UNIVERSITE D'ABOMEY-CALAVI
(UAC)
--*-*-*-*-*-*

FACULTEDES LETTRES, ARTS ET SCIENCES HUMAINES (FLASH)
--*-*-*-*-*
ECOLE DOCTORALE PLURIDISCIPLINAIRE (E.D.P.)
-*-*-*-*-*-*

« ESPACE, CULTURES ET DEVELOPPEMENT »

Filière :Etudes Anglophones Sous-Filière: Etudes Britanniques

MEMOIRE DE DIPLOME D'ETUDES APPROFONDIES (D.E.A.)

Thème:

THE ROLE OF GREAT BRITAIN IN THE BIRTH OF THE U.S.A: IMPACTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Présenté et soutenu par:

Olivier Orérien ABODOHOUI

Sous la direction de:

Taofiki KOUMAKPAÏ

Professeur Titulaire(CAMES) de Littérature et de Civilisation Britanniques

Année Académique 2013-2014

Table of contents

Dedication

To the memory of my late father ABODOHOUI Jean-Baptiste.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to:

- Professor Taofiki KOUMAKPAÏ my Godfather for his great assistance,
- all the lecturers of the English Department who have contributed to my academic progress,
- my mother GOUGLA Justine,
- my sisters Jocelyne, Malthilde, Edith, Léonie, Fidèle and my brothers Bénoît and Achille,
- my wife Florentine KEKE.

I am highly grateful to what you have sacrificed to help me during the process of this research work.

INTRODUCTION

Prior to 1650, many Englishmen immigrated to the New World, specifically to the North American to form the very first “colonies”. These immigrants fled from a society that they found to be displeasing in many specific ways. Although economic and political values led many of the English migration to the New World, religious tumult in England was undoubtedly the main cause for the immigration.

In the early eighteenth ($18^{th)}$century), most of the European colonial powers were confronted with agitations and reforms at home. But those reforms, instead of being at their best interest, turn out to be their foes. Britain was the place where the tumults reached a certain climax making many people to find refuge in a “New World”. Thus thirteen (13) British colonies found refuge in today’s America that was then known as the “New World”. Later on, they will become strong enough to cut off all the ties which still bound them their mother land and proclaim their independence in July 4th 1776. After 7 years of war, the young republic came up with the domination of the powerful Great Britain. From 1776 to 1789, it organized itself within the states, then at the federal level. The American example influenced the European revolutions in the 18^{th} century and also the 20 century’s movement of independence.

My work will be focused on the impactsand implications of Great Britain on the birth of the U.S.A. It will display the contributions of Britain in the birth of the early America.Moreover, light will be shed on the way the newly settled colonies managed to gain their independence from Great Britain.

Generally speaking, the colonial economy had changed in the 16^{th} century. Vegetable resources took many European countries to the Caribbean Latin America and to the Southern and Northern America. This general change was followed by a great immigration, of Whites who were heads of farming

exploitations and Blacks taken from the African continent. The most important colonial power in America was England.

My research work will consist in laying down what happened. The study will be carried out using a demonstrative and illustrative methodology. The nature of the study is a thematic analysis of the impact of Great Britain on the birth of the American States. The 13 British colonies, strung out along the eastern seaboard of what is now the United States, declared their independence from England in 1776. A year before, a war had broken out between the colonies and Great Britain, a war for independence that lasted six bitter years. While still at war, the colonies- calling themselves United States of America – drafted a contact which bound them together as a nation. The contact, known as the *"Articles of confederation and Perpetual Union,"*was adopted by a Congress of the states in 1777, and formally signed in July 1778. The Articles became binding when they were ratified by the 13th state Maryland, in March 1781.

However, they finally stated creating a new people without realizing it: the American people because of the British policy which was composed of excessive taxes and unpopular laws. The British policy at home led their people to depart but still attached to homeland. But one way or the other,the British foreign policy has againgreatly played a key role, in the independence of the American colonies and in the birth of a new country: The United States of American (USA).

PART I

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY,LITERATURE REVIEWAND METHODOLOGY

Chapter one: Literature Review and Methodology

1.1- Literature Review

Many are the writers who, through their works, greatly contribute to the understanding of what has happened between the British at homeland and the one at the New England who will later become known as American. Contemporary American writers, have also dealt with the question. Impacts of British colonial influence have always been of interest to many writers and critics. I have selected some of their documents in the process of my research.

Anne Sharp Wells' *The American Colonies, 1584-1688: A Selective Guide To Materials In The British Library* is a step by step scrutiny and analysis of all the colonies that landed in the New World. The book written in comprehensive and accessible English is presented like a study guide of every details concerning the colonies in the New England.

Gregory Clark, Kevin H. O'Rourke, and Alan M. Taylor *Made in America? The New World, the Old, and the Industrial Revolution* is a review of the impact the British slave trade with their former colonies has in the process of building a strong nation. It shows how agriculture has change the life of the colonies give them hope and ultimately power.

Blackstone, Sir William in *Commentaries on the Laws of England, published by* Oxford: Clarendon Press in 1765 makes a description of the British parliament as a decision making camera.

K. M. Brown and R. J. Tanner, presents an account of *The History of the Scottish Parliament under the title* Parliament and Politics, from 1235 to 1560, published in Edinburgh in 2004

As for Davies, M. in 2003, he wrote the 19th ed. of *Companion to the Standing Orders and guide to the Proceedings of the House of Lords*,.Farnborough, Thomas Erskine, 1st Baron. (1896). *Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George the Third,* 11th ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

In "Parliament," published in 1911 in Encyclopædia *Britannica*, (11th ed. London: Cambridge University Press.) In this book there are detailed information on the problem between the Parliament and the King James I and King Henry VIII. It puts an emphasis on the problems which led to the tumults sending many British to the New World.

With the help of the above mentioned books, my research work will be focused on the colonies from their departure to their arrival and atfterwards.

1.2- Methodology

Any research work needs to follow a well defined process and this one is no exception.

Findingreliableandvalidsourcesofinformation on this topic is a challenge I have to overcome in the first place. The search for the information is conducted through key words on the available platform, the World Wide Web (W.W.W.). The challenge of citing resources from the World Wide Web is that I have to check for the credibility of the information found and then analyze it.

Among the several methodologies that exist, I have used documentary research by collecting and analyzing data.

Chapter Two:Background to the Study

Up to the 18th century England possessed the biggest colonial territory in the world in terms of inhabitants. The island of Bermuda, Bahamas and Barbados, producers of Tobacco, sugar cane belongs to England. She was also present in Africa, Asia and in north America. Among all those territories the 13north American colonies were the most important. 2,5millions British were living there. Between the Appalachs chains and the Atlantic Ocean did 13 English colonies (12 before 1732) constitute a basic power for expansion to the West coast? These 13 territories were established conditions. The oldest was Virginia 1607 created for a trade purpose, the second Massachusetts in 1620 for the presented Puritans and the first situation. The latest Georgia was created under the ruling of Georgia II by a "philanthropic club; we can distinguish 3 groups:

- ✓ in the north 4: Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island;
- ✓ in the south 5: Virginia, Maryland, north Carolina, south Carolina and Georgia;
- ✓ in the middle 4: new Jersey, New York, Delaware and Pennsylvania.

The colonies increased the numbers of inhabitants rapidly in 1763 by a great number of European emigrants attracted by the land which was easy to find not expensive compared to the high salaries of workers. Only few came from England, most came from Ulster.

These colonies were different. Independent from each other, there was no relationships between them. There were taxes to pay to go from one colony to the other and they were separated mostly by board communications and distances .8 of them were directly related to the British Crown, some were

owners colonies and some others charter colonies. But if they can enjoy the same political liberties as English, it wasn't the case in trade. They have no right to create industries and were a personal market of the colonial power.

The great diversity of the new American people was an obstacle to unity. They were of widely differing origins, beliefs and interests. Most had come from England, but Sweden, Norway, France, Holland, Prussia, Poland and many other countries also sent immigrants to the New World. Their religious beliefs were varied and in most cases strongly held. There were Anglicans, Roman, Catholics; Calvininists, Huguenots, Lutherans, Quakers, Jews, agnostics and atheteists. Economically and socially from landed aristocracy to slaves from Africa and indentured servants working for debts. But the backbone of the country was the middle class – farmers, tradesmen, mechanics, sailors, shipwrights, weavers, carpenters and a host of others.

Even though they were disconnected in terms of communications, they have features that can unite them against the English government. All of them have representative regime. All have members of parliaments that vote laws. In most places only high rank with recognized religious forth were allowed to vote. There were only 8 to 9 % electors, sometimes less (2% in Massachusetts and Connecticut). All the colonies have a council in charge of the vote and a governor to execute the laws.

Generally there was a conflict in the political power. In Connecticut and Rhode Island, those who do not have the vote right were unhappy. In Maryland and Pennsylvania, there was a struggle against the council governor. And in the 8 royal colonies there was a misunderstanding between the governor and the king. All this unhappiness will be increased by the British foreign policy.

PART II

AN IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS INTO EARLY AMERICAN COLONIES

Chapter Three: From British immigrants to American settlers

3.1. Reasons behind British immigration

James I, who believed in the divine right of kings, thought he was allowed to disobey Parliament because he answered to no one but God. He started a conflict with Parliament that gained momentum under Charles I's reign. This conflict finally sparked a civil war lasting seven years, during which time the government unsympathetically persecuted its citizens, driving many of them out of the country.

Furthermore, England's unstable economy and inflation led to much poverty. The demand for a certain raw material like wool could put many slaves out of a job if the landowner suddenly decided it was more profitable to raise sheep; thus requiring only a small fraction of the work force. Inflation also made life hard for the poorer people, who found they could no longer pay for basic necessities.

People saw that moving to the North American Colonies was a great money-making opportunity. Growing sugar on islands off the North American coast was so profitable that one man’s capital may have spilled over to a relative who lived generations later. People were also quite excited about the idea of Capitalism, the economic system in which one makes even more money by investing his capital in a growing business, for example. Finally, people saw that the vast fields in the New World would yield much produce, and that moving to the Colonies was an opportunity too good to pass up.

Religious conflicts, however, was the main factor contributing to the English migration to New England. The Catholic Church had become too intense on individuals and their everyday life, and Protestantism seemed to be the best alternative for many people. Also, King Henry VIII had established the

Anglican Church, which he strongly enforced upon the Englishmen. Protestants and Catholics in this society were shunned by their neighbors, fined by the government, and even sent to jail. The English nation was in a state of religious turmoil with no religion to unify its citizens.

In addition, religious warfare had become extremely gory, and the amount of bloodshed was immense, simply because of each side's belief that any killing of the enemy was good since God was on their side. People did not know where to turn, and began looking toward the North American Colonies. Certain Protestants, however, took the Reformation a step further and tried to simplify or "purify" the Anglican Church, since they believed that even Anglicanism was not as much a reform from Catholicism as they wanted. These Protestants were called Puritans, and they believed that they did not need priests, Anglicanism, or its Church, but that they, alone, could talk to God. Such a feeling was common to all the Protestants, so they decided that they would attempt to create a Protestant nation in North America. Since they knew that changing the ways and customs of an existing society would be far too difficult, they left England and headed straight toward the New World.

Some of the Puritans even believed in typology; that their life was a repetition of the Bible, and that they were compared to the ancient Hebrews, who fled from Egypt only to wander in the desert for forty years before entering the Promised Land. They believed that while they temporarily settled in the Colonies, England would be destroyed, and that they, the "saving remnants", as they called themselves, would later return and resettle it as the Promised Land. After a couple of generations with no word of Europe's long awaited destruction, though, the colonists decided that they would create a permanent settlement in the New World, since perhaps this was the promised land.

Many people from England fled to the New World during the late 1500s and early 1600s. Their country was in a state of economic, political, and

religious tumult, and they saw great potential in the New World. They were displeased with the Catholic Church and all of England, so they came to the Colonies to start anew, and create what was, in their eyes, the perfect society.

Of all the reasons, there were two major catalysts for English immigration: economic and religious reasons. The Jamestown settlement, established by the Virginia joint-stock company settled in America for financial improvement. As the major difference to later established colonies, Jamestown was a stock-holder proprietary colony, whereas the other colonies were established out of religious reasons. A lot of English people became stockholders, supplying the company with money, and hoped for return of gold and goods such as citrus fruits, wine, oil, tar and pitch. But all these hopes ultimately never came true. Others came with the hope of finding a passage to India for trade improvement. But soon, after about a year of starvation, in which more than eighty percent of the immigrants died, the Virginia-Company was still waiting for profit. They sent another 3750 persons to the colony to supply the remaining 700 there, in hope of finding profit. Many were persuaded by the propaganda of the Virginia Company, which painted Virginia as a land of “milk and honey.” For example a pamphlet entitled “A Plaine Pathway to Plantations”, Richard Eburnes tried to persuade settlers by telling them, they would get land and promised that with time Jamestown will “be advanced of preferment and government.” Therefore, Virginia was established by the Virginia-joint stock company and became the first proprietary colony.

Maryland, established by Cecilius Calvert, was the only colony established as a refuge for English Catholics, even if there were other religious refuges established, too. Cecilius father, George Calvert, had tried before “to settle in Virginia with some Catholic followers but he was soon expelled. Most

Virginians were Protestants and did not accept Catholics in their society"[1]. As England was dominated by the Anglican Church, the Catholics felt oppressed and searched for lands where they could establish a "heaven for English Catholics."[2]In 1632, Cecilius Calvert received a royal charter from Charles I. When Calvert sailed to America, he took English Catholics and their Protestant servants with him. He gave religious freedom to every "*Christian, but discreetly warned the Catholics, not to lose their political power*".[3] Nevertheless, Catholics were always the minority in Maryland and in 1640; they lost their political control to the Protestants. Calvert was forced to appoint the Protestant William Stone as governor. Five years later, after the repudiated Toleration Act, Catholicism was outlawed, which led to juxtaposition to the original aims of establishing Maryland. Finally, by the end of the seventeenth century, the English King gained control over the colony and established the Anglican Church as the colony's main church, as a difference to other colonies, which never accepted the Anglican Church as main church.

In 1620, the Plymouth colony was established by Puritans, English Separatists, who refused to accept the Anglican Church as a true Church and opposed government influence in church affairs. In about 1606 they gathered as an independent congregation, which was declared illegal by the Anglican Church and they were imprisoned. Afterwards, in 1609 this small group immigrated to the Netherlands, but failed financially and decided to immigrate to America. In 1620, they started with their ship *Mayflower* and on November 9, 1620 landed at Cape Cod, establishing the Plymouth colony.10 At the end of the

[1]Hanft, Sheldon. "English Americans." Rudolph J. Vecoli, Anna Sheets and Robyn V. Young ed. *Gale Encyclopedia of Multicultural America – Volume 1*. Detroit, MI: Gale

[2]Murphy, Andrew R. "Puritans and other Religious Dissenters." James Ciment, ed. *Encyclopedia of American Immigration 1*. Armonk, NY: Sharpe Reference, 2001, 18-24

[3]Daniels, Roger. *Coming to America. A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 2002.

seventeenth century, Plymouth colony was finally absorbed by the analogous growing colony of Massachusetts. The colony had also been established by Puritans but they differed in their views from the Plymouth-Puritans. The Puritans in Massachusetts wanted to establish a more biblical community than what existed in England, but never called for a formal separation from the Church of England, such as the Puritans in Plymouth did. Furthermore, they insisted on a reformed, national and congregational church structure. Most of the immigrants wanted to leave elaborate hierarchies as well as ruling bishops behind but they stayed loyal to the Church of England. Hence, Puritans came to Massachusetts not in search of religious liberty but to find a place where they could live their godly lives in both aspects: individually and collectively. As many settlers believed that England had provoked God's wrath, they started to believe that God wanted them to establish their new colony. Thomas Hooker's letter represented the thought of many immigrants: "*As sure as God is God, God is going away from England … God begins to ship away his Noahs … and God makes account that New England shall be a refuge for his Noahs and his Lots, a rock a shelter for his righteous ones to run unto*." Obviously, he saw the Puritans as the "Noahs," who had to go away from England to America for religious purity and refuge. Another proof for this view is stated in John Winthrop's famous article "A Model of Christian Charity." John Winthrop, who later became the first Governor of Massachusetts, wrote this article on board of his ship *Arbella*: "For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill, the eyes of all people are upon us." Later on, he wrote: "Therefore let us choose between life, that we, and our seed, may live, and obeying His [God's] voice, and cleaving to Him, for He is our life and prosperity,"[4] which ultimately referred to the thought of many people that Massachusetts was given to them by God and it was their strong belief that they were guided by God. On the whole, Massachusetts was also established by Puritans, who did not want to separate

[4] John Winthrop. "A Model of Christian Charity," http://washington.uwc.edu/about/faculty/huehner_d/his101/winthrop.html. Accessed 30 October, 2005.

from the Anglican Church but to free themselves from the corruptions in England and to establish a better society.

With King Charles II on the throne, after the restoration, the Anglican Church was re-established. Most religious dissenters faced difficult situations. The King made attempts to extend religious liberty to other groups than the "Anglican Church, but he was forced by parliament to withdraw these plans. This decision made it especially hard for Quakers, who believed that religious liberty should be a fundamental principle of legitimate government, to survive in England."[5] William Penn, who converted to Quakerism in 1667, suffered several imprisonments because of preaching and writing to defend the Quaker Society. Finally, he searched for land in America and received a royal charter in 1681. One year later, he sailed to America and named the colony Pennsylvania. Almost one year after its establishment, the colony had reached a population of about 4.000 people.

3.2. Living conditions of the early settlers

Once the immigrants arrived in America from England, they faced new problems: First of all, they had to start building houses and they had to learn how to make a living. To start with Jamestown, "Captain John Smith sailed with 108 men to Chesapeake Bay with three ships, which were called *Susan Constant, Goodspeed* and *Discovery*."[6] On May, 14, 1606, the group arrived in the Chesapeake Bay and settled about forty miles inland near the river, which they called "James" and called their settlement Jamestown. Within two weeks, Native Americans attacked them, killing one settler and wounding eleven. As a consequence, the settlers built a fort with huts, storehouses and a church. Sadly, Jamestown was established near a malarial swamp area and

[5]Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Jamestown 1544-1699.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

[6]Carl Brindenbaugh, *Jamestown 1544-1699* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 56.

within a year, roughly two thirds of the original 108 settlers were dead. John Smith wrote about his colony:

> *"Of all this country, wee purpose not to speake, but only of that part which was planned by the English men in the yeare of our Lord, 1606. And this is under the degrees, 37, 38, and 39. The temperatures of this countrie doth agree well with English constitutions being once seasoned to the country. Which appeared by this, that though by many occasions our people fell sicke; yet did they recover by very small means and continued in health, though there were other great causes, not only to have made them sicke, but even to end their daies, etc."*[7]

This hard time was followed by the so called "starving time, two winters later, in 1609, in which more than 80 percent of the new settlers, who had been sent by the Virginia Company, died in six months because of hunger or diseases."[8] After seven more years, quarrels with Indians started to ease because of the marriage of John Rolfe with Pocahontas, the daughter of the Powhatan-chief. When John Rolfe discovered tobacco, he experimented several times with it until he found a crop which was more sweet and fragrant than the native tobacco. He started to plant this tobacco, which others adopted as well and by 1617 the colonists produced enough to send shipments to England. It was with the discovery of this crop, that the colony's economy started to flourish and became the first real successful English settlement in North America. During these years, about 14.000 people immigrated to the Jamestown settlement in Virginia but still, in 1624 the population stood at about 1200 people.

[7]John Smith, "The Jamestown Settlement in 1607," Jeffrey Lehman. *Gale Encyclopedia of Multicultural America Primary Documents* (Detroit, MI: Gale Group, 1999), 200-203.
[8]Carl Brindenbaugh, *Jamestown 1544-1699* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 57.

Ten years later, when Sir Cecilius Calvert established Maryland, he took about 150 immigrants with him. By virtue of the huge amount of men and barely any women, the population grew very slowly and it reached about 400 people in 1640. The settlers made their living relying on mixed farming, but after a while Maryland's main income source was the same as Virginia's, tobacco. A boom in tobacco prices brought renewed immigration although servants did still dominate among the immigrants. The first immigrants to Plymouth, "New England, came in a group of 101 men, women and children, on the ship *Mayflower*."[9] Those people are also often called Pilgrim Fathers. The Pilgrims built houses but still, nearly half of them died in the winter because of disease. It was only because of an Indian that they survived, as he taught them how to grow maize. After a while, Plymouth was absorbed by another colony, Massachusetts, as Plymouth's population never grew over 7000 people. John Winthrop and his followers numbered 996 people, most of them artisans or servants. The settlers made their living with farming and trading with Indian tribes and so did the settlers in Massachusetts. The last important colony which was established after a different pattern was Pennsylvania. In August 1682, the Quaker William Penn arrived with his ship *Welcome* in America and established the colony of Pennsylvania, which he named after his father (Penn's Woods). The ship was filled with additional passengers, mostly Friends. They arrived at New Castle on October 27th, 1682, and the next day in Philadelphia. In the following years immigration increased and also other religious dissenters came. But the Quakers still remained the majority in Pennsylvania. These people made their living with farming and partially with trade with the Indians. Shortly after it was established, Pennsylvania ranked as the leading colony in producing wheat, corn, rye and flax and it soon produced surpluses that they could export for financial improvement. Furthermore, Pennsylvania was established on an area

[9]Andrew R. Murphy, "Puritans and Other Religious Dissenters," James Ciment, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Immigration 1* (Armonk, NY: Sharpe Reference, 2001), 19.

with a lot of abundant materials, such as iron and the colony became soon important for its production of pig iron as well as finished iron products.

English immigrants had an important influence on the new American Culture. Because they were the first European immigrants at the east coast of America, they had the opportunity to establish a completely new culture and sometimes lucky coincidences helped them to be successful. "For example, right after the arrival of the immigrants who came to Plymouth colony, an Indian named Squanto showed them, how to grow maize and after about one year, they had a flourishing agriculture."[10] Out of gratitude, the immigrants celebrated today's Thanksgiving. The famous author William Bradford wrote the first book on American soil, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, which was published in larger numbers. Another major impact on American society and culture was that the Protestants brought the first religious bigotry to New England. Anti-Catholicism among the Puritans certainly existed, as they thought that the Anglican Church was not purged of Roman ceremonies but the Roman concept of ruling the church together with the state was also objectionable. As Catholicism was soon outlawed by the Maryland government, which was established as a refuge for Catholics, many Puritans thought that this was the proof that they were chosen by God and they believed that their success in "*establishing a colony showed that they were better equipped than the Catholics for the demands of the modern world, i.e. expansionism, capitalism and industrialism*."[11] Still today, many Americans think that the best place to live in America is Massachusetts, as it is the state which was given to them by God. The most important impact on American Culture is very obvious: with the arrival of the English, the English language was established as officials, and it is still today. The first immigrants also produced a secure foundation for further

[10]Roger Daniels, *Coming to America, A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 2002), 51.
[11]Sally Frahm, "The Cross and the Compass: Manifest Destiny, Religious Aspects of the Mexican-American War," *Journal of Popular Culture* (2001): 87-88.

immigrants, as they made their living in America and showed that they could have better lives in America than in Europe. This attracted many new immigrants over the years and all came out of different reasons. With time, America became a mixture of different cultures, religions and habits to form a new American culture. This is why America is often called the melting pot, where many cultures form a new, single culture.

English immigration is one of the most important parts of US history, as it established a completely new nation. The first immigrants came for different reasons: On the one hand, there were people who were sent by a joint stock company, as stock-holders hoped for financial improvement. On the other hand, there were three major groups of religious dissenters: Catholics, who established Maryland, Puritans, who established Plymouth and Massachusetts as well as Quakers, who established Pennsylvania; all came to America as they suffered from religious persecution. As all these settlements were successful, they attracted more and more people to the new colonies, as many hoped for improvement of their lives in different ways. Still today, the magic of immigration attracts many people from all over the world to immigrate to America and to start a new life and therefore, America developed slowly but surely to the nation with the most interesting culture, as it was influenced by many immigrants and with this, America became the so called melting pot.

3.3. Slavery in the New England

Men and women with little active interest in a new life in America were often induced to make the move to the New World by the skillful persuasion of promoters. William Penn, for example, publicized the opportunities awaiting newcomers to the Pennsylvania colony. Judges and prison authorities offered convicts a chance to migrate to colonies like Georgia instead of serving prison sentences.

But few colonists could finance the cost of passage for themselves and their families to make a start in the new land. In some cases, ships' captains received large rewards from the sale of service contracts for poor migrants, called indentured servants, and every method from extravagant promises to actual kidnapping was used to take on as many passengers as their vessels could hold.

In other cases, the expenses of transportation and maintenance were paid by colonizing agencies like the Virginia or Massachusetts Bay Companies. In return, indentured servants agreed to work for the agencies as contract laborers, usually for four to seven years. Free at the end of this term, they would be given "freedom dues," sometimes including a small tract of land.

Perhaps half the settlers living in the colonies south of New England came to America under this system. Although most of them fulfilled their obligations faithfully, some ran away from their employers. Nevertheless, many of them were eventually able to secure land and set up homesteads, either in the colonies in which they had originally settled or in neighboring ones. No social stigma was attached to a family that had its beginning in America under this semi-bondage. Every colony had its share of leaders who were former indentured servants. There was one very important exception to this pattern: African slaves. The first black Africans were brought to Virginia in 1619, just 12 years after the founding of Jamestown. Initially, many were regarded as indentured servants who could earn their freedom. By the 1660s, however, as the demand for plantation labor in the Southern colonies grew, the institution of slavery began to harden around them, and Africans were brought to America in shackles for a lifetime of involuntary servitude.

In 1619, a Dutch trading ship brought several Africans to Jamestown, Virginia - England's first American colony. They were sold as indentured servant. One of those original African servants, a man named Anthony Johnson, completed his indenture, bought land and prospered. Soon, he imported several

of his own servants, including another African man named John Casor. Rather than freeing him after seven years like most indentured servants, Johnson claimed that Casor was his slave. The case went to trial, and Johnson won. So, in 1655, an African man became America's first owner of a permanent slave.

Slavery was an integral part of 18th-century Virginia society. Attitudes and class structure legitimized a slave system based on color of skin; slavery touched virtually all aspects of life in 18th-century Virginia. Beginning with the arrival of the first Africans at Point Comfort in 1619, an initially unplanned system of hereditary bondage for blacks gradually developed. Over the course of 150 years, slavery became entrenched in Virginia society, increasingly supported by a series of restrictive laws and reinforced by the teachings of the community and family.

Slavery was the foundation of Virginia's agricultural system and essential to its economic viability. Initially, planters bought slaves primarily to raise tobacco for export. By the last quarter of the 18th century, wealthy Virginia farmers were using slave labor in a diversified agricultural regime. Enslaved African Americans also worked as skilled tradesmen in the countryside and in the capital city of Williamsburg. Many also served as domestics in the households of wealthier white Virginians.

The constant interaction between black slaves and white masters (as well as blacks and whites in general) created an interdependence that led to the development of a distinctive Virginia culture. That interdependence was as destructive as it was unequal. The horrors endured by enslaved African Americans, whether physical or mental, were numerous. White Virginians were caught up in a system that measured social distinction based upon ownership of slaves. Economic reliance on slavery, fears about the consequences of

emancipation, and unyielding racial prejudice and cultural bias all contributed to the continuation of slavery in an era of independence.

At the dawn of the American Revolution, 20 percent of the population in the thirteen colonies was of African descent. The legalized practice of enslaving blacks occurred in every colony, but the economic realities of the southern colonies perpetuated the institution first legalized in Massachusetts in 1641. During the Revolutionary era, more than half of all African Americans lived in Virginia and Maryland. Most blacks lived in the Chesapeake region, where they made up more than 50 to 60 percent of the overall population. The majority, but not all, of these African Americans were slaves. In fact, the first official United States Census taken in 1790 showed that eight percent of the black populace was free.[12] Whether free or enslaved, blacks in the Chesapeake established familial relationships, networks for disseminating information, survival techniques, and various forms of resistance to their condition.

[12]Edgar A. Toppin. *Blacks in the American Revolution* (published essay, Virginia State University, 1976), p. 1

Chapter four: The road to independence

4.1.The Breaking

The British government, fearing a series of Indian wars, believed that the lands should be opened on a more gradual basis. Restricting movement was also a way of ensuring royal control over existing settlements before allowing the formation of new ones. The Royal Proclamation of 1763 reserved all the western territory between the Allegheny Mountains, Florida, the Mississippi River, and Quebec for use by Native Americans. Thus the Crown attempted to sweep away every western land claim of the 13 colonies and to stop westward expansion. Although never effectively enforced, this measure, in the eyes of the colonists, constituted a high-handed disregard of their fundamental right to occupy and settle western lands.

More serious in its repercussions was the new British revenue policy. London needed more money to support its growing empire and faced growing taxpayer discontent at home. It seemed reasonable enough that the colonies should pay for their own defense. That would involve new taxes, levied by Parliament — at the expense of colonial self-government.

The first step was the replacement of the Molasses Act of 1733, which placed a prohibitive duty, or tax, on the import of rum and molasses from non-English areas, with the Sugar Act of 1764.This act outlawed the importation of foreign rum; it also put a modest duty on molasses from all sources and levied taxes on wines, silks, coffee, and a number of other luxury items. The hope was that lowering the duty on molasses would reduce the temptation to smuggle the commodity from the Dutch and French West Indies for the rum distilleries of New England. The British government enforced the Sugar Act energetically. Customs officials were ordered to show more effectiveness. British warships in American waters were instructed to seize smugglers, and “writs of assistance,” or warrants, authorized the king’s officers to search suspected premises.

Both the duty imposed by the Sugar Act and the measures to enforce it caused consternation among New England merchants. They contended that payment of even the small duty imposed would be ruinous to their businesses. Merchants, legislatures, and town meetings protested the law. Colonial lawyers protested "taxation without representation," a slogan that was to persuade many Americans they were being oppressed by the mother country.

Later in 1764, Parliament enacted a Currency Act "to prevent paper bills of credit hereafter issued in any of His Majesty's colonies from being made legal tender." Since the colonies were a deficit trade area and were constantly short of hard currency, this measure added a serious burden to the colonial economy. Equally objectionable from the colonial viewpoint was the Quartering Act, passed in 1765, which required colonies to provide royal troops with provisions and barracks.

- **The Stamp Act Issue**

A general tax measure sparked the greatest organized resistance. Known as the "Stamp Act," it required all newspapers, broadsides, pamphlets, licenses, leases, and other legal documents to bear revenue stamps. The proceeds, collected by American customs agents, would be used for "defending, protecting, and securing" the colonies.

Bearing equally on people who did any kind of business, the Stamp Act aroused the hostility of the most powerful and articulate groups in the American population: journalists, lawyers, clergymen, merchants and businessmen, North and South, East and West. Leading merchants organized for resistance and formed non importation associations.

Trade with the mother country fell off sharply in the summer of 1765, as prominent men organized themselves into the "Sons of Liberty" — secret organizations formed to protest the Stamp Act — often through violent means.

From Massachusetts to South Carolina, mobs, forcing luckless customs agents to resign their offices, destroyed the hated stamps. Militant resistance effectively nullified the Act.

Spurred by delegate Patrick Henry, the Virginia House of Burgesses passed a set of resolutions in May denouncing taxation without representation as a threat to colonial liberties. It asserted that Virginians, enjoying the rights of Englishmen, could be taxed only by their own representatives. The Massachusetts Assembly invited all the colonies to appoint delegates to a "Stamp Act Congress" in New York, held in October 1765, to consider appeals for relief to the Crown and Parliament. Twenty-seven representatives from nine colonies seized the opportunity to mobilize colonial opinion. After much debate, the congress adopted a set of resolutions asserting that "no taxes ever have been or can be constitutionally imposed on them, but by their respective legislatures," and that the Stamp Act had a "manifest tendency to subvert the rights and liberties of the colonists."

- **Taxation without Representation**

The issue thus drawn centered on the question of representation. The colonists believed they could not be represented unless they actually elected members to the House of Commons. But this idea conflicted with the English principle of "virtual representation," according to which each member of Parliament represented the interests of the whole country and the empire — even if his electoral base consisted of only a tiny minority of property owners from a given district. This theory assumed that all British subjects shared the same interests as the property owners who elected members of Parliament.

The American leaders argued that their only legal relations were with the Crown. It was the king who had agreed to establish colonies beyond the sea and the king who provided them with governments. They asserted that he was

equally a king of England and a king of the colonies, but they insisted that the English Parliament had no more right to pass laws for the colonies than any colonial legislature had the right to pass laws for England. In fact, however, their struggle was equally with King George III and Parliament. Factions aligned with the Crown generally controlled Parliament and reflected the king's determination to be a strong monarch.

The British Parliament rejected the colonial contentions. British merchants, however, feeling the effects of the American boycott, threw their weight behind a repeal movement. In 1766 Parliament yielded, repealing the Stamp Act and modifying the Sugar Act. However, to mollify the supporters of central control over the colonies, Parliament followed these actions with passage of the Declaratory Act, which asserted the authority of Parliament to make laws binding the colonies "in all cases whatsoever." The colonists had won only a temporary respite from an impending crisis.

- **The Townshend Acts**

The year 1767 brought another series of measures that stirred anew all the elements of discord. Charles Townshend, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, attempted a new fiscal program in the face of continued discontent over high taxes at home. Intent upon reducing British taxes by making more efficient the collection of duties levied on American trade, he tightened customs administration and enacted duties on colonial imports of paper, glass, lead, and tea from Britain. The "Townshend Acts" were based on the premise that taxes imposed on goods imported by the colonies were legal while internal taxes (like the Stamp Act) were not.

The Townshend Acts were designed to raise revenue that would be used in part to support colonial officials and maintain the British army in America. In response, Philadelphia lawyer John Dickinson, in *Letters of a Pennsylvania*

Farmer, argued that Parliament had the right to control imperial commerce but did not have the right to tax the colonies, whether the duties were external or internal.

The agitation following enactment of the Townshend duties was less violent than that stirred by the Stamp Act, but it was nevertheless strong, particularly in the cities of the Eastern seaboard. Merchants once again resorted to non-importation agreements, and people made do with local products. Colonists, for example, dressed in homespun clothing and found substitutes for tea. They used homemade paper and their houses went unpainted. In Boston, enforcement of the new regulations provoked violence. When customs officials sought to collect duties, they were set upon by the populace and roughly handled. For this infraction, two British regiments were dispatched to protect the customs commissioners.

The presence of British troops in Boston was a standing invitation to disorder. On March 5, 1770, antagonism between citizens and British soldiers again flared into violence. What began as a harmless snowballing of British soldiers degenerated into a mob attack. Someone gave the order to fire. When the smoke had cleared, three Bostonians lay dead in the snow. Dubbed the "Boston Massacre," the incident was dramatically pictured as proof of British heartlessness and tyranny.

Faced with such opposition, Parliament in 1770 opted for a strategic retreat and repealed all the Townshend duties except that on tea, which was a luxury item in the colonies, imbibed only by a very small minority. To most, the action of Parliament signified that the colonists had won a major concession, and the campaign against England was largely dropped. A colonial embargo on "English tea" continued but was not too scrupulously observed. Prosperity was increasing and most colonial leaders were willing to let the future take care of itself.

During a three-year interval of calm, a relatively small number of radicals strove energetically to keep the controversy alive. They contended that payment of the tax constituted an acceptance of the principle that Parliament had the right to rule over the colonies. They feared that at any time in the future, the principle of parliamentary rule might be applied with devastating effect on all colonial liberties.

The radicals' most effective leader was Samuel Adams of Massachusetts, who toiled tirelessly for a single end: independence. From the time he graduated from Harvard College in 1743, Adams was a public servant in some capacity — inspector of chimneys, tax-collector, and moderator of town meetings. A consistent failure in business, he was shrewd and able in politics, with the New England town meeting his theater of action.

Adams wanted to free people from their awe of social and political superiors, make them aware of their own power and importance, and thus arouse them to action. Toward these objectives, he published articles in newspapers and made speeches in town meetings, instigating resolutions that appealed to the colonists' democratic impulses.

In 1772 he induced the Boston town meeting to select a "Committee of Correspondence" to state the rights and grievances of the colonists. The committee opposed a British decision to pay the salaries of judges from customs revenues; it feared that the judges would no longer be dependent on the legislature for their incomes and thus no longer accountable to it, thereby leading to the emergence of "a despotic form of government." The committee communicated with other towns on this matter and requested them to draft replies. Committees were set up in virtually all the colonies, and out of them grew a base of effective revolutionary organizations. Still, Adams did not have enough fuel to set a fire.

- **The Boston "Tea Party"**

In 1773, however, Britain furnished Adams and his allies with an incendiary issue. The powerful East India Company, finding itself in critical financial straits, appealed to the British government, which granted it a monopoly on all tea exported to the colonies. The government also permitted the East India Company to supply retailers directly, bypassing colonial wholesalers. By then, most of the tea consumed in America was imported illegally, duty-free. By selling its tea through its own agents at a price well under the customary one, the East India Company made smuggling unprofitable and threatened to eliminate the independent colonial merchants. Aroused not only by the loss of the tea trade but also by the monopolistic practice involved, colonial traders joined the radicals agitating for independence.

In ports up and down the Atlantic coast, agents of the East India Company were forced to resign. New shipments of tea were either returned to England or warehoused. In Boston, however, the agents defied the colonists; with the support of the royal governor, they made preparations to land incoming cargoes regardless of opposition. On the night of December 16, 1773, a band of men disguised as Mohawk Indians and led by Samuel Adams boarded three British ships lying at anchor and dumped their tea cargo into Boston harbor. Doubting their countrymen's commitment to principle, they feared that if the tea were landed, colonists would actually purchase the tea and pay the tax.

A crisis now confronted Britain. The East India Company had carried out a parliamentary statute. If the destruction of the tea went unpunished, Parliament would admit to the world that it had no control over the colonies. Official opinion in Britain almost unanimously condemned the Boston Tea Party as an act of vandalism and advocated legal measures to bring the insurgent colonists into line.

- **The Coercive Acts**

Parliament responded with new laws that the colonists called the "Coercive" or "Intolerable Acts." The first, the Boston Port Bill, closed the port of Boston until the tea was paid for. The action threatened the very life of the city, for to prevent Boston from having access to the sea meant economic disaster. Other enactments restricted local authority and banned most town meetings held without the governor's consent. A Quartering Act required local authorities to find suitable quarters for British troops, in private homes if necessary. Instead of subduing and isolating Massachusetts, as Parliament intended, these acts rallied its sister colonies to its aid. The Quebec Act, passed at nearly the same time, extended the boundaries of the province of Quebec south to the Ohio River. In conformity with previous French practice, it provided for trials without jury, did not establish a representative assembly, and gave the Catholic Church semi-established status. By disregarding old charter claims to western lands, it threatened to block colonial expansion to the North and Northwest; its recognition of the Roman Catholic Church outraged the Protestant sects that dominated every colony. Though the Quebec Act had not been passed as a punitive measure, Americans associated it with the Coercive Acts, and all became known as the "Five Intolerable Acts."

At the suggestion of the Virginia House of Burgesses, colonial representatives met in Philadelphia on September 5, 1774, "to consult upon the present unhappy state of the Colonies." Delegates to this meeting, known as the First Continental Congress, were chosen by provincial congresses or popular conventions. Only Georgia failed to send a delegate; the total number of 55 was large enough for diversity of opinion, but small enough for genuine debate and effective action. The division of opinion in the colonies posed a genuine dilemma for the delegates. They would have to give an appearance of firm unanimity to induce the British government to make concessions. But they also

would have to avoid any show of radicalism or spirit of independence that would alarm more moderate Americans.

A cautious keynote speech, followed by a "resolve" that no obedience was due the Coercive Acts, ended with adoption of a set of resolutions affirming the right of the colonists to "life, liberty, and property," and the right of provincial legislatures to set "all cases of taxation and internal polity." The most important action taken by the Congress, however, was the formation of a "Continental Association" to reestablish the trade boycott. It set up a system of committees to inspect customs entries, publish the names of merchants who violated the agreements, confiscate their imports, and encourage frugality, economy, and industry.

The Continental Association immediately assumed the leadership in the colonies, spurring new local organizations to end what remained of royal authority. Led by the pro-independence leaders, they drew their support not only from the less well-to-do, but from many members of the professional class (especially lawyers), most of the planters of the Southern colonies, and a number of merchants. They intimidated the hesitant into joining the popular movement and punished the hostile; began the collection of military supplies and the mobilization of troops; and fanned public opinion into revolutionary ardor.

Many of those opposed to British encroachment on American rights nonetheless favored discussion and compromise as the proper solution. This group included Crown-appointed officers, Quakers, and members of other religious sects opposed to the use of violence, numerous merchants (especially in the middle colonies), and some discontented farmers and frontiersmen in the Southern colonies.

The king might well have effected an alliance with these moderates and, by timely concessions, so strengthened their position that the revolutionaries would have found it difficult to proceed with hostilities. But George III had no

intention of making concessions. In September 1774, scorning a petition by Philadelphia Quakers, he wrote, “The die is now cast, the Colonies must either submit or triumph.” This action isolated Loyalists who were appalled and frightened by the course of events following the Coercive Acts.

4.2. The beginning of the revolution

General Thomas Gage, an amiable English gentleman with an American-born wife, commanded the garrison at Boston, where political activity had almost wholly replaced trade. Gage’s main duty in the colonies had been to enforce the Coercive Acts. When news reached him that the Massachusetts colonists were collecting powder and military stores at the town of Concord, 32 kilometers away, Gage sent a strong detail to confiscate these munitions.

After a night of marching, the British troops reached the village of Lexington on April 19, 1775, and saw a grim band of 77 Minutemen so named because they were said to be ready to fight in a minute through the early morning mist. The Minutemen intended only a silent protest, but Marine Major John Pitcairn, the leader of the British troops, yelled, “Disperse, you damned rebels! You dogs, run!” The leader of the Minutemen, Captain John Parker, told his troops not to fire unless fired at first. The Americans were withdrawing when someone fired a shot, which led the British troops to fire at the Minutemen. The British then charged with bayonets, leaving eight dead and 10 wounded. In the often-quoted phrase of 19th century poet Ralph Waldo Emerson, this was “the shot heard round the world.”

The British pushed on to Concord. The Americans had taken away most of the munitions, but they destroyed whatever was left. In the meantime, American forces in the countryside had mobilized to harass the British on their long return to Boston. All along the road, behind stone walls, hillocks, and houses, militiamen from “every Middlesex village and farm” made targets of the

bright red coats of the British soldiers. By the time Gage's weary detachment stumbled into Boston, it had suffered more than 250 killed and wounded. The Americans lost 93 men.

The Second Continental Congress met in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on May 10.The Congress voted to go to war, inducting the colonial militias into continental service. It appointed Colonel George Washington of Virginia as their commander-in-chief on June 15.Within two days, the Americans had incurred high casualties at Bunker Hill just outside Boston. Congress also ordered American expeditions to march northward into Canada by fall. Capturing Montreal, they failed in a winter assault on Quebec, and eventually retreated to New York.

Despite the outbreak of armed conflict, the idea of complete separation from England was still repugnant to many members of the Continental Congress. In July, it adopted the Olive Branch Petition, begging the king to prevent further hostile actions until some sort of agreement could be worked out. King George rejected it; instead, on August 23, 1775, he issued a proclamation declaring the colonies to be in a state of rebellion.

Britain had expected the Southern colonies to remain loyal, in part because of their reliance on slavery. Many in the Southern colonies feared that a rebellion against the mother country would also trigger a slave uprising. In November 1775, Lord Dunmore, the governor of Virginia, tried to capitalize on that fear by offering freedom to all slaves who would fight for the British. Instead, his proclamation drove to the rebel side many Virginians who would otherwise have remained Loyalist.

The governor of North Carolina, Josiah Martin, also urged North Carolinians to remain loyal to the Crown. When 1,500 men answered Martin's

call, they were defeated by revolutionary armies before British troops could arrive to help.

British warships continued down the coast to Charleston, South Carolina, and opened fire on the city in early June 1776.But South Carolinians had time to prepare, and repulsed the British by the end of the month. They would not return South for more than two years.

Chapter Five: The independences

5.1. The propaganda

In January 1776, Thomas Paine, a radical political theorist and writer who had come to America from England in 1774, published a 50-page pamphlet, *Common Sense*. Within three months, it sold 100,000 copies. Paine attacked the idea of a hereditary monarchy, declaring that one honest man was worth more to society than "all the crowned ruffians that ever lived." He presented the alternatives — continued submission to a tyrannical king and an outworn government, or liberty and happiness as a self-sufficient, independent republic. Circulated throughout the colonies, *Common Sense* helped to crystallize a decision for separation.

There still remained the task, however, of gaining each colony's approval of a formal declaration. On June 7, Richard Henry Lee of Virginia introduced a resolution in the Second Continental Congress, declaring, "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states...." Immediately, a committee of five, headed by Thomas Jefferson of Virginia, was appointed to draft a document for a vote.

Largely Jefferson's work, the Declaration of Independence, adopted July 4, 1776, not only announced the birth of a new nation, but also set forth a philosophy of human freedom that would become a dynamic force throughout the entire world. The Declaration drew upon French and English Enlightenment political philosophy, but one influence in particular stands out: John Locke's *Second Treatise on Government*. Locke took conceptions of the traditional rights of Englishmen and universalized them into the natural rights of all humankind. The Declaration's familiar opening passage echoes Locke's social-contract theory of government:

> *We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.*

Jefferson linked Locke's principles directly to the situation in the colonies. To fight for American independence was to fight for a government based on popular consent in place of a government by a king who had "combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws...." Only a government based on popular consent could secure natural rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Thus, to fight for American independence was to fight on behalf of one's own natural rights.

5.2. Defeats and victories

Although the Americans suffered severe setbacks for months after independence was declared, their tenacity and perseverance eventually paid off. During August 1776, in the Battle of Long Island in New York, Washington's position became untenable, and he executed a masterly retreat in small boats from Brooklyn to the Manhattan shore. British General William Howe twice hesitated and allowed the Americans to escape. By November, however, Howe had captured Fort Washington on Manhattan Island. New York City would remain under British control until the end of the war.

That December, Washington's forces were near collapse, as supplies and promised aid failed to materialize. Howe again missed his chance to crush the Americans by deciding to wait until spring to resume fighting. On Christmas Day, December 25, 1776, Washington crossed the Delaware River, north of Trenton, New Jersey. In the early-morning hours of December 26, his troops surprised the British garrison there, taking more than 900 prisoners. A week later, on January 3, 1777, Washington attacked the British at Princeton, regaining most of the territory formally occupied by the British. The victories at Trenton and Princeton revived flagging American spirits.

In September 1777, however, Howe defeated the American army at Brandywine in Pennsylvania and occupied Philadelphia, forcing the Continental Congress to flee. Washington had to endure the bitterly cold winter of 1777-1778 at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, lacking adequate food, clothing, and supplies. Farmers and merchants exchanged their goods for British gold and silver rather than for dubious paper money issued by the Continental Congress and the states.

Valley Forge was the lowest ebb for Washington's Continental Army, but elsewhere 1777 proved to be the turning point in the war. British General John Burgoyne, moving south from Canada, attempted to invade New York and New England via Lake Champlain and the Hudson River. He had too much heavy equipment to negotiate the wooded and marshy terrain. On August 6, at Oriskany, New York, a band of Loyalists and Native Americans under Burgoyne's command ran into a mobile and seasoned American force that managed to halt their advance. A few days later at Bennington, Vermont, more of Burgoyne's forces, seeking much-needed supplies, were pushed back by American troops.

Moving to the west side of the Hudson River, Burgoyne's army advanced on Albany. The Americans were waiting for him. Led by Benedict Arnold —

who would later betray the Americans at West Point, New York — the colonials twice repulsed the British. Having by this time incurred heavy losses, Burgoyne fell back to Saratoga, New York, where a vastly superior American force under General Horatio Gates surrounded the British troops. On October 17, 1777, Burgoyne surrendered his entire army — six generals, 300 other officers, and 5,500 enlisted personnel.

In France, enthusiasm for the American cause was high: The French intellectual world was itself stirring against feudalism and privilege. However, the Crown lent its support to the colonies for geopolitical rather than ideological reasons: The French government had been eager for reprisal against Britain ever since France's defeat in 1763.To further the American cause, Benjamin Franklin was sent to Paris in 1776. His wit, guile, and intellect soon made their presence felt in the French capital, and played a major role in winning French assistance.

France began providing aid to the colonies in May 1776, when it sent 14 ships with war supplies to America. In fact, most of the gunpowder used by the American armies came from France. After Britain's defeat at Saratoga, France saw an opportunity to seriously weaken its ancient enemy and restore the balance of power that had been upset by the Seven Years' War (called the French and Indian War in the American colonies). On February 6, 1778, the colonies and France signed a Treaty of Amity and Commerce, in which France recognized the United States and offered trade concessions. They also signed a Treaty of Alliance, which stipulated that if France entered the war, neither country would lay down its arms until the colonies won their independence, that neither would conclude peace with Britain without the consent of the other, and that each guaranteed the other's possessions in America. This was the only bi-lateral defense treaty signed by the United States or its predecessors until 1949.

The Franco-American alliance soon broadened the conflict. In June 1778 British ships fired on French vessels, and the two countries went to war. In 1779

Spain, hoping to reacquire territories taken by Britain in the Seven Years' War, entered the conflict on the side of France, but not as an ally of the Americans. In 1780 Britain declared war on the Dutch, who had continued to trade with the Americans. The combination of these European powers, with France in the lead, was a far greater threat to Britain than the American colonies standing alone.

With the French now involved, the British, still believing that most Southerners were Loyalists, stepped up their efforts in the Southern colonies. A campaign began in late 1778, with the capture of Savannah, Georgia. Shortly thereafter, British troops and naval forces converged on Charleston, South Carolina, the principal Southern port. They managed to bottle up American forces on the Charleston peninsula. On May 12, 1780, General Benjamin Lincoln surrendered the city and its 5,000 troops, in the greatest American defeat of the war.

But the reversal in fortune only emboldened the American rebels. South Carolinians began roaming the countryside, attacking British supply lines. In July, American General Horatio Gates, who had assembled a replacement force of untrained militiamen, rushed to Camden,

South Carolina, to confront British forces led by General Charles Cornwallis. But Gates's makeshift army panicked and ran when confronted by the British regulars. Cornwallis's troops met the Americans several more times, but the most significant battle took place at Cowpens, South Carolina, in early 1781, where the Americans soundly defeated the British. After an exhausting but unproductive chase through North Carolina, Cornwallis set his sights on Virginia.

5.2. The end of the war and Americans independences

In July 1780 France's King Louis XVI had sent to America an expeditionary force of 6,000 men under the Comte Jean de Rochambeau. In addition,

the French fleet harassed British shipping and blocked reinforcement and resupply of British forces in Virginia. French and American armies and navies, totaling 18,000 men, parried with Cornwallis all through the summer and into the fall. Finally, on October 19, 1781, after being trapped at Yorktown near the mouth of Chesapeake Bay, Cornwallis surrendered his army of 8,000 British soldiers.

Although Cornwallis's defeat did not immediately end the war — which would drag on inconclusively for almost two more years — a new British government decided to pursue peace negotiations in Paris in early 1782, with the American side represented by Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and John Jay. On April 15, 1783, Congress approved the final treaty. Signed on September 3, the Treaty of Paris acknowledged the independence, freedom, and sovereignty of the 13 former colonies, now states. The new United States stretched west to the Mississippi River, north to Canada, and south to Florida, which was returned to Spain. The fledgling colonies that Richard Henry Lee had spoken of more than seven years before had finally become "free and independent states." The task of knitting together a nation remained.

Chapter six: The formation of a National Government

6.1. The challenges of building a well structured country

The successful Revolution against England gave the American people an independent place in the family of nations. It gave them a changed social order in which heredity and privilege counted for little and human equality or much. It gave them a thousand memories of mutual hope and struggle. But most of all, it gave them the challenge to prove they possessed a genuine ability to hold their new place, to prove their capacity for self-government.

The success of the Revolution had furnished Americans with the opportunity to give legal form and expression to their political ideals as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and to remedy some of their grievances through state constitutions. As James Madison, fourth President of the United States, wrote, [13]"*Nothing has excited more admiration than the manner in which free governments have been established in America; for it was the first instance that free inhabitants have been seen deliberating on a form of government, and selecting such of their citizens as possessed their confidence to determine upon and give effect to it.*"

Today, Americans are so accustomed to living under written constitutions that they take them for granted. Yet the written constitution was developed in America and is among the earliest in history. "In all free states, the constitution is final," wrote John Adams, second President of the United States. Americans everywhere demanded "*a standing law to live by*." As early as May 10, 1776, Congress passed a resolution advising the colonies to form new governments "such as shall best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents." Some of them had already done so and, within a year after the Declaration of Independence, every state but three had drawn up a new constitution.

[13] James Madison fourth president of the USA

Writing these documents provided a splendid opportunity for the democratic elements to remedy their grievances and to realize their ambitions for sound government. And most of the resulting constitutions showed the impact of democratic ideas, though none made any drastic break with the past, built as they were by Americans on the solid foundation of colonial experience, English practice, and French political philosophy. Indeed, it was actually in the drafting of these state constitutions that the revolution was accomplished. Naturally, the first object of the framers was to secure those "unalienable rights," the violation of 'which had caused them to repudiate their connection with England. Consequently, each constitution began with a declaration or bill of rights, and Virginia's, which served as a model for all the others, included a declaration of principles such as popular sovereignty, rotation in office, freedom of elections, and an enumeration of the fundamental liberties -moderate bail and humane punishments, a militia instead of a standing army, speedy trials by the law of the land, trial by jury, freedom of the press, of conscience, of the right of a majority to reform or, alter the government, and prohibition of general warrants. Other states considerably enlarged this list to include freedom of speech, of assemblage, of petition, of bearing arms, the right to a writ of habeas corpus, inviolability of domicile, and equal operation of the laws. In addition, all the state constitutions paid allegiance to the theory of executive, legislative, and judiciary branches, each one to be checked and balanced by the others.

While the thirteen original colonies were being transformed into states and adjusting themselves to the conditions of independence, new commonwealths were developing in the vast expanse of land stretching west from the seaboard settlements. Lured by the finest hunting and the richest land yet found in the country, pioneers poured west of the Appalachian Mountains. By 1775, the far-flung outposts scattered along the waterways had tens of thousands of settlers. Separated by mountain ranges and hundreds of miles from the centers of political authority in the east, the inhabitants established their own

governments, and the communities throve lustily. Settlers from all the tidewater states pressed through into the fertile river valleys, the hardwood forests, and over the rolling prairies. By 1790, the population of the trans-Appalachian region numbered well over 120,000.

With the end of the Revolution, the United States had inherited the old unsolved western question - the problem of "empire" - with its complications of land, fur trade, Indians, settlement, and government of dependencies. Before the war, several colonies had had extensive and often overlapping claims to land beyond the Appalachians. The prospect of these states acquiring this rich territorial prize seemed quite unfair to those without claims in the west. Maryland, the spokesman of the latter group, introduced a resolution that the western lands be considered common property to be parceled out by Congress into free and independent governments. This idea was not received enthusiastically. Nonetheless, in 1780, New York led the way by ceding her claims to the United States. She was soon followed by the other colonies and, by the end of the war, it was apparent that Congress would come into possession of all the lands north of the Ohio River and probably of all west of the Allegheny Mountains. This common possession of millions of acres was the most tangible evidence of nationality and unity that existed during these troubled years and gave a certain substance to the idea of national sovereignty. Yet it was at the same time a problem which pressed for solution.

This solution was achieved under the Articles of Confederation, a formal agreement which had loosely unified the colonies since 1781. Under the Articles, a system of limited self-government was applied to the new western lands and satisfactorily bridged the gap between wilderness and statehood. This system, set forth in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, has since been applied to all of the continental possessions and most of the insular possessions of the United States. The Ordinance of 1787 provided for the organization of the

Northwest Territory initially as a single district, ruled by a governor and judges appointed by Congress. When this territory should contain five thousand male inhabitants of voting age, it was to be entitled to a legislature of two chambers, itself electing the lower house. In addition, it could at that time send a nonvoting delegate to Congress. No more than five nor less than three states were to be formed out of this territory, and whenever any one of them had sixty thousand free inhabitants, it was to be admitted to the Union "on an equal footing with the original states in all respects." Six "articles of compact between the original states and the people and states in the said territory" guaranteed civil rights and liberties, encouraged education, and guaranteed that "there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory."

Thus a new colonial policy based upon the principle of equality was inaugurated. The new policy repudiated the time-honored doctrine that colonies existed for the benefit of the mother country and were politically subordinate and socially inferior. This concept was replaced by the principle that colonies were but the extension of the nation and were entitled, not as a privilege but as a right, to all the benefits of equality. The enlightened provisions of the Ordinance laid the permanent foundations for the American territorial system and colonial policy, and enabled the United States to expand westward to the Pacific Ocean and to develop from thirteen to forty-eight states, with relatively little difficulty.

Unfortunately, however, in the solution of other problems the Articles of Confederation proved disappointing. Their notable shortcoming was their failure to provide a real national government for the thirteen states which had been tending strongly towards unification since their delegates first met in 1774 to protect their liberties against encroaching British power. Pressures arising from the struggle with England had done much to change their attitude of twenty years before when colonial assemblies had rejected the Albany Plan of Union. Then they bad refused to surrender even the smallest part of their autonomy to

any other body, even one they themselves had elected. But, in the course of the Revolution, mutual aid proved efficacious, and the fear of relinquishing individual authority in some spheres had, to a large degree, lessened.

The Articles went into effect in 1781. Though they constituted an advance over the loose arrangement provided by the Continental Congress system, the governmental framework they established bad many weaknesses. There was quarreling over boundary lines. The courts handed down decisions which conflicted with one another. The legislatures of Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania passed tariff laws which injured their smaller neighbors. Restrictions upon commerce between states created bitter feeling. New Jersey men, for example, could not cross the Hudson River to sell vegetables in New York markets without paying heavy entrance and clearance fees.

The national government should have bad the power to lay whatever tariffs were necessary and to regulate commerce -but it did not. It should have bad the authority to levy taxes for national purposes-but again it did not. It should have had sole control of international relations, but a number of states had begun their own negotiations with foreign nations. Nine states had organized their own armies, and several had little navies of their own. There was a curious hodgepodge of coins minted by a dozen foreign nations and a bewildering variety of state and national paper bills, all fast depreciating in value.

Economic difficulties subsequent to the war also caused discontent, especially among the farmers. Farm produce tended to be a glut on the market, and general unrest centered chiefly among farmer debtors who wanted strong remedies to insure against the foreclosure of mortgages on their property and to avoid imprisonment for debt. Courts were clogged with suits for debt. All through the summer of 1786, popular conventions and informal gatherings in

several states demanded reform in the state administrations. Many yeomen, facing debtor's prison and loss of ancestral farms, resorted to violence.

In one state - Massachusetts - mobs of farmers, under the leadership of a former army captain, Daniel Shays, in the autumn of 1786, began forcibly to prevent the county courts from sitting and to prevent further judgments for debt, pending the next state election. They met with stout resistance from the state government, and for a few days there was danger that the state house in Boston would be besieged by an infuriated yeomanry. But the rebels, armed chiefly with staves and pitchforks, were repulsed by the militia and scattered into the hills. Only after the uprising was crushed did the legislature consider the justice of the grievances which had caused it and take steps to remedy them.

At this time, Washington wrote that the states were united only by a "rope of sand," and the prestige of the Congress had fallen to a low point. Disputes between Maryland and Virginia over navigation in the Potomac River led to a conference of representatives of five states at Annapolis in 1786. One of these delegates, Alexander Hamilton, convinced his colleagues that commerce was too much bound up with other questions and that the situation was too serious to be dealt with by so unrepresentative a body as themselves. He induced the gathering to call upon all the states to appoint representatives of the United States and to "devise such further provisions as shall appear to them necessary to render the Constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies of the Union." The Continental Congress was at first indignant over this bold step, but its protests were cut short by the news that Virginia had elected George Washington a delegate, and during the next fall and winter, elections were held in all the states but Rhode Island.

It was a gathering of notables that assembled as the Federal Convention in the Philadelphia State House in May 1787. The state legislatures sent leaders

with experience in colonial and state governments, in Congress, on the bench, and in the field. George Washington, regarded as the outstanding citizen in the entire country because of his military leadership during the Revolution and because of his integrity and reputation, was chosen as presiding officer. The sage Benjamin Franklin, now eighty-one and mellow with years, let the younger men do most of the talking, but his kindly humor and wide experience in diplomacy helped ease some of the difficulties among the other delegates. Prominent among the more active members were Governor Morris, able and daring, who clearly saw the need for national government, and James Wilson, also of Pennsylvania, who labored indefatigably for the national idea. From Virginia came James Madison, a practical young statesman, a thorough student of politics and history and,. according to a colleague, "from a spirit of industry and application ... the best informed man on any point in debate." Massachusetts sent Rufus King and Elbridge Gerry, young men of ability and experience. Roger Sherman, shoemaker turned judge, Was one of the representatives from Connecticut. From New York came Alexander Hamilton, just turned thirty and already famous. One of the few great men of colonial America absent was Thomas Jefferson who was in France on a mission of state. Among the fifty-five delegates, youth predominated, for the average age was forty-two.

The Convention had been authorized merely to draft amendments to the Articles of Confederation but, as Madison later wrote, the delegates "with a manly confidence in their country" simply threw the Articles aside and went ahead with the consideration of a wholly new form of government. In their work, the delegates recognized that the predominant need was to reconcile two different powers -the power of local control which was already being exercised by the thirteen semi-independent states and the power of a central government. They adopted the principle that the functions and powers of the national government, being new, general, and inclusive, had to be carefully defined and stated, while all other functions and powers were to be understood as belonging

to the states. They recognized, however, the necessity of giving the national government real power and thus generally accepted the fact that the national government be empowered - among other things -to coin money, to regulate commerce, to declare war, and make peace. These functions, of necessity, called for the machinery of a national government.

The eighteenth-century statesmen who met in Philadelphia were adherents of Montesquieu concept of the balance of power in politics. This principle was naturally supported by colonial experience and strengthened by the writings of Locke with which most of the delegates were familiar. These influences led to the understanding that three distinct branches of government be established, each equal and coordinate with the others. The legislative, executive, and judicial powers were to be so adjusted and interlocked as to permit harmonious operation. At the same time they were to be so well balanced that no one interest could ever gain control. It was natural also for the delegates to assume that the legislative branch, like the colonial legislatures and the British Parliament, should consist of two houses.

On these broad, general views there was homogeneity. But sharp differences arose within the assemblage as to the method of achieving the desired ends. Representatives of the small states, New Jersey, for instance, objected to changes that would reduce their influence in the federal government by basing representation upon population instead of upon statehood, as under the Articles of Confederation. On the other hand, representatives of the large states like Virginia argued vehemently for proportionate representation. Over this question, the debate threatened to go on endlessly until finally the Connecticut delegate came forward with very able arguments in support of a plan for representation in proportion to the population of the states in one house of Congress and equal representation in the other.

The alignment of large against small states then dissolved. Almost every succeeding question, however, raised new alignments to be resolved only by new compromises. Certain members wished no branch of the federal government to be elected directly by the people; others thought it must be given as broad a basis as possible. Some delegates wished to exclude the growing west from the opportunity of statehood; others championed the equality principle established in the Ordinance of 1787. There was no serious difference of opinion on such national economic questions as paper money, tender laws, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. But there was a need for balancing the distinct sectional economic interests; for settling heated arguments as to the powers, term, and selection of the executive; and for solving the problems concerning the tenure of judges and the kind of courts to be established.

Conscientiously and with determination, through a hot Philadelphia summer, the Convention labored to iron out problems. It finally achieved a satisfactory draft which incorporated in a brief document the organization of the most complex government yet devised by man -a government supreme within its sphere, but within a sphere that is defined and limited. As the Tenth Amendment made clear in 1791, 11 the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"; and the supremacy of federal laws is limited to such as "shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution." The states are coequally supreme within their sphere; in no legal sense are they subordinate institutions, and both the federal and state governments rest on the same broad foundation of popular sovereignty. In subsequent years, the scope of federal power has been widely extended by amendment, implication, judicial interpretation, and the necessities of national crises. The same, however, is true of the states. Even in the twentieth century, the American citizen comes far more frequently into contact with his state than with his national government. For to the states belong, not by virtue of the federal constitution but of their own

sovereign power, the control of municipal and local government, the police power, factory and labor legislation, the chartering of corporations, the statutory development and judicial administration of civil and criminal law, the control of education, and the general supervision of the people's health, safety, and welfare.

In conferring powers, the Convention freely and fully gave the federal government the power to lay taxes, to borrow money, to lay uniform duties, imposts, and excises. It was given authority to coin money, fix weights and measures, grant patents and copyrights, and establish post offices and post roads. It was empowered to raise and maintain an army and navy and could regulate interstate commerce. It was given the whole management of Indian relations, of international relations, and of war It could pass laws for naturalizing foreigners and, controlling the public lands, it could admit new states on a basis of absolute equality with the old. The power to pass all necessary and proper laws for executing these defined powers rendered the federal government sufficiently elastic to meet the needs of later generations and of a greatly expanded body politic.

In constructing this frame of government, practically every feature showed the influence of the unwritten constitution of the British Empire; but also there is hardly a clause which cannot be traced to the constitution of one of the thirteen American states or to colonial practice. The principle of separation of powers, familiar in most colonial governments, had already been given a fair trial in most state constitutions and had been proven sound. And so the Convention set up a governmental system in which there was a separate legislative, executive, and judiciary branch - each checked by the others. Congressional enactments did not become law until approved by the President. And the President was to submit the most important of his appointments and all of his treaties to the Senate for confirmation. He, in turn, might be impeached

and removed by Congress. The judiciary was to hear all cases arising under the laws and the Constitution. The courts were, therefore, in effect, empowered to interpret both the fundamental and the statute law. But the judiciary, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, might also be impeached by Congress.

Foreseeing the possible future necessity for changing or adding to the new document, the Convention included an article which delineated specifically methods for its amendment. However, to protect the Constitution from indiscriminate alteration, Article Five-used successfully only twenty-one times - was designed. It states that either two-thirds of both houses of Congress or two-thirds of the states, meeting in convention, may propose amendments to the Constitution. The proposals become law by one of two methods -either by ratification by the legislatures of three fourths of the states, or by convention in three-fourths of these states. The Congress proposes which method shall be used.

Finally, the Convention faced the most important problem of all: how should the powers given to the new government be enforced? Under the old Articles of Confederation, the national government had possessed - on paper - large, though by no means adequate, powers. But in practice these powers had come to naught, for the states paid no attention to them. What was to save the new government from meeting precisely the same obstacle? At the outset, most delegates furnished but one answer-the use of force, But it was quickly seen that the application of force upon the states would destroy the Union. As the discussion progressed, ;t was decided that the government should not act upon the states but upon the people within the states. It was to legislate for and upon all the individual residents of the country. As the keystone of the Constitution, the Convention adopted a brief but highly significant device:

"Congress shall have power . . . to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the . . . powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States. (Article I , Section viii.)

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." (Article Vi.)

Thus the laws of the United States became enforceable in its own national courts, through its own judges and marshals. They were also enforceable in the state courts, through the state judges and state law officers.

At the end of sixteen weeks of deliberation -on September 17, 1787 -the finished Constitution was signed "by unanimous consent of the states present." The delegates were obviously impressed by the solemnity of the moment, and Washington sat in grave meditation. But Franklin relieved the tension by a characteristic sally. Pointing to the half sun painted in brilliant gold on the back of Washington's chair, he remarked that artists had always found it difficult to distinguish between a rising and a setting sun.

"I have often and often," he remarked, "in the course of the session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President, without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting; but now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising, and not a setting sun."

The Convention was over; the members "adjourned to the City Tavern, dined together, and took a cordial leave of each other." Yet a crucial part of the struggle for a more perfect union was still to be faced. For the consent of

popularly elected state conventions was still required before the document could become effective.

The Convention had decided that the Constitution would take effect as soon as it was approved by conventions in nine of the thirteen states. By the end of 1787, three had ratified it. But would six others? To many plain folk the document seemed full of dangers, for would not the strong central government that it set up tyrannize over them, oppress them with heavy taxes, and drag them into wars? These questions brought into existence two parties, the Federalists and the Ant federalists - those favoring a strong government and those who preferred a loose association of separate states. The controversy raged in the press, the legislature, and the state conventions. Impassioned arguments were poured forth on both sides. The ablest of these were the Federalist Papers, now a classic political work, written in behalf of the new Constitution by Hamilton, Madison, and John Jay. As a result of a particularly sharp contest in Massachusetts where agrarian discontent was still rife, a Bill of Rights was appended to the Constitution in the form of amendments. Other states soon recognized the importance of making such additions to the Constitution, and the Rights, which had previously been included in all the state constitutions, were incorporated into the supreme law of the land - forming the first ten amendments of the original constitutional document. These amendments have guaranteed to citizens of the United States -among other rights - freedom of religion, speech, the press, and assembly; a militia instead of a standing army; the right to trial by jury; speedy trials by the law of the land, and prohibition of general warrants. As a result of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, the wavering states soon came to the support of the Constitution, which was finally adopted June 21, 1788. The Congress of the Confederation arranged for the first presidential election, declared the new government would begin on March 4, 1789, and quietly expired.

One name was on every man's lips for the new chief of state, and Washington was unanimously chosen President. On April 30, 1789, he took the oath pledging faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and to the best of his ability to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

It was a lusty republic that set out upon its career. The economic problems caused by the war were on their way to solution and the country was growing steadily. Immigration from Europe came in volume; good farms were to be had for small sums; labor was in strong demand. The rich valley stretches of upper New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia soon became great wheat-growing areas. Although many items were still home-made, manufactures too were growing. Massachusetts and Rhode Island were laying the foundations of important textile industries; Connecticut was beginning to turn out tin ware and clocks; New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania were producing paper, glass, and iron. Shipping had grown to such an extent that on the seas the United States was second only ' to England. Before 1790, American ships were traveling to China to sell furs and bring back teas, spices, and silks.

The main impulse of American energy, however, was westward. New Englanders and Pennsylvanians were moving into Ohio; Virginians and Carolinians were heading for Kentucky and Tennessee. Up the long slopes of the Alleghenies climbed the white-topped wagons of the emigrant trains. Into Kentucky wound the buckskin-clad hunters and the pioneers with carts of furniture, seeds, simple farm implements, and domestic animals. In many a rough clearing, the frontier farmer and his neighbors raised a log cabin, its timbers chinked with clay, its roof covered with oak staves. Year by year, more rafts and boats, laden with grain, salt meat, and potash, floated down the Mississippi to New Orleans. Year by year, the western towns grew more important. Wild animals, disease, and other perils and hardships bad to be faced,

but still ten thousand rivulets of settlement spilled into the wilderness. The keynote of an earlier day-"Westward the course of empire takes its way"-was still the watchword.

This was the condition of the country when Washington took office. The new Constitution, at the time merely a blueprint of things to come, possessed neither tradition nor the backing of organized public opinion. The two parties, formed during the period of ratification, continued antagonistic. The Federalists were the party of strong central government, of rising business, and commercial interests. The Ant federalists were champions of state rights and agrarianism. The new government had to create its own machinery. There were no taxes coming in. Until a judiciary could be established, there was no means of law enforcement. The army was small. The navy had ceased to exist.

The wise leadership of Washington was essential to the nation at this time. The qualities that had made him the first soldier in the Revolution also made him the first statesman in the newly organized country. He had the power of planning for a distant end and a capacity for taking infinite pains. He inspired respect and trust; he had directness rather than adroitness; fortitude rather than flexibility-, and great dignity and reserve as well as shyness, humility, and stoical self-control.

The organization of the government was no small task. Congress quickly created departments of State and of the Treasury. Washington appointed Thomas Jefferson as Secretary of State and Alexander Hamilton, his aide during the Revolution, as Secretary of the Treasury. Simultaneously the Congress established the federal judiciary, setting up not only a Supreme Court, with one Chief Justice (John Jay was named to the post) and five associate justices, but also three circuit courts and thirteen district courts. In the first administration, both a Secretary of War and an Attorney-General were also appointed. Since

Washington generally preferred to make decisions only after consulting those men whose judgment he trusted, the American cabinet (consisting of the heads of all the departments that Congress might create) came into existence, although it was not officially recognized by law until 1907.

Just as revolutionary America had produced two commanding figures of worldwide renown -Washington and Franklin - so did the youthful republic raise to fame two brilliantly able men, Hamilton and Jefferson, whose reputations were to spread beyond the seas. It was not their sterling personal gifts, great though they were, which entitle these men to a place in history. Rather it was their representation of two powerful and indispensable, though to some extent antagonistic, forces in American life. Hamilton tended toward closer union and a stronger national government; Jefferson leaned toward a broader, freer democracy.

The keynote of Hamilton's public career was his love of efficiency, order, and organization. Indeed, the evidences of weakness and inefficiency he saw from 1775 to 1789 explain his dominant impulse to serve the young nation. Hamilton had bold plans and definite policies where others had cautious notions and vague principles. In response to the call of the House of Representatives for a plan for the "adequate support of public credit," Hamilton laid down and supported principles not only of public economy as such, but of effective government. America must have credit for industrial development, commercial activity, and the operations of government. It also must have the complete faith and support of the people. Many men wished to repudiate the national debt or pay only a part of it. Hamilton, however, insisted upon full payment of the debt of the union government and also upon a plan by which the federal government took over the unpaid debts of the states incurred in aid of the Revolution. He devised a Bank of the United States, with the right to establish branches in different parts of the country. He sponsored a national mint. He argued in favor

of tariffs based upon the protection principle in order to foster the development of national industries. These measures had an instant effect -placing the credit of the federal government on a firm foundation and giving it all the revenues it needed. They encouraged commerce and industry, thus creating a solid phalanx of businessmen who stood fast behind the national government and were ready to resist any attempt to weaken it.

Thomas Jefferson, on the other hand, was a man of thought rather than action. As Hamilton's talents were executive, Jefferson's were meditative and philosophical, and among contemporary political thinkers and writers, he was without a peer. Politically, he was frequently at odds with Hamilton. When he went abroad as Minister to France, he realized the value of a strong central government in foreign relations, but he did not want it strong in many other respects, fearing it would fetter men. Born an aristocrat, but by inclination and conviction an equalitarian democrat, he fought always for freedom -from the British Crown, from church control, from a landed aristocracy, from inequalities of wealth.

Hamilton's great aim was to give the country a more efficient organization, Jefferson's to give individual men a wider liberty, believing that "*every man and every body of men on earth possess the right of self-government.*" Hamilton feared anarchy and thought in terms of order; Jefferson feared tyranny and thought in terms of liberty. The United States needed both influences. It required both a stronger national government and also the unfettering of men. It was the country's good fortune that it had both men and could in time fuse and, to a great extent, reconcile their special contributions.

Their differing points of view, made manifest shortly after Jefferson took office as Secretary of State, led to a new and profoundly important interpretation of the Constitution. For when Hamilton brought forth his bill establishing a

national bank, Jefferson objected, speaking for all believers in state rights as opposed to national rights, and for those who feared great corporations. The Constitution, he declared, expressly enumerates all the powers belonging to the federal government and reserves all other powers to the states. Nowhere was it empowered to set up a bank. Hamilton contended that all the powers of the national government could not be set down in words because of the intolerable detail this would necessitate. A vast body of powers had to be implied by general clauses, he stated, and one of these authorized Congress to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper" for carrying out other powers specifically granted. The Constitution declared the national government should have the power to lay and collect taxes, pay debts, borrow money. A national bank would materially assist in carrying out these functions efficiently, and Congress was therefore entitled to set up the bank under its "Implied powers." Washington and the Congress accepted Hamilton's measure and established a precedent.

Though its first tasks were to strengthen the domestic economy and make the union secure, the young country could not ignore political occurrences abroad. The cornerstone of Washington's foreign policy was the preservation of peace-peace to give the country time to recover from the wounds it had received during the war and to permit the slow work of national integration to continue. But events in Europe threatened the achievement of this goal. Many Americans were watching the French Revolution with the keenest interest and sympathy. And in April 1793, news came that made this conflict an issue in American politics. France had declared war on Great Britain and Spain. Citizen Genèt was coming to the United States as Minister of the French Republic.

America was still formally an ally of France, and war would enable Americans to discharge both their debt of gratitude to her and their feeling of resentment against Britain. But though most of the executive department of the

United States wished the French well, it was more anxious to keep America out of war. And so Washington now proclaimed to the belligerents of Europe the neutrality of the United States, and when Genèt arrived, he was greeted with stern formality. Angered by this treatment, he attempted to disobey an order forbidding him to use American ports as bases of operations for French privateers, and after a time a request for his recall by the French government was granted.

In this period-from 1793 to 1795- came the crystallization of the two poles of American public opinion. For the French Revolution seemed to some a clean-cut contest between monarchy and republicanism, oppression and liberty, autocracy and democracy; to others, a new eruption of strife between anarchy and order, atheism and religion, poverty and property. The former joined the Republican Party, ancestor of today's Democratic Party, the latter Joined the Federalists, from whom the present-day Republican Party is descended.

As a result of the Genèt incident, American ardor for France cooled somewhat. At the same time, relations with Great Britain were far from satisfactory. British troops still occupied forts in the west; property carried off by British soldiers during the Revolution had not been restored or paid for; and the British navy was playing havoc with American commerce. To settle these matters, Washington sent to London as American envoy extraordinary, John Jay, an experienced diplomat, who was at the same time Chief justice of the Supreme Court. Acting with moderation, Jay negotiated a treaty whereby he secured the withdrawal of the British from western forts and some slight trading concessions. Nothing was said, however, about returning property, about the seizure of American ships in the future, or about "impressments" - the forcing of American sailors into British naval service.

Jay's treaty caused general dissatisfaction, but as the end of Washington's second administration approached, it was evident that marked achievements had been made in other fields -the government was organized, national credit was established, maritime commerce fostered, the Northwest Territory recovered, and peace preserved.

Washington retired in 1797, firmly declining to serve for more than eight years as the nation's head. John Adams, able and high-minded, stern and obstinate, was elected as the new President. Even before he entered the presidency, Adams had quarreled with Hamilton who had contributed so much to the previous administrations. Thus Adams was handicapped by having a divided party behind him and a divided cabinet at his side. To make matters worse, the international skies were again heavily clouded. For France, angered by Jay's recent treaty with Britain, refused to accept Adams' minister. When Adams sent three other commissioners to Paris, they were met with fresh contumely, and American indignation arose to an excited pitch. Troops were enlisted, the navy was strengthened and, in 1798, after a series of sea battles with the French in which American ships were uniformly victorious, war seemed inescapable. In this crisis, Adams thrust aside the guidance of Hamilton, who wanted war, and sent a new minister to France. Napoleon, who had just come to power, received him cordially and the danger of conflict disappeared.

In home affairs, Adams was not popular with the American people, and the year 1800 found the country ripe for a change. Under Washington and Adams, the Federalists had capably established the government and made it strong. But failing to recognize that the American government must be responsive to the will of the people, they had followed policies which did much to alienate large masses of the people. Jefferson, a born popular leader, had steadily gathered behind him a great mass of small farmers, shopkeepers, and other workers, and they asserted themselves with tremendous power in the

election of 1800. "The tough sides of our Argosie have been thoroughly tried," wrote Jefferson to a friend. "We shall put her on her republican tack, and she will now show by the beauty of her motion the skill of her builders."

Indeed Jefferson enjoyed extraordinary ascendency because of his appeal to America's idealism, simplicity, youth, and hopeful outlook. And the manner in which he assumed the presidency in 1801 emphasized the fact that democracy had come into power. Jefferson, carelessly garbed as usual, walked from his simple boardinghouse up the hill to the Capitol together with a few friends. Entering the Senate chamber, he shook hands with Vice President Burr, his rival in the recent election, and took the oath of office administered by John Marshall, recently appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. His inaugural address promised "a wise and frugal government" which should preserve order among the inhabitants but "shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement."

Jefferson's mere presence in the White House encouraged democratic procedures. To him the plainest citizen was as worthy of respect as the highest officer. He taught his subordinates to regard themselves merely as trustees for the people. He encouraged agriculture and westward expansion. He encouraged a liberal naturalization law, believing in America as a haven for the oppressed. By the end of 1809, his farsighted Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, had reduced the national debt to less than sixty millions. As a wave of Jeffersonian feeling swept the nation, state after state abolished property qualifications for the ballot and passed more humane laws for debtors and criminals.

One of Jefferson's steps doubled the area of the nation. Spain had long held the country west of the Mississippi, with the port of New Orleans near its mouth. But soon after Jefferson came into office, Napoleon forced a weak

Spanish government to cede the great tract called Louisiana back to France. The moment he did so Americans trembled with apprehension and indignation, for New Orleans was a port indispensable for the shipment of American products grown in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. Napoleon's plans for a huge colonial empire just west of the United States menaced the trading rights and the safety of all the interior settlements.

Jefferson asserted that if France took possession of Louisiana, from that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation and that the first cannon shot fired in a European war would be the signal for the march of an Anglo American army against New Orleans. Napoleon was impressed by the certainty that the United States and England would strike. He knew that another war with Great Britain was impending after the brief Peace of Amiens and that, when it began, he would surely lose Louisiana. He therefore resolved to fill his treasury, to put Louisiana beyond the reach of the British, and to bid for American friendship by selling the region to the United States. For $15,000,000 this vast area passed into the possession of the republic. Jefferson stretched the Constitution till it cracked in buying it, for no clause authorized the purchase of foreign territory, and he acted without Congressional consent. As a result, the United States, in 1803, obtained more than a million square miles and with it the port of New Orleans, a picturesque city built on a crescent of the Mississippi, with a dark cypress forest as background. The country had gained a sweep of rich plains that within eighty years was to become one of the world's greatest granaries. It also had control of the whole central river system of the continent. Puffing vessels within a few years filled all the western streams, taking emigrants to settle on the land and bringing furs, grain, cured meats, and a hundred other products back to market.

As the end of his first term approached, Jefferson continued to enjoy widespread popularity. Louisiana was manifestly a great prize, the country was

prosperous, and the President had tried hard to please all sections. His re-election was certain, and in his next term, which began in 1805, Jefferson made his second extraordinary use of federal authority in attempting to maintain American neutrality during the colossal struggle between Great Britain and France. Both forces had set up blockades and thereby struck heavy blows at American commerce. The British acted to cut off the rich carrying-trade of American vessels with products of the French West Indies and by proclamation declared blockaded the coast of Europe from Brest to the Elbe River. The French ordered the seizure of any American ship which submitted to British search or touched at a British port. The war soon reached a point where no American craft could trade with the broad region controlled by France without being liable to seizure by the British, and none could trade with Britain without danger from France. Under these conditions commerce was crippled.

Still another grievance aroused American feeling against Great Britain. To win the war, the British were building up their navy to a point where it had more than seven hundred warships, manned by nearly 150,000 sailors and marines. This wall kept Britain safe, protected her commerce, and preserved her communications with her colonies. Yet the men of her fleet were so ill-paid, ill-fed, and ill-handled that it was impossible to obtain crews by free enlistment. Many sailors deserted and found refuge on the pleasanter and safer American vessels. In these circumstances, British officers regarded as essential the right of searching American ships and taking off British subjects. When every sailor who spoke English had been a British subject, impressments seldom involved error. But now after the establishment of the United States as an independent nation, the case was different. It was humiliating for American vessels to lay to under the guns of a British cruiser, while a lieutenant and a party of marines lined up the crew and examined them. Moreover, many British officers were charged with being arrogant and unfair, and they impressed bona fide American citizens by the scores and hundreds -ultimately, it was alleged, by the thousands.

To bring Great Britain and France to a fairer attitude without war, Jefferson finally persuaded Congress to pass the Embargo Act, a law altogether forbidding foreign commerce. Its effects were disastrous. On the one hand, the shipping interests were almost ruined by the measure, and discontent rose high in New England and New York. Then the agricultural interests found that they too were suffering heavily, for prices tumbled when the southern and western farmers could not ship overseas their surplus grain, meat, and tobacco. In a single year American exports fell to one-fifth of their former volume. But the hope that the embargo would starve Great Britain into a change of policy failed. As the grumbling at home increased, Jefferson turned to a milder measure which conciliated the domestic shipping interests. Substituted for the embargo was a non-intercourse law which permitted commerce with all countries except Britain or France and their dependencies, and paved the way for negotiations by authorizing the President to suspend the operation of the law against either of these upon the withdrawal of its restrictions upon American trade. In 1810, Napoleon officially announced that he had abandoned his measures in spite of the fact that he continued to maintain them. But the United States believed him and thereafter limited its non-intercourse to Great Britain.

Jefferson finished his second presidential term and James Madison took office in 1809. Relations with Great Britain grew worse, and the two countries drifted rapidly toward war. The President laid before Congress a detailed report, showing 6,057 instances in which the British had impressed American citizens within three years. In addition, northwestern settlers had suffered from attacks by Indians which they believed had been encouraged by British agents in Canada. In 1812, war was declared on Britain.

The United States suffered from internal divisions of the gravest kind. While the south and west favored war, New York and New England in general opposed it. The declaration of war had been made with army preparations still

far from complete. There were fewer than 7,000 regular soldiers distributed in widely scattered posts along the coast, near the Canadian border, and in the remote interior. These were to be supported by the undrilled, undisciplined militia of the several states.

Hostilities began with a triple movement for the invasion of Canada which, if properly timed and executed, would have brought united action against Montreal. But the entire campaign utterly miscarried and ended with the British occupation of Detroit. While action had gone ill on land, however, the navy had, in a measure, restored American confidence. The frigate, Constitution, Captain Isaac Hull in charge, met the British Guerrière southeast of Boston on August 19, and captured her after a fight of thirty minutes, Hull reducing the enemy ship to complete wreckage. Two months later, the American sloop Wasp met the British sloop Frolic and demolished her entirely. This telling work of the navy took the world by surprise. In addition American privateers swarming the Atlantic captured five hundred British vessels during the fall and winter of 1812-13.

The campaign of 1813 centered about Lake Erie in New York state. General William Henry Harrison had led an army of militia, volunteers, and regulars from Kentucky with the object of reconquering Detroit. On September 12, news reached him, while he was still in upper Ohio, that Commodore Oliver Perry had annihilated the enemy's ships on Lake Erie. Two days before, Perry had come upon British vessels and, after two and a half hours of heroic action, thrilled the country with his dispatch, "We have met the enemy and they are ours." Thereafter the take remained in American hands. Harrison was now on the offensive and, in less than a month, upper Canada fell into American control. At the end of the year, however, the English still held Lake Ontario, and the next year and a half saw a series of land and sea engagements which made the military situation a virtual stalemate.

The war was brought to a close by the Treaty of Ghent which was approved by the United States in February 1815. Day by day during the treaty negotiations, both England and the United States gave up more and more of their demands, with the curious result that in the final treaty neither side gained nor lost. It merely provided for the cessation of hostilities, the restoration of conquests, and a commission to settle boundary disputes. Not a word was said about impressments and neutrality rights, the causes for which the war had been so dearly fought. The dramatic victory which a bizarre but formidable army of frontiersmen, under the fiery fighter, Andrew Jackson, won at New Orleans over a strong British force gave the United States some real cause for exultation. Ironically, this took place on January 8, 1815, after the peace treaty had been signed but before it became known in America.

As in every war, losses were devastating. Particularly so to a young and growing country was the loss of 21,000 sailors and 30,000 soldiers killed or injured. Added to that was the destruction of 1,400 ships and enormous financial losses. However, historians agree that the War of 1812 had one important positive result - the strengthening of national unity and patriotism. The fact that men of different states again fought side by side and that a Virginian, Winfield Scott, was the ablest commander of northern troops, added to the sense of national unity. Western troops fought alongside their compatriots from the eastern seaboard, and from this time onward, the west, always national in sentiment, grew in importance in American life.

Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury from 1801 to 1813, asserted that before the conflict Americans were becoming too selfish and too prone to think in local terms. "The war," he said, "has renewed and reinstated the national feeling and character which the Revolution had given, and which were daily lessening. The people have now more general objects of attachment, with which their pride and political opinions are connected. They are more Americans; they

feel and act more as a nation; and I hope that the permanency of the Union is thereby better secured."

PART III:

IMPACTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Chapter seven: The relationships between USA AND UK

British Prime Minister David Cameron's recent visit to Washington has revived interest in what is frequently called the "Special Relationship" between Great Britain and the United States. Through times of war and rebellion, peace and estrangement, as well as becoming friends and allies, Britain and the US cemented these deeply rooted links during World War II into what is known as the "Special Relationship"

The intense level of military co-operation between the United Kingdom and United States began with the creation of the Combined Chiefs of Staff in December 1941, a military command with authority over all American and British operations. Following the end of the Second World War the joint command structure was disbanded, but close military cooperation between the nations resumed in the early 1950s with the start of the Cold War.

Many Americans may be familiar with the phrase, as it is often used to characterize the strength of the ties between London and Washington made manifest by the strong British commitment to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq; by their joint struggle against international terrorism; and by the bonds of language and history, stretching all the way back to the birth of the Thirteen Colonies.

British–American relations also referred to as Anglo-American relations, encompass many complex relations ranging from two early wars to competition for world markets. Since 1940 they have been close military allies enjoying the Special Relationship built as wartime allies, and NATO partners.

Since the Second World War and the subsequent Berlin Blockade, the United States has maintained substantial forces in Great Britain. In July 1948,

the first American deployment began with the stationing ofB-29 bombers. Currently, an important base is the radar facility RAF Fylingdales, part of the US Ballistic Missile Early Warning System, although this base is operated under British command and has only one USAF representative for largely administrative reasons. Several bases with a significant US presence include RAF Men with Hill (only a short distance from RAF Fylingdales), RAF Laken Heath and RAF Milden hall.

Following the end of the Cold War, which was the main rationale for their presence, the number of US facilities in the United Kingdom has been reduced in number in line with the US military worldwide. Despite this, these bases have been used extensively in support of various peacekeeping and offensive operations of the 1990s and early 21st century.

The two nations also jointly operate on the British military facilities of Diego Garcia in the British Indian Ocean Territory and on Ascension Island, a dependency of Saint Helena in the Atlantic Ocean.

The United States and the United Kingdom jointly conducted subcritical nuclear experiments in 2002 and 2006 to determine the effectiveness of existing stocks, as permitted under the 1998 Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Today, the United Kingdom affirms its relationship with the United States as its "most important bilateral partnership" in the current British foreign policy, and the American foreign policy also affirms its relationship with Britain as its most important relationship, as evidenced in aligned political affairs, mutual cooperation in the areas of trade, commerce, finance, technology, academics, as well as the arts and sciences; the sharing of government and military intelligence, and joint combat operations and peacekeeping missions carried out between the United States Armed Forces and the British Armed

Forces. The UK has always been the biggest foreign investor in the US and vice versa.

A Europeanist, Prime Minister Edward Heath preferred to speak of a '"**natural relationship**", based on shared culture and heritage', and stressed that the special relationship was 'not part of his own vocabulary'.

The two nations are bound together by shared history, an overlap in religion and a common language and legal system, and kinship ties that reach back hundreds of years, including kindred, ancestral lines among English Americans, Scottish Americans, Welsh Americans, and Scotch-Irish Americans. Today large numbers of expatriates live in the other country.

Together, they have given the English language a dominant role in many sectors of the modern world.

The United Kingdom is the only collaborative, or Level One, international partner in the largest US aircraft procurement project in history, the F-35 Lightning IIprogram.The United Kingdom was involved in writing the specification and selection and its largest defense contractor, BAE Systems is a partner of the American prime contractor Lockheed Martin. BAE Systems is also the largest foreign supplier to the United States Defense Department and has been permitted to buy important US defense companies such as Lockheed Martin Aerospace Electronic Systems and United Defense.

The United States is the largest source of foreign direct investment to the United Kingdom; likewise the United Kingdom is the largest single foreign direct investor in the United States. British trade and capital have been important components of the American economy since its colonial inception. In trade and finance, the special relationship has been described as 'well-balanced', with London's 'light-touch' regulation in recent years attracting a massive

outflow of capital from New York. The key sectors for British exporters to the United States are aviation, aerospace, commercial property, chemicals and pharmaceuticals, and heavy machinery.

British ideas, classical and modern, have also exerted a profound influence on US economic policy, most notably the historian Adam Smith on free trade and the economist John Maynard Keynes on counter-cyclical spending, while the British government has adopted workfare reforms from the United States. American and British investors share entrepreneurial attitudes towards the housing market, and the fashion and music industries of each country are major influences on their counterparts. Trade ties have been strengthened by globalization, while both governments agree on the need for currency reform in China and educational reform at home to increase their competitiveness against India's developing service. In 2007 the US ambassador suggested to British business leaders that the special relationship could be used 'to promote world trade and limit environmental damage as well as combating terrorism'.

In a press conference that made several references to the special relationship, US Secretary of State John Kerry, in London with UK Foreign Secretary William Hague on 9 September 2013, said

"We are not only each other’s largest investors in each of our countries, one to the other, but the fact is that every day almost one million people go to work in America for British companies that are in the United States, just as more than one million people go to work here in Great Britain for American companies that are here. So we are enormously tied together, obviously. And we are committed to making both the U.S.-UK and the U.S.-EU relationships even stronger drivers of our prosperity."

The relationship often depends on the personal relations between British prime ministers and US presidents. The first example was the close relationship between Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt who were in fact distantly related.

This is the doctrine of interdependence, which must be applied in the world today, if Peace and Prosperity are to be assured.

Chapter eight: The differences between the USA and Great Britain

The differences between the USA and Great Britain are summed up in five points such as:

*The USA practices the federal constitutional republic form of government while the UK uses constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system

*The USA has thifty states and one federal district whereas the UK is a single state kingdom comprised of four different countries

*The USA is more a continent (a clumped piece of land) whereas the UK is more of an archipelago

*The USA has bigger land area than UK as well as a bigger GDP (Gross Domestic Product)

* The UK was a more powerful nation in the 19th century while the USA is the present most powerful nation in the world.

CONCLUSION

The early 19th century in the United Kingdom came with so many troublesome issues at home. The King and his decisions became controversies day after day. The poor economic and religious matters were some big questions that needed to be solved.

Instead of finding ways out of the problems, many British decided to find their ways far away from the problems. In their continuous quest for a better place to live, as their homeland no longer met their needs to really make both ends meet. This situation became worse with the religious pressure. British people were undergoing at home. As time went on, and nothing seemed to change, many English men decided to try their chances elsewhere in an adventure: thus they decided to relocate themselves in what was then known as “The New world». And so the British people have been a massive move to the New world and that is how the thirteen colonies were born.

Starting a new life in a completely wild and hostile environment compare to the one they were used to be quite a challenge to overcome. Settlement was very difficult, many of the early settlers died out of lack of food, adequate medication to face the disease especially smallpox. Also there were the troubles of a new cohabitation with the indigenous Indians which did not make things easy to settlers. As time went on, they began finding harmony not only with the indigenous population, but also with the environment, they started growing crops, building shelter and got themselves involved in trade.

Though there was a breach in terms of cohabitation between “The New England” and Great Britain, the political links still lingered. It was in effect through the different taxations and Acts the mother land still collects from its colonies. But due to exaggeration and greediness, Great Britain awoke the settlers and they rose up to rebel and claimed the independence.

As it should be expected, Great Britain was not ready to grant absolute freedom to his colonies. In a nutshell they continued the pressure implementing foreign policy which did not favour the settlers. This situation created tension between the parties that is Great Britain on one hand and the settlers on the other hand. One the most outstanding example I can mention is the one commonly known as the “The Boston Tea Party” with the settlers damping into the sea British tea ship.

This tension finally turned out to become a war to be precise “the war of the independence”. At the beginning of the war it was quite obvious that the settlers or now a young nation with limited means had no chance against the mighty British fleet, well organized and well trained in the art of war. But against all odds, it was the American who finally won the war thanks to their international allies among which the French.

After the war treaties were signed between both nations to remain at the disposal of each other for business matters. This was a beneficial agreement which would bring benefits to both countries because the first produced and needed a market to deliver its products and the other was a young nation and needed to build itself.

Besides international troubles, there were also some domestic affairs that need attention too. The main problem at that period was organizational and how to make possible the ratification of the different states to the law and regulation of the newly born country on the concept of freedom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1- AHLSTROM, SYDNEY, E. *A Religious history of the American people*, Yale University Press, 1972

2- ALLEN,FREDERICK, L. *The big change: America transforms itself*, 1900-1950, Harper& Row, 1986

3- BAILYN, BERNARD : *Faces of revolution: personalities and themes in the struggle for American independence*, Random house, INC. 1992

4- BAILYN, BERNARD: *Ideological origins of the American revolution*, Harvard University Press, 1967

5- BAILYN, BERNARD , ROBERT, DALLEK and Al :*The Great Republic: A history of the American people*(2vols), 3 ed; D.C. Health, CO. 1985

6- BOORSTIN, DANIEL J.: *The American* (3vols); Vol1:*The colonial experience;* Vol2: *The democratic experience;* Vol3: *The national experience*. Random House; 1975

7- BOWEN, CATHERINE D. *Miracle at Philadelphia: The Story of the constitutional convention, May to September 1787*,Little, Brown and Co; 1986

8- ELAZAR, DANIEL J. :*American federalist, view from the States*, 3rd ed; Harper and Row, 1984

9- EPSTEIN ,DAVID F:*The Political theory of "the Federalist"*, University of Chicago Press, 1984

10- HALBERSTAM, DAV ID: *The best and the brightest*, Fawcett Books, 1993

11- HAMILTON, ALEXANDER; JAMES, MADISON AND JOHN, JAY: *The Federalist Papers*, Bantam Books,1982

12- HANDLIN , OSCAR: *The uprooted*, 2d ed; Little, Brown & Co; 1973

13- HARPER, COLLINS: *The Confederate Nation* 1861-1865,1981 Little, Brown & Co

14- HOWE, DANIEL, W.: *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*, University of Chicago Press, 1984

15- JANDA, KENNETH M. BERRY. JERRY ; GOLDMAN , EDS. :*The challenge of Democracy: Government in America*, 3d ed; Houghton Mifflin, 1992

16- JOHNSON, HAYNES: *Sleepwalking through history: America through the Reagan years*, W.W. Norton & CO; In ; 1991

17- LINEBERRY , ROBERT L.: *Government in America: People, politics and policy*, 4th ed; Scott, Forest man and Co; 1989

18- NASH ,GARY B. AND AL: *The American people: Creating a nation and a society*,(2vols), 2d; Harper Collins.1990

19- NEVINS , ALLAN: *Ordeal of the Union*(4vols), Macmillan Publishing CO;1992

20- PAINE ,THOMAS :Common sense, Macmillan Publishing CO, 1989

21- PATTERSON , SAMUEL C.: *A more perfect union: Introduction to American government*, 4th ed; Brooks/Cole,1989

22- PETERSON, MERRILL D.: *The New nation: A Bibliography*, oxford University Press, 1986

23- PETERSON , MERRILL D.: *Thomas Jefferson & the New Nation: A Bibliography*, Oxford University Press, 1986

24- ROSSITER, CLINTON. ED: *The Federalist papers, by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay*. New American Library, 1961

25- SCHLESINGER, ARTHUR M. JR: *The Crisis of the old Order*, Houghton Mifflin CO. 1988

26- SCHLESINGER, ARTHUR M. JR: *The Politics of Upheaval*, Houghton Mifflin CO; 1988

27- SELLERS, CHARLES HENRY, MAY AND NEIL, R. MCMILLEN:*A Synopsis of American History*7th rev. & comb. Ed; Ivan R. Dee, 1992

28- TOFFLER , ALVIN: *Future Shock*, Bantam Books, 1971

29- VANHORN , CARL E. :*State of the states, Congressional Quarterly*, Inc; 1989

30- WOLFE , TOM: *The right Stuff*, Bantam Books, 1984

31- YORK, NEIL, L.: *Toward a More Perfect Union: Six Essays on the Constitution, State* University of New York Press, 1988

WEB SITES SOURCES

1- http://www.newworldencyclopedia org/entry/Amer. August,14th 2013

2- http:// www.jstor.org/stable/25058618. August, 24th 2013

3- http://www.princeton.edu/~batke/eliot/ March, 3rd 2013

4- http://pik.tv/en/news/story/7290-UK-AM-inkwell sold.July,28th 2013

5- http://www.videosurf.com/videos/peliculas+de+democr.July, 28th 2013

6- www.bbc.co.uk/schools/primaryhistory/victorian_britain. September, 19th 2014

7- www.woodlands-junior.kent.sch.uk/Homework/British/Parliament. September, 19th 2014.