South, a tradition that continues today. While perhaps not really government by the saints, New England leaders were more willing than their counterparts in other American regions to take issues of public morality and social justice seriously. New England gave America whatever tradition of big government it may have, but it also gave us whatever tradition we have of responsible government, of governments that actually cared about the type of society was developing under their watch. Whether you agreed with them or not, there

was no doubt that New England government was about something other than keeping the powerful in power and protecting the financial interests of the major interest groups. One area where there was not much in common was in New England's dealings with the Indians, which unfortunately we will not have much time to get into.