

E 209

.A46

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0000572885A







THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
IN OUR SCHOOL TEXT-BOOKS

CHARLES ALTSCHUL

The American Revolution in Our School Text-Books

AN ATTEMPT TO TRACE THE INFLUENCE OF EARLY SCHOOL EDUCATION
ON THE
FEELING TOWARDS ENGLAND
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BY
CHARLES ALTSCHUL
"

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
JAMES T. SHOTWELL
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

6
3
4
2
1

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

E 209
.A46

COPYRIGHT, 1917,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OCT -8 1917

©CLA476441

no 1.

INTRODUCTION

THE great war has shown the importance of the teaching of history, in the formation of national ideals. From it may come either a clarification of our understanding as to the meaning of the process of which the present forms but a momentary part, or else a perpetuation of misunderstandings which prejudice and uncritical habits of mind have fastened upon us. In either case, as we see it now, the historian, with all the varied data of the past to draw upon, has in his hands more than we had formerly imagined of the moulding of opinion in the present, and therefore of the direction—in general lines—of future policies.

Unfortunately it cannot be said of those histories which are by far the most widely read, that they have been written out of a knowledge of all this varied data of the past. On the contrary, the text-books in history have more commonly been the product of a very limited knowledge of the actual facts of the subjects with which they deal. This limit of vision has naturally gone with a distortion in perspective. They have, for the most part, persisted in perpetuating ancient, uncriticized traditions which have accumulated since the events themselves, rather than attempting bravely and frankly to tell the story of what happened in the light of the time in which it happened. The text-books which have been written recently show a marked improvement in historical perspective, but unfortunately their influence has come too late to affect the generation which to-day is called upon to face the most tremendous issues of which history has record, and which is therefore bound to bring to that decision an imperfect historical judgment. For the teaching of history depends largely upon the text-books used in the schools; and upon that teaching rests, to a large degree, our conception as to the character of nations and national policies.

This has been clearly evident in the teaching of history in

Europe, where the emotional interest in the story of the past has been heightened by the shifting but ever-present conflict of national forces, so that many of the issues at stake are too vital to be treated as discarded elements of ancient things. But if it has been easy for American students to point out the fallacies in European history-books, since the theme is seen more objectively, the discovery leads us less toward complacency as to our own achievements than toward a sharpening of self-criticism. It turns us back upon ourselves for a re-examination of the kind of outlook we have acquired concerning the events and the meaning of the leading features of American history.

Fortunately already before this war the older issues of our past had ceased to dominate in the present. The nation which had conquered a continent learned, after the great task was practically completed, that this conquest was its greatest achievement. It had also willed that the soil it made its own should be free, and that the ideals of democracy should here find a safe and secure abode. America, "home of the free," earned its title by a struggle lasting century-long. From the ever-moving frontier came much of the spirit of its freedom. But this process lacked the picturesque, heroic quality of the first great struggle for liberty, and the Revolution furnished the epic of American history—until the scientific historians of to-day began to show, and the school-books to reflect, the importance of the small events of generations of peaceful lives, making real the ideals of the past.

Before the war came, therefore, a re-valuation of our history was under way. But the war has thrust criticism upon us in other ways. The present study is a good example of it. It is the work of a business-man, intensely interested in the opinions of his fellow-citizens. It makes no claim to "higher criticism". It does not deal with original sources of the history of the problem with which it deals; it is simply an analysis of the basis of that opinion about history and peoples which the author observed in those with whom he came in contact, and who, in spite of admonitions from high quarters, were more intent upon expressing those opinions than upon substantiating them by a study of fact.

It will be seen by any serious student of the period, that

Mr. Altschul has, with rare moderation, limited his survey not only to the text-books he analyzes, but also to a small portion of the subject itself. There are many other angles of approach and many other possibilities of criticism. But the author has preferred to deal thoroughly with the patent facts in his own line of inquiry. He does not attempt to evaluate the "tendencies" of the books with which he deals, nor to enter into the question of general interpretations. That, he feels, is a matter for the research historian. But the method employed is novel and the results of interest, not simply for the citizen who has only such text-book knowledge of the history of his country as is given in the books under review, but for the teacher who even to-day accepts the statements in them as authoritative and final. When the spirit of criticism is awakened in the citizen who has been trained in the old traditions, it is bound to penetrate the schools as well.

There is one large inference Mr. Altschul has justly drawn from the data, and that is that our history has been studied for the most part in a rather superficial manner. The larger inheritance of our institutions and habits of thought, being so intimate a part of us, has been taken for granted without any clear appreciation of how much of it is a product of history that reaches back, in the main, beyond the Revolution. When history is seen to be more than a succession of dramatic events, of wars and crises, an embodiment, rather, of the long life-story of social and political adjustment to ideals through changing environment, a process affecting every generation and linking the common things of daily life to the great purposes of national development, then the story of our achievement will be seen to have a different content and a more practical bearing than the epic which time and the careless memory of men have offered as its substitute. And then, corrected by a wider apprehension of its meaning, the old story, recast to meet the demands of a critical audience, will lend its inspiration to the attainment of juster ideals than provincial and misleading conceptions of a receding past.

JAMES T. SHOTWELL.

PREFACE

SINCE the outbreak of the Great War, it has been highly interesting to watch the drift of American sympathy towards the different belligerent nations, and to note the direction in which it crystallized.

The line between pro-Teuton and pro-Ally sentiment was quickly drawn, but the grouping of those who sympathized with the different Allied nations did not become apparent so soon. Since a long time, however, it has been perfectly evident that there is a very strong pro-French sentiment in this country, while there is no such broad and popular manifestation in favor of the English.

It is not difficult to understand why the sympathy for the French will always assert itself vigorously in the United States. We all cherish a grateful remembrance of the assistance given us by France during our Revolutionary War; we all followed her political difficulties during the last forty years with the deepest interest; we have always recognized and admired the achievements of her people in the arts, in literature, in science; and their generally lighter, more graceful vein charms us and appeals powerfully to our imagination.

In view of the deep significance of the present European contest, it is, however, not easy to account for the apparent lack of a similar sympathy for England—a country which is, in its way, faced with as dire a peril as France, and one which, even though she has not yet suffered as much, would probably undergo deeper humiliation, should the Allies succumb.

We all understand that the historical origin of our nation is one of the causes which dampens the enthusiasm for England; we remember the political agitation which, years ago, aroused slumbering animosities at every election, and which, even in these days, occasionally fans the flames of prejudice. Besides, we recall minor causes of irritation which have, from time to time, sown mutual distrust be-

tween the two nations; and, at the present moment, we must make allowance for the pernicious effect of recent German propaganda.

But, in spite of the controversies which have at times raged between the two peoples, we speak the same language as the English; our customs have been fashioned after theirs; our legal procedure has been founded upon theirs; their ideas of government and their conception of Liberty are ours as well. In spite of the wars we have fought against them, we have never thought of turning to any other nation as a model for what is most essential in our public and private life. Many nationalities have been brought together in this melting pot; but the influence of all other nations remains negligible compared to that of England. She is, after all, the Mother Country, from whom we have acquired what really counts in the long run: language, customs, political liberty, tradition!

Why then, have we not rallied in a much greater measure to the moral support of England in this world upheaval? Why did not the sympathy of the largest proportion of our people go out to the English rather than to any other nation?

It has occurred to me that the explanation of this phenomenon lies in the way in which facts of history, superficially studied without due regard to surrounding circumstances, determine our views in later life; especially if lodged in that mysterious store-house, "the sub-conscious", during childhood, when the spirit in which instruction is given leaves a more indelible mark than do the facts themselves. Impressions gained during the early years of school-life may possibly have had a far-reaching influence in instilling a prejudice against the country whose control we repudiated in the Revolutionary War. Such a prejudice once engendered would be very likely to distort one's vision in connection with everything that relates to the same subject, and yet leave one totally unaware of the part those very school-day influences play in forming one's present opinions.)

In following this line of thought, I have tried to ascertain what impressions pupils are likely to have received from the study of the American Revolution as recorded in our text-books. Have the children been given an adequate or unbiased picture of the conditions which led to the great conflict with the Mother Country; and if not, what general

impressions are they apt to have gained from their earliest studies? Would an impartial presentation of the historical facts have given them different ideas, and would it have prevented possibly wrong and antagonistic notions? Have the pupils, for instance, been shown the gulf which, at that time, separated the King of that day and his friends from the truer representatives of the best thought and traditions of England? Have their minds been directed as forcefully as might have been to the shining example of prominent Englishmen, like Pitt, Burke, Barré, Fox, and others, who lost no opportunity in Parliament to fight in the interest of the Americans, and who never hesitated to risk the displeasure of the King, in attempting to promote the cause of the colonists? In fine, has the history of the greatest event in the life of our nation been taught in the spirit of fair and impartial inquiry for the facts of the case, or in a one-sided manner apt to implant prejudice?

The object of this informal study is to ascertain if satisfactory evidence is available to warrant an answer to these questions; to determine whether we are justified in thinking that the history text-books in use more than twenty years ago may have had a definite prejudicial influence on the minds of a considerable part of our population; and if so, to what extent the text-books in use at present promise a different result.

In following this inquiry, no attempt was made to gather information concerning the Revolutionary Period from sources other than the text-books themselves.

C. A.

New York City, March, 1917.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
IN OUR SCHOOL TEXT-BOOKS

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION IN OUR SCHOOL TEXT-BOOKS

THE great majority of people in this country have probably gained their knowledge of the American Revolution in the first grades of the Public Schools in which they were taught History. Owing to the general custom that a chapter of History, once studied by the pupil, is not taken up again, it would seem that the text-books used in these grades should be a fair index to the knowledge that had been imparted. No doubt, many pupils make a more complete study of certain phases of History at some later time; but this inquiry is confined to the great mass of children that follows only the regular course of our Public Schools.

If one could ascertain how many pupils had acquired their knowledge from each of the different text-books, current at a given time, one could determine pretty closely what general knowledge the pupils of that day are apt to have gained. It is manifestly impossible to secure an accurate picture of that kind, principally because of the complexity of the task, and the lack of instructive records in many communities. Nevertheless, it may be possible to form a fairly reliable opinion of the character of the information which has been disseminated on so striking a subject as the one with which we are concerned—the American Revolution.

The text-books which contain, relatively, the most complete information on this subject represent the situation to have been substantially as follows :

Up to the time when George III. ascended the throne, the colonists greatly valued the connection with the mother country ; the various distinct and separate colonies were at least as much attached to her as to one another ; and many colonists remained loyal throughout the Revolutionary War ;

In spite of their grievances, there was no general disposition to separate from the mother country before 1775 ;

The greatest, wisest, and fairest-minded of England's statesmen were against the King, and fought on many occasions in Parliament in the interest of the Americans ;

Pitt, Burke, Fox, and others, were, in spirit, the allies of Franklin, Adams, and Washington ;

The responsibility for the American Revolution mainly lies at the door of George III. and the "King's Friends" ;

Parliament was, at that time, not representative of the great mass of the English people ; out of a population of approximately 8,000,000 only about 200,000 Englishmen had the right to vote ; and many of these were influenced by illegitimate, disreputable means, adopted by the King in order to gain control of the legislative body ;

The people of England, as a whole, were not, and under the circumstances could not be, responsible for the American Revolution.

How far from these conclusions are the statements from which most of the citizens of this country have drawn their knowledge of the history of the Revolution ?

In an endeavor to reach the sources from which the public gained its information, I have asked Boards of Education,

Superintendents of Public Schools, Principals of High Schools, and personal friends, to send me the names of some of the most popular text-books which were in use more than twenty years ago, in the three lowest grades in which American History was taught, in the Public Schools of their several communities; as well as the names of some of the text-books in use at present.

Correspondents in the following cities kindly answered my inquiries:

Alabama	Montgomery	New Hampshire	Concord
Arizona	Phoenix		Manchester
	Prescott	New Jersey	Newark
	Tucson	New Mexico	Deming
Arkansas	Fort Smith	New York	New York City
California	Sacramento	Nevada	Carson City
	San Diego	North Carolina	Charlotte
	San Francisco		Raleigh
Colorado	Denver	North Dakota	Grand Forks
Connecticut	Hartford	Ohio	Cincinnati
Delaware	Dover		Cleveland
Dist. of Col.	Washington		Columbus
Florida	Tallahassee	Oklahoma	Oklahoma City
Georgia	Atlanta	Oregon	Portland
	Savannah	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia
Idaho	Boise	Rhode Island	Providence
Illinois	Chicago	South Carolina	Charleston
Indiana	Indianapolis		Columbia
Iowa	Des Moines	South Dakota	Aberdeen
	Davenport	Tennessee	Memphis
Kansas	Kansas City		Nashville
	Topeka	Texas	Austin
Kentucky	Louisville		Galveston
Louisiana	New Orleans		San Antonio
Maine	Bangor	Utah	Salt Lake City
Maryland	Baltimore	Vermont	Burlington
Massachusetts	Boston		Montpelier
Michigan	Detroit	Virginia	Richmond
Minnesota	Minneapolis	West Virginia	Charleston
Mississippi	Vicksburg	Washington	Seattle
Missouri	St. Louis		Walla Walla
Montana	Helena	Wisconsin	Madison
	Butte		Milwaukee
Nebraska	Omaha	Wyoming	Cheyenne

I have received answers from every State in the Union, (68 Cities), and have examined the chapters or paragraphs devoted to the Revolutionary Period in the following 93 History text-books to which my attention has been directed in this manner.

List of Text-Books Examined

which were in use more than twenty years ago:

1. Anderson's Popular School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1886.
2. Anderson's New Grammar School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1890.
3. Anderson's Junior Class History of the U. S.—Ed. 1894.
4. Armstrong's Primer of U. S. History.—Ed. 1885.
5. Barnes' Primary History of the U. S.—Ed. 1885.
6. Barnes' Brief History of the U. S., by Steele.—Ed. 1885.
7. California State Series, History of the U. S.—Ed. 1888.
8. Chambers' (Hansell's) School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1887.
9. Chambers' (Hansell's) Higher History of the U. S.—Ed. 1889.
10. Derry's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1882.
11. Eggleston's First Book in American History.—C. R. 1889.
12. Eggleston's History of the U. S. and Its People.—Ed. 1888.
13. Ellis' Eclectic Primary History of the U. S.—Ed. 1884.
14. Field's Grammar School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1897.
15. Fisher's Outlines of Universal History.—Ed. 1897.
16. Fiske's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1894.
17. Gilman's Making of the American Nation.—Ed. 1887.
18. Goodrich's (Parley's) Pictorial Hist. of the U. S.—Ed. 1881.
19. Goodrich's (Seavey's) History of the U. S.—Ed. 1880.
20. Higginson's Young Folks' History of the U. S.—Ed. 1885.
21. Holmes' New School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1895.
22. Johnston's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1895.
23. Lossing's School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1885.
24. Magill's History of Virginia.—Ed. 1904.
25. MacMaster's School History of the U. S.—C. R. 1884.
26. Montgomery's Beginner's American History.—Ed. 1894.
27. Montgomery's Leading Facts of American History.—Ed. 1893.
28. Quackenbos' Elementary History of the U. S.—C. R. 1884.
29. Quackenbos' (Appleton's) School History of the World.—C. R. 1889.
30. Quackenbos' School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1878.
31. Ridpath's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1885.
32. Scudder's Short History of the U. S.—Ed. 1890.
33. Scudder's New History of the U. S.—Ed. 1897.
34. Sheldon's American History (Mary Sheldon Barnes' Studies in Am. Hist.)—Ed. 1892.
35. Swinton's First Lessons in Our Country's History.—Ed. 1872.
36. Swinton's Condensed U. S. School History.—Ed. 1871.
37. Swinton's Outlines of the World's History.—Ed. 1874.
38. Swinton's School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1893.
39. Thalheimer's Eclectic History of the U. S.—Ed. 1881.
40. Thomas' History of the U. S.—Ed. 1897.

List of Text-books examined which are in use at present:

41. Adams and Trent's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1913.
42. Barnes' School History of the U. S., by Steele.—Ed. 1914.
43. Barnes' American History for Grammar Grades.—Ed. 1913.
44. Barnes' Short American History by Grades, I.—Ed. 1913.
45. Barnes' Short American History by Grades, II.—Ed. 1913.
46. Bourne and Benton's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1913.
47. Burton's Builders of Our Nation.—Ed. 1910.
48. Chandler and Chitwood's Makers of American History.—C. R. 1904.
49. Channing's Student's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1913.
50. Chambers' (Hansell's) A School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1913.
51. Connor's The Story of the U. S.—Ed. 1916.
52. Dickson's American History for Grammar Schools.—Ed. 1916.
53. Eggleston's First Book in American History.—Ed. 1915.
54. Eggleston's History of the U. S. and Its People.—Ed. 1915.
55. Eggleston's New Century History of the U. S.—Ed. 1916.
56. Elson's History of the U. S. of America.—Ed. 1913.
57. Elson and MacMullan's Story of Our Country.—Ed. 1915.
58. Evan's First Lessons in Georgia History.—Ed. 1913.
59. Evans' Essential Facts of American History.—Ed. 1915.
60. Estill's Beginner's History of Our Country.—Ed. 1915.
61. Fiske's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1907.
62. Formans' History of the U. S.—Ed. 1916.
63. Foster's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1917.
64. Gordy's Elementary History of the U. S.—Ed. 1913.
65. Gordy's Stories of Later American History.—Ed. 1915.
66. Gordy's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1914.
67. Gorton's Elementary History of the U. S., II.—Ed. 1914.
68. Hall, Smither, and Ousley's Student's Hist. of Our Country.—Ed. 1914.
69. Hamilton's Our Republic.—Ed. 1910.
70. Hart's Essentials in American History.—Ed. 1914.
71. Higginson's Young Folks' History of the U. S.—Ed. 1902.
72. Hodgdon's First Course in American History, II.—Ed. 1908.
73. Lemmon's (Cooper, Estill, and Lemmon's) History of Our Country.—Ed. 1908.
74. Mace's Primary History—Stories of Heroism.—Ed. 1916.
75. Mace's Beginner's History.—Ed. 1916.
76. Mace's School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1914.
77. MacMaster's Primary History of the U. S.—Ed. 1915.
78. MacMaster's Brief History of the U. S.—1915.
79. MacMaster's School History of the U. S.—Ed. 1916.
80. Montgomery's Elementary American History.—Ed. 1915.
81. Montgomery's Beginner's American History.—Ed. 1915.
82. Montgomery's Leading Facts of American History.—Ed. 1916.
83. Morris' History of the U. S. of America.—Ed. 1916.
84. Perry and Price's American History, II.—Ed. 1914.
85. Sheldon's American History (Mary Sheldon Barnes' Studies in Am. Hist.)—Ed. 1907.

86. Swan's History and Civics, Fifth Year, II.—Ed. 1915.
87. Tappan's Elementary History of Our Country.—Ed. 1916.
88. Thomas' Elementary History of the U. S.—Ed. 1916.
89. Thompson's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1915.
90. Thwaites and Kendall's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1915.
91. Woodburn and Moran's Elementary American Hist. & Govt.—
Ed. 1914.
92. Woodburn and Moran's American History and Government.—
Ed. 1914.
93. White's Beginner's History of the U. S.—Ed. 1916.

Some of these text-books may not have been responsible for the earliest impressions of the pupils on this subject; others which did have such an influence certainly exist, but did not come to my notice. The plan, however, on which this study has been developed, was to accept the replies to inquiries sent out, as a fair reflection of general conditions, and to avoid broadening the investigation.

The picture which is thereby revealed of the teaching of American History throughout the country, cannot but be very incomplete, as there are innumerable communities and numberless text-books, and those which I have examined form but a fraction of the whole. Besides, it is impossible to ascertain how many pupils studied from one particular book, and how many made use of another.

In spite of this, the picture is probably fairly representative. An earnest effort was made to secure the most popular text-books from the principal City of each State, and in some instances, for special reasons, from some other cities besides; and it is reasonably safe to assume that the smaller communities have followed the lead of their larger neighbors in matters of education.

The result of my investigation follows. The books have been arranged in five groups. In a few instances, it has been difficult to determine to which group a book properly belonged. In each such case, the book has been given the most favorable classification possible.

Of 40 text-books in use more than twenty years ago:	Of 53 text-books in use at present:	
4	6	deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, give an account of general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, and give credit to prominent Englishmen for the services they rendered the Americans;
4	14	deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make some reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, and mention some prominent Englishmen who rendered services to the Americans;
11	13	deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, but make, at least, favorable mention of several prominent Englishmen;
7	5	deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, but mention, at least, Pitt;
14	15	deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, nor to any prominent Englishmen who devoted themselves to the cause of the Americans.*

*Practically all the text-books mention Pitt in connection with the war against France in America, and in connection with the naming of Pittsburgh. This inquiry is however not directed to the period in which those incidents occurred.

This numerical comparison by itself may be, to some extent, misleading; it gives the picture from one angle only. It is essential to gain, besides, an impression of the relative distribution of the different text-books throughout the country. The number of pupils who are apt to have acquired knowledge from any of these books, can be more accurately estimated if we have some idea, in which particular communities, and in how many different ones, each separate text-book has been used.

The following lists may throw some light on this subject. In order to enable as close a comparison as possible, only one City in a State is recorded in the lists referring to each text-book, even though, in some instances, the particular book was mentioned in replies from several cities in the same State.

CITIES FROM WHICH THE USE OF EACH
SEPARATE TEXT-BOOK WAS
REPORTED

BOOKS IN USE MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS
AGO

Group One

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, give an account of general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, and give credit to prominent Englishmen for the services they rendered the Americans.

Four Books			
7*	16	33	40
San Francisco	New York Washington	Columbus Concord New York Philadelphia	Charleston, W. Va. New York

* The numbers correspond with the numbers of the text-books as listed on pages 18, 19, and 20.

Group Two

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make some reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, and mention some prominent Englishmen who rendered services to the Americans.

Four Books

17 Columbus	20 Columbus Concord New York	22 Columbus	23 Hartford
----------------	---------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Group Three

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, but make, at least, favorable mention of several prominent Englishmen.

Eleven Books

9 Charlotte Nashville New Orleans Vicksburg	10 Richmond	14 Atlanta	15 Nashville
18 Charleston, W. Va. Charlotte	19 Raleigh	21 Richmond	27 Burlington Chicago Cleveland Concord Grand Forks Indianapolis New York Philadelphia
34 New York Salt Lake City	36 New York San Francisco Savannah	38 Davenport New York	

Group Four

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, but mention, at least, PITT.

Seven Books

1	2	3	24
Cincinnati Newark New York	Denver Detroit Louisville Newark New York Omaha Philadelphia Salt Lake City	New York Philadelphia	Richmond
	29	31	39
	Memphis New York	Aberdeen Kansas City Sacramento	Columbus Galveston Minneapolis New York

Group Five

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, nor to any prominent Englishmen who devoted themselves to the cause of the Americans.

Fourteen Books

4	5	6	8
New York	Charleston, W. Va. Dover Galveston Philadelphia San Francisco Vicksburg	Aberdeen Bangor Boise City Charlotte Cheyenne Chicago Columbia Concord Deming Denver Detroit Grand Forks Kansas City Louisville Milwaukee Montpelier New York Philadelphia Providence San Antonio San Francisco St. Louis	Charlotte Memphis New Orleans Vicksburg

11

New York
Philadelphia
Salt Lake City

12

Charlotte
Chicago
Deming
Detroit
Madison
Newark
New York
Philadelphia
Portland
Washington

13

Columbus
Indianapolis
New York
San Diego

25

New York
Portland

26

Burlington
New York
Phoenix

28

New York

30

Baltimore

32

New York
Philadelphia

35

Columbia
Galveston
Milwaukee
New York
Philadelphia
Savannah
Tallahassee
Walla Walla

37

New York
Savannah

CITIES FROM WHICH THE USE OF EACH SEPARATE TEXT-BOOK WAS REPORTED

BOOKS IN USE AT PRESENT

Group One

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists give, an account of general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, and give credit to prominent Englishmen for the services they rendered the Americans.

Six Books

49
Boise City
Boston
Butte
Louisville
Manchester

52
Boston
Detroit
Milwaukee

61
Boston
Denver
Kansas City
New York
Salt Lake City

67
New York

91
Boston
Chicago
Newark
New York
Philadelphia

92
Boston
Columbus
Detroit
Madison

Group Two

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make some reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, and mention some prominent Englishmen who rendered services to the Americans.

Fourteen Books

41 Boston Fort Smith Savannah	43 New York	44 New York	45 New York
46 Aberdeen Burlington Cheyenne Cincinnati Concord Detroit Louisville Philadelphia Providence	47 Chicago Columbus	56 Hartford Milwaukee San Antonio	63 Kansas City
66 Bangor Boston Burlington Butte Concord Des Moines Grand Forks Hartford Indianapolis Kansas City Milwaukee New York Philadelphia Salt Lake City Vicksburg	68 Austin	71 Boston	73 Galveston Savannah
	84 New York Philadelphia	87 Bangor Boston Concord	

Group Three

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, but make, at least, favorable mention of several prominent Englishmen.

Thirteen Books

65
Seattle

69
Charlotte
Richmond
Tallahassee

70
Boston
Portland

74
Baltimore
Dover
Hartford
Helena
Indianapolis
Minneapolis
Tucson

75
Baltimore
Cleveland
Hartford
New York
Philadelphia
San Francisco
St. Louis

76
Baltimore
Butte
Carson City
Charlotte
Chicago
Des Moines
Detroit
Hartford
Milwaukee
Montpelier
New York
Philadelphia
Portland
Tucson
St. Louis

78
Boston
Butte
Denver
Milwaukee
New York
Philadelphia
San Francisco

82
Aberdeen
Bangor
Boston
Carson City
Cheyenne
Hartford
Newark
New York
Philadelphia
Washington

83
Milwaukee
New York
Philadelphia

85
Boston
Salt Lake City

86
New York

88
Boston
San Diego

90
Aberdeen
Boston
Des Moines
Madison
Milwaukee
Philadelphia

Group Four

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, but mention, at least, PITT.

Five Books

51 Raleigh	57 New York Seattle	64 Bangor Boston Hartford Newark New York Topeka	72 Chicago
	89 Atlanta Charleston, S. C. Charlotte Columbia Memphis Montgomery		

Group Five

Text-books which deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, nor to any prominent Englishmen who devoted themselves to the cause of the Americans.

Fifteen Books

42 New York	48 Baltimore Memphis Richmond	50 Savannah	53 Baltimore Boston, New York
54 New York San Diego	55 New York	58 Savannah Tallahassee	59 Oklahoma
60 Austin New Orleans	62 Chicago Detroit Louisville Omaha Philadelphia	77 Chicago New York	79 Cincinnati New York San Diego
80 Bangor Boston Newark New York Washington	81 Bangor Charleston, W. Va. Columbia Dover Hartford Newark New York Washington	93 Charleston, S. C. Charlotte	

These data can likewise merely serve as an indication. Correspondents in some cities have reported more books in active use than others have done, so that existing conditions are no doubt only partially reflected. It must also be borne in mind that the circulation of different text-books in a given city is very unequal, and that, therefore, one text-book used in a community may reach a greater number of pupils than another.

Making, however, full allowance for the different inaccuracies in this review which have been pointed out as unavoidable, and for others which may have crept in unnoticed, the conclusions seem nevertheless fairly well justified:

The great majority of History text-books, used in our Public Schools more than twenty years ago, gave a very incomplete picture of general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, and either did not refer at all to the great efforts made by prominent Englishmen in behalf of the Colonies, or mentioned them only casually;

The number of separate History text-books which gave this incomplete picture was not only much larger than the number of those giving more complete information, but the former circulated in many more communities throughout our country than the latter;

The public mind must thereby have been prejudiced against England;

The children now studying American History in the Public Schools have a far greater number of text-books available which give relatively complete information on this subject; but the improvement is by no means sufficiently marked to prevent continued growth of unfounded prejudice against England.

A perusal of the accompanying extracts from the different text-books here referred to will give a more accurate impression of the picture which these classifications attempt to summarize.

EXTRACTS

BOOKS IN USE MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS
AGO

GROUP ONE

Text-books
which

deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
give an account of general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
and give credit to prominent Englishmen
for the services they rendered the Americans.

P. 112: The feeling of Americans toward the home government was never more loyal than at the close of the French war. Royal governors asserted that the colonies were aiming at independence, but Americans, with one voice, denied the charge. They looked forward to a great development, but under the British flag. The colonies loved England far more than they loved one another.

P. 113: George III. and his Influence.—The measures, which in a dozen years changed Americans from loyal English subjects into the defenders of a new nationality, "fighting for their just and equal position among the powers of the earth," must not be regarded as the unanimous will of the people of England. George III., king from 1760 to 1820, assumed the crown as a young man obstinately minded to rule in his own fashion. He did not, like the Stuarts, seek to override Parliament, but he made a corrupt Parliament the servant of his will. The English monarch united with the aristocracy ruling in Parliament to suppress public opinion in England and self-government in America. Even a king cannot stop the growth of nations, and beneath the tyranny of George III. arose government by the people in both England and America.

P. 115: Pitt was out of power and absent from Parliament on account of sickness. One opponent of the bill, however, spoke of Americans as "sons of liberty", trained by hardship and danger to maintain their rights. His word received no attention in England, but the "sons of liberty" heard them in America.

P. 118: In England merchants were threatened with ruin by the loss of American trade and petitioned for a repeal. Grenville had lost his position. Pitt declared "This kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies. I rejoice that America has resisted." Fierce debates raged in Parliament on the question of repeal, for Parliament had deliberately proclaimed its right to tax the colonies, and was reluctant to take back its words. The repeal was carried in March, 1766, but at the same time a Declaratory Act was passed, opposed only by Pitt and a few others, stating the right of Parliament "to bind the colonies and people of America in all things whatsoever." An outburst of joy in England and America greeted the news of repeal. Americans cared very little about the declaratory act so long as nothing was done to enforce it. "They blessed their sovereign, revered the wisdom and the goodness of the British Parliament, and felt themselves happy."

P. 119: This was the spirit of the succeeding English legislation that led to the American Revolution—the legislation of an English Parliament which did not represent the will of the English people, but was controlled and managed by George III.

*The numbers correspond with the numbers of the text-books as listed on pages 18, 19, and 20.

P. 120: "It is the weight of that preamble," said the noble-minded Burke, defending the rights of Americans on the floor of the House of Commons, "and not the weight of the duty, that the Americans are unable and unwilling to bear."

P. 121: Americans hated the British soldiers, now stationed both at New York and Boston, for their presence was a constant reminder of threatened slavery.

P. 122: George III., in 1770, began a method of ruling the colonies by royal orders. Not waiting for the formality of an act of Parliament, he sent instructions, over his own signature, to be executed by the colonial governors through military force, if necessary. By these orders, colonial assemblies were dissolved, unusual places were set for their meeting, and their organization was interfered with. Americans for the most part were opposed to the slave trade, but the king ordered them to cease their efforts to stop it.

P. 123: The Tea Tax, 1773.—Americans up to this time had been in the habit of expressing loyalty to the king, and of blaming only his ministers and corrupt majorities in Parliament for their troubles. They did not know that the king's will controlled both ministry and Parliament. The king was anxious "to try the question with America," and the tea tax was selected for the experiment.

P. 127: In Parliament there were great debates on American affairs. Burke delivered an immortal speech in favor of conciliation (March 22d, 1775), proclaiming that the fierce spirit of liberty in America could not be conquered, but his eloquence fell unheeded upon a nation whose pride of mastery had been wounded. The policy of the king and ministry went on unchecked.

P. 157: Opinions of Englishmen.—After Burgoyne's surrender, the Earl of Chatham (Pitt), in the English House of Lords, repeated what Burke had proclaimed to the House of Commons in 1775: "My Lords", he said, "you cannot conquer America. In three years' campaign we have done nothing and suffered much. You may swell every expense, accumulate every assistance you can buy or borrow, traffic and barter with every little pitiful German prince, your efforts are forever vain and impotent, doubly so from this mercenary aid on which you rely, for it irritates to an incurable resentment. If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms—*never, NEVER, NEVER.*" In the House of Commons Burke continued to speak for the Americans, supported now by Charles James Fox, the youngest defender of the American cause, and one of the most brilliant of English statesmen. Even now Fox demanded the recognition of American independence.

"THE LEGISLATION OF AN ENGLISH PARLIAMENT WHICH DID NOT REPRESENT THE WILL OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE."

From Fiske's *History of the United States*

[16]

P. 182: . . . and the smuggling of foreign goods into Boston and New York and other seaport towns was winked at. . . .

P. 191: As the Americans would not buy or use the stamps, Parliament repealed the Stamp Act the next year, 1766, after a fierce debate that lasted three months. William Pitt declared that such an act should never have been passed, and he praised the Americans for resisting a bad and dangerous law. The majority in Parliament did not take this view; they repealed the law as a concession to the Americans, but declared that Parliament had a right to make whatever laws it pleased. But some men of great influence agreed with Pitt in holding that such a form of taxation without representation was unconstitutional and ought to be resisted.

Taxation in England. The People of London were delighted at the repeal of the Stamp Act, and it seemed as if all the trouble were at an end. So it might have been, but for that agreement of opinion between the Americans and Pitt. In getting such a powerful friend in Pitt, the Americans found an implacable enemy in the new king, George III., who had come to the throne in 1760, at the age of twenty-two. There was then going on in England a hot dispute over this very same business of "no taxation without representation", and it was a dispute in which the youthful king felt bound to oppose Pitt to the bitter end. Let us see just what the dispute was.

In such a body as the British House of Commons or the American House of Representatives, the different parts of the country are represented according to population. For example, today New York, with over 5,000,000 inhabitants, has thirty-four representatives in Congress, while Delaware, with about 170,000 inhabitants, has only one representative. This is a fair proportion; but as population increases faster in some places than in others, the same proportion is liable to become unfair. To keep it fair it must now and then be changed. In the United States, every tenth year, after a new census has been taken, we have the seats in the House of Representatives freshly distributed among the States, so that the representation is always kept pretty fair. A hundred men in any one part of the country count for about as much as a hundred in any other part.

Now in England, when George III. came to the throne, there had been nothing like a redistribution of seats in the House of Commons for more than two hundred years. During that time, some old towns and districts had dwindled in population, and some great cities had lately grown up, such as Manchester and Sheffield. These cities had no representatives in Parliament, which was as absurd and unfair as it would be for a great state like Missouri to have no representatives in Congress. On the other hand, the little towns and thinly peopled districts kept on having just as many representatives as ever. One place, the famous Old Sarum, had members in Parliament long after it had ceased to have any inhabitants at all

The result was that people who could not get representation in Parliament by fair means got it by foul means. Seats for the little towns and districts were simply bought and sold, and such practices made political life at that time very corrupt. Parliament did not truly represent the people of Great Britain; it represented the group of powerful persons that could buy up enough seats to control a majority of votes.

During the reigns of the first two Georges, this group of powerful persons consisted of the leaders of the party of Old Whigs. They ruled England, and reduced the power of the crown to insignificance. Their rule was mostly wise and good, but it was partly based on bribery and corruption. The Old Whigs may be called the Aristocratic party. Among their leaders were such great men as Charles Fox and Edmund Burke.

When George III. became king, he was determined to be a real king, to set the old Whig families at defiance, and to rule Great Britain according to his own notions. In these views the young king was generally supported by the Tories, whom we may call the Royalist party. In order to succeed in their schemes, it was necessary to beat the old Whigs at their own game, and secure a steady majority in Parliament by methods involving bribery and corruption.

Besides these two parties of Tories and Old Whigs, a third had been for some time growing up. It was called the party of New Whigs. As opposed alike to Royalists and Aristocrats, the New Whigs were the Democrats of that time. Among sundry reforms advocated by them, the most important was the redistribution of seats in the House of Commons. They wished to stop the wholesale corruption, and to make that assembly truly represent the people of Great Britain. The principal leader of this party was William Pitt, who, in 1766, became Earl of Chatham.

We can now see why the antagonism between the king and Pitt was so obstinate and bitter. With a reformed Parliament, the king's schemes would be nowhere; their only chance of success lay in keeping the old kind of Parliament with all its corruptions. So when Pitt declared that it was wrong for the people of great cities, like Leeds and Birmingham, who paid their full share of taxes, not to be represented in Parliament, the king felt this to be a very dangerous argument. He felt bound to oppose it by every means in his power.

Now the debates on the Stamp Act showed that the same principle applied to the Americans as to the inhabitants of Birmingham and Leeds. "No taxation without representation," the watchword of Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams, was also the watchword of William Pitt. The king, therefore, felt that in the repeal of the Stamp Act, no matter on what ground, the New Whigs had come altogether too near winning a victory. He could not let the matter rest, but felt it necessary to take it up again, and press it until the Americans should submit to be taxed by Parliament. This quarrel between George III. and the Americans grew into the Revolutionary War. In that struggle, the people of England were not our enemies; we had nowhere better friends than among the citizens of London, and on the floors of the House of Commons and the

House of Lords. As a rule, the New Whigs and Old Whigs sympathized with the Americans; of the Tories, some went heartily with the king, while others disapproved his measures, but were unwilling to oppose them. Among the Americans there were a good many Tories, mostly of the latter class.

P. 201: This sending of the tea was not a commercial operation, but simply a political trick. It was George III.'s way of asking the Americans, "What are you going to do about it?" Such an insulting challenge merited the reception which it got.

P. 202: By sunrise next morning, the revenue officers would board the ships and unload their cargoes, the consignees would go to the custom house and pay the duty, and thus the king's audacious scheme would be crowned with success. The only way to prevent such a wicked result was to rip open the tea chests and spill their contents into the sea—

P. 208: His only reply was a proclamation calling for troops to put down the rebellion in America. Finding that Englishmen generally were unwilling to volunteer in a war for that purpose, he hired about 20,000 German troops from the Duke of Brunswick, the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, and other petty princes.

Nothing went further to enrage the Americans and urge them forward to a declaration of independence than this hiring of foreigners to fight against them.

"PARLIAMENT DID NOT TRULY REPRESENT
THE PEOPLE OF GREAT BRITAIN."

From Scudder's *A New History of the United States*

[33]

P. 126: Now Parliament was supposed to be the choice of the people; in reality it was the mouthpiece of a few powerful families. There was, however, one notable exception, William Pitt, called the Great Commoner, because the people at large instinctively felt that he was their champion and leader. Pitt was at the head of a rising party known as the New Whigs. Their aim was to make Parliament really represent the people instead of being a political machine used by the Old Whig group. This party, though a small one at first, was, in fact, fighting for constitutional liberty in England.

When George III. came to the throne, a new, or more strictly speaking, the revival of an old force in government was seen. As the Stuart kings had tried to establish a nearly absolute monarchy, so George III. was determined to be the real ruler of the country. He drew about him the Tory party, and undertook by means of his cabinet to manage the affairs of England and her colonies. It is needful to bear this in mind, if one would understand the attitude which America bore to England.

P. 128: There was nothing unusual in the attitude which England took toward the colonies. They belonged to her according to the theory of the time, and moreover she had just been waging a costly war.

P. 129: "Taxation without representation is Tyranny."—This sentence became a watchword in America during the exciting times which followed. The people meant by the phrase that they were as much Englishmen as those who lived in England. They said that for Parliament to tax them without giving them a voice in making the laws, either in Parliament or in their own assemblies, was to treat them as if they were a subject people.

The force of the watchword is more apparent if we consider that the American people were far more directly and completely represented in their assemblies than the English were in Parliament. The right to vote for members of Parliament was confined to certain classes in England, and the members elected did not in any special way represent the interests of the place where they were elected. In America, all but a few men had the right to vote, and the members elected to the assemblies spoke for their neighbors.

P. 133: The effect was felt in England, where a small party in Parliament upheld the colonists. In the House of Commons William Pitt uttered the memorable words: "The gentlemen tell us that America is obstinate, America is almost in open rebellion. Sir, I rejoice that America has resisted! Three millions of people, so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest."

P. 136: There was no quarrel between the king's ministry and Parliament, but the colonies for some time maintained the position

that they were loyal subjects of the king and resisted only the illegal acts of Parliament.

P. 150: And yet the cause of the Americans was upheld by some of the greatest Englishmen of the day, who perceived clearly that the cause was one of free government, and that England was deeply concerned. Edmund Burke, one of the most far-sighted statesmen of the time, spoke earnestly in Parliament against the policy the King was pursuing. The Earl of Chatham, also, in the House of Lords, though failing in strength of body, was unceasing in his opposition to the repressive policy.

P. 173: But King George, whose insanity was gaining on him, hated the Earl of Chatham with a furious hatred, and utterly refused to call him to his aid as prime minister. He might even have been compelled to call him, and Chatham might even then have restored peace and formed some kind of union between Great Britain and America, but he died shortly after.

“GEORGE III. UNDERTOOK BY MEANS OF HIS
CABINET TO MANAGE THE AFFAIRS OF
ENGLAND AND HER COLONIES.”

From Thomas' *History of the United States*

[40]

P. 81: In England, law-makers were, or professed to be, elected by the people to represent them, and so the people had a voice in laying their own taxes; but the colonists were not represented in the British Parliament, and so if Parliament laid taxes upon the colonists there would be "taxation without representation", which was contrary to the custom and principles of the colonists.

P. 82: . . . and that colonies existed for the good of the mother country was an axiom of most governments.

P. 83: In considering the relations between England and the colonies, it must be remembered that the English government at this time was very corrupt, and bribery was recognized, even by the officers of state, as a regular means of securing legislation. The House of Commons no longer represented the English people, for in a population of about 8,000,000, there were less than 175,000 voters. The election districts had not been changed for a very long time, large cities had grown up without any representation at all, and other districts represented a very small population. In one place, Old Sarum, three voters elected two members of Parliament. By this means many members of Parliament were chosen according to the wish of those of the nobility who were large landlords, and controlled the votes of their tenants. As a matter of fact, for a good part of the eighteenth century the House of Commons was ruled by the House of Lords.

Notwithstanding that the British Parliament was so little of a representative body, it is likely that most of their measures relating to the colonies were fairly in accord with the common sentiments of the people, for neither the people nor the Parliament understood the real state of affairs.

FOOT NOTE: The great William Pitt entered Parliament (1735) as a member for Old Sarum, owing his election to the influence of the noble landowner of that district.

P. 85: There was little opposition to the passage of the act in Parliament, Colonel Isaac Barré making the only strong speech against it. In this speech he repudiated the idea that the colonists owed anything to English care, but claimed that her neglect had rather stimulated them. This speech, as well as others, gained him the admiration of the Americans, and they adopted as their own a phrase he used on another occasion when he called them "Sons of Liberty."

P. 87: William Pitt, in the House of Commons, said, "I rejoice that America has resisted"; but he also said, "I assert the authority of this kingdom over the colonists to be sovereign and supreme in every circumstance of government and legislation whatever—Taxation is no part of the legislative or governing power. Taxes are a

voluntary gift and grant of the Commons alone." Moved by all these things, Parliament, in 1766, repealed the Stamp Act, but at the same time passed a Declaratory Act, setting forth that "the crown, with the advice and consent of Parliament," "had, hath, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies and peoples of America, subjects of the crown of Great Britain in all cases whatever."

It is important to remember that the object of this taxation was not to help pay the expenses of the government at home, nor was it to help pay the interest on the debt, but all the expected revenue was to be spent in or for the colonies themselves.

P. 88: The grounds of their objection were that the money was raised without their consent, and that the taxes were laid by a body in which they had no representation.

P. 93: William Pitt, now become Earl of Chatham, was prevented by ill health from taking any part in political matters; . . .

P. 95: Though Burke, Barré, and Chatham opposed these bills, they were passed by large majorities in Parliament.

P. 103: There was now presented the curious spectacle of a Congress fighting against the armies of the king, and exercising many of the prerogatives of an independent government, and yet protesting that it had no wish for independence.

PICTURE OF THE CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION AND OF THE
EFFORTS MADE BY PROMINENT ENG-
LISHMEN IN FAVOR OF THE
COLONIES.

BOOKS IN USE MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS
AGO

GROUP TWO

Text-books
which
deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make some reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
and mention some prominent Englishmen
who rendered services to the Americans.

From Gilman's *The Making of the American Nation*

[17]

P. 8: The Americans had no desire to be represented in the home government, and they did not complain that they were constrained in their personal liberty; but they objected to the navigation laws that kept them from buying and selling where they pleased, and they complained that they were arbitrarily taxed in vexatious ways.

P. 13: The intention of the British government was to make all American trade profitable to England only; and next to govern the colonies from England, not allowing the inhabitants any voice in the matter. The ministers of the king told the English people that taxes upon the Americans would make their own lighter, as I have shown. They were mistaken in thinking that the colonists would bear such an imposition.

P. 43: When King George the Third heard that the Stamp Act, which was a favorite of his, had been resisted,—in fact, that it was not allowed to go into effect anywhere,—he was very wroth. He was an obstinate, self-willed man, very fond of authority, and especially determined that his subjects, English and American, should not share his power. He was not a good king for England at that time.

The people of the mother-country were not truly represented by the rulers. From the king down, those in authority lacked the kind feeling for their American brethren that was felt by most of the middle class of Englishmen. Britons generally loved liberty quite as much as the Americans, and they professed to like fair play. They did not all, or most of them, think that the stamp act was right, and there were not wanting men among them who dared to speak out plainly in favor of repealing.

William Pitt was one of these outspoken men. He made a great speech in Parliament in which he said, "I shall never own the justice of taxing America internally, until she enjoys the right of representation . . . I rejoice that America has resisted." The great orator, Edmund Burke, was another.

P. 52: In studying this period of our history, we must not forget that all Englishmen did not think with the king, and that all Americans even did not feel sure that the colonists were right. . . .

P. 76: If the war had been popular in England, the difficulty would not have been so great. The citizens of London were very much opposed to fighting their brethren, and so were many of the people of other cities.

"THE PEOPLE OF THE MOTHER COUNTRY
WERE NOT TRULY REPRESENTED BY
THE RULERS."

From Higginson's *Young Folks' History of the United States*

[20]

P. 160: When we think about the Revolutionary War, we are very apt to suppose that the colonies deliberately came together, and resolved to throw off the yoke of Great Britain. But this was not the case at all. When the troubles began, most of the people supposed themselves to be very loyal; and they were ready to shout "God save King George!" Even after they had raised armies, and had begun to fight, the Continental Congress said, "We have not raised armies with the ambitious design of separating from Great Britain, and establishing independent States." They would have been perfectly satisfied to go on as they were, if the British Government had only treated them in a manner they thought just; that is, if Great Britain either had not taxed them, or had let them send representatives to parliament in return for paying taxes. This wish was considered perfectly reasonable by many of the wisest Englishmen of that day; and these statesmen would have gladly consented to either of these measures. But King George III. and his advisers would not consent; . . .

P. 161: There was nothing very bad about the law called the "Stamp Act", in itself; and Englishmen would not have complained of it at home. . . . Even in the British Parliament, when the Stamp Act was being discussed, there were persons who had been in America, and who declared that the imposed law was very unjust. The member to whom the people of America felt most grateful, was Colonel Barré, who had fought under General Wolfe at the taking of Quebec.

P. 165: Similar things happened in other States; so that nobody dared to act as stamp-officer, and the law was never enforced. The news went quickly to England; and, while the king and his ministers were enraged, there were many in parliament to defend the cause of the Americans.

The statesman, William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, said, "The gentleman tells us that America is obstinate; America is almost in open rebellion. *I rejoice that America has resisted.*"

By the strong efforts of such men as Lord Chatham, the Stamp Act was repealed in just a year from its passage; . . .

P. 169: This affair made an intense excitement; and Captain Preston (who had given the order to fire, at the Boston Massacre) was tried for murder. But some of the leading lawyers of Boston, who were also eminent patriots, defended him on the ground that he had done his duty as an officer; and he was acquitted. . . .

P. 171: . . . and men felt more and more disposed to resist what they thought the unlawful acts of King George and his ministry.

P. 174: Instead of this, it made them (the colonies) unite more firmly, and take up the cause of Boston as their own.

This was just what the wisest men in the British parliament, such as Edmund Burke and Charles James Fox, had predicted. They had warned the government that the American people would be driven into open rebellion by such measures. But King George was a very obstinate man, and used all his influence in parliament to push such laws through.

P. 176: Then we must remember that there were other men, and often good men, too, who felt very sad about all this, and who thought that it was very wrong to resist King George, and that it would ruin the colonies even to attempt such a thing; and who tried, with tears in their eyes, to persuade the patriots to listen to reason. These were generally the rich and prosperous men, and those who held offices under the British government; in short, the people who had most to lose by war in any case.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN ATTITUDE OF THE
KING AND OF PROMINENT ENGLISH-
MEN INDICATED.

From Johnston's *History of the United States*

[22]

P. 81: The British government was neither wise nor prudent. Most of its power was in the hands of the Parliament, which was not elected by the whole people. By artful contrivance or by accident, the laws of election were such that a few rich men, nobles or landowners, controlled the election of most of the members of the House of Commons. In most matters, these richer men were divided into two parties, which opposed one another. In regard to American affairs, they were now united by reason of heavy taxes in a claim which could not help making them the enemy of the colonies.

. . . The Parliament had forced the kings to yield to it the power to lay taxes in Great Britain: it now began to claim a right to lay taxes on the colonies, even against the will of the colonies themselves . . .

P. 82: On this question, of "Taxation without Representation," the Parliament and the colonies were now to quarrel for twelve years until force was used; then came the Revolutionary War.

P. 84: The British government was taken aback by the stir in America. English manufacturers petitioned for the repeal of the Stamp Act, for the American merchants and people had agreed not to buy any more English goods until the repeal should take place. Pitt and other friends of the colonies in Parliament urged the repeal. Finally, there was a change of government in Great Britain, another political party came into power, and early in 1766 the act was repealed. Parliament still declared its right to tax the colonies, if it should wish to do so; but the Americans were convinced that it would never again attempt to do so, and were willing to make the repeal pleasant for Great Britain.

P. 85: . . . but the colonists in general were very anxious to show that they were "loyal subjects of the King—God bless him!" . . .

At first, they only suggested different means by which members from the colonies might be admitted to Parliament. Many eminent men in Great Britain desired such an arrangement, and it is possible that it might have been successful. But the king, an honest but very obstinate man, had lofty ideas of his own dignity, and was determined to make the colonies submit without debate. His friends in Parliament now began a new scheme, which increased all the previous difficulties a hundredfold.

P. 103: The people in England had offered many expressions of sympathy for the colonies. A number of officers in the army had resigned their commissions rather than serve in America. Petitions against the war had been offered to the king and Parliament from many towns. The city of London had declared its abhorrence of the measures designed to oppress "our fellow subjects in the colonies," and had begged the king to change his government. But

none of these expressions had any influence upon those who had power in Great Britain; and, as the war grew angrier, English expressions of sympathy for the colonies became fewer. . . .

The hired soldiers from Hesse-Cassel, called Hessians, who could speak no English, were particularly hated by the colonists, and were accused of numberless cruelties during the war.

CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLU-
TION REFERRED TO, BUT NO ADE-
QUATE MENTION OF THE SERVICES
RENDERED THE COLONIES BY
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Lossing's *School History of the United States*

[23]

P. 115: The colonists could not complain of the willful exercise of actual tyranny by the rulers of Great Britain. There was no motive for such conduct. They complained of an illiberal policy toward them, rigidly enforced, concerning manufactures and commerce; the exactions and haughtiness of the royal governors sent to rule them without their leave; and above all, the exercise, by the home government, of the asserted right to tax the colonists without their consent, and without allowing them representatives in the British Parliament.

P. 116: A young monarch, virtuous and of upright intentions, was just seated (1761) upon the British throne. Having confidence in his integrity, and having recently felt the justice of the government under the direction of Pitt, they were disposed to forget their grievances.

P. 117: Had the young king listened to the counsels of wise men like Pitt, the Americans might have been loyal subjects during his long reign.

P. 119: England was touched in a tender point—her commerce; and her merchants and manufacturers joined with the Americans in a demand for the repeal of the Stamp Act. The government was compelled to listen; and on the 18th of March, 1766, the obnoxious act was repealed. Pitt was then in the Parliament, and with Burke, Barré, and others, was chiefly instrumental in accomplishing that result. The repeal gave joy in England and America.

New trouble soon appeared. While Pitt applauded the Americans for resisting the stamp tax, he appended to the repeal bill a declaration that the British Parliament had the right "to bind the colonies in any manner whatsoever." Without this concession to British pride, it was said, the repeal bill could not have become law. But Pitt's expedient was hurtful; for under the sanction of that Declaratory Act, as it was called, the British ministry planned and executed measures for taxing the Americans quite as odious in principle as the Stamp Tax.

P. 120: This palpable attempt to enslave the Americans filled them with burning indignation.

P. 122: A minority in the British House of Commons took the same position. Burke denounced the revival of the old statute, and said: "Can you not trust the juries of that country? If you have not a party among two millions of people, you must either change your plan of government or renounce the colonies forever."

SOME REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION AND TO THE POSI-
TION TAKEN BY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

BOOKS IN USE MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS
AGO

GROUP THREE

Text-books
which
deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make no reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
but make, at least, favorable mention
of several prominent Englishmen.

From Chambers' (Hansell's) *Higher History of the
United States*

[9]

P. 216: One year after its passage the Stamp Act was repealed (March 18, 1766), to the great joy of America.

P. 217: It was the great ambition of this king to increase his power—to be a king in fact as well as in name. With this ambition went a dense ignorance of the character of his American subjects, and a stubborn persistency in adhering to a policy once formed.

Side Note: The setting aside of the rights of the English in America would have prepared the way for the revoking of dearly-bought civil privileges of the English in England. Many wise statesmen recognized this, and there arose friends of America, such as Pitt, Burke, Barré and others in Parliament, who opposed all oppressive measures. But the measures of the king, shaped by his ministry, generally prevailed.

NO PICTURE OF POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION
AND LITTLE REFERENCE TO THE
SERVICES RENDERED THE COL-
ONISTS BY PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN.

From Derry's *History of the United States*

[10]

P. 101: British merchants injured by the loss of American trade petitioned Parliament to repeal the act. William Pitt, the Earl of Chatham, Burke, and Lord Camden earnestly plead the cause of the colonies.

P. 103: Early in 1775, Lord Chatham introduced a bill in Parliament which he hoped would bring about a reconciliation, but he failed; for the Parliament would listen to nothing but the absolute submission of the colonies.

THESE ARE THE ONLY REFERENCES TO CONDI-
TIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLU-
TION AND TO PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN
WHO FAVORED THE COLONISTS.

From Field's *A Grammar School History of the
United States*

[14]

P. 131: After the Americans refused to buy British goods, the merchants of England complained that they were losing heavily, and asked that the commerce between the two countries might be reopened. William Pitt and Edmund Burke, men of great influence and friends of the American cause, urged Parliament to repeal the Stamp Act. This, Parliament did one year after passing the act.

P. 133: A bill was passed to remove all the taxes, except that of three pence (six cents) per pound on tea, which was retained to show the colonies that England had the right to tax them.

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION AND NO FURTHER
REFERENCE TO THE PROMINENT ENGLISH-
MEN WHO LABORED IN THE INTERESTS
OF THE COLONIES.

From Fisher's *Outlines of Universal History*

[15]

P. 485: The colonists all acknowledged the authority of King and Parliament, but they felt that they had brought with them across the ocean the rights of Englishmen.

. . . William Pitt, in the House of Commons, eulogized the spirit of the colonies. The Stamp Act was repealed.

P. 508: Edmund Burke, however, the great philosophical statesman, who had defended the cause of freedom in the American war. . . .

NO REFERENCE TO THE CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR ANY OTHER REFERENCE TO THE PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO ESPOUSED THE CAUSE OF THE COLONIES.

From Goodrich's *Pictorial History of the United States*

[18]

P. 165: As will be hereafter seen, the chief ground of opposition to these measures was, that the colonies were not represented by any members of their own country, in the British government, and that it was alike unjust, dangerous, and contrary to the British constitution for any people to be taxed by the government in which they had no representatives to watch over and vindicate their rights and interests.

P. 167: Though the Act passed the House of Lords in Great Britain unanimously, it met with opposition in the House of Commons. Colonel Barré, in particular, spoke against it with great warmth and eloquence. And when the question was put, whether or not it should be passed, fifty members out of three hundred were against it.

P. 171: The general assemblies of Massachusetts and Virginia went so far as to vote thanks to Mr. Pitt and the other members of Parliament who had done so much to effect a repeal; and in Virginia it was proposed to erect a statue to the king. Mr. Pitt, Colonel Barré, and Edmund Burke, who had favored our cause in Parliament, received the thanks of the people, . . .

P. 177: There is no doubt that in most of these transactions the mob were in the wrong; the source of the mischief lay, however, in the fact that the British government insisted upon keeping an army among a people outraged by a series of unjust and irritating laws. This conduct showed that the king and parliament of Great Britain intended to compel the colonists to submission by force of arms, and not to govern them by fair and proper legislation.

NO FURTHER REFERENCE TO THE CONDITIONS
IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION,
NOR TO THE SERVICES RENDERED THE
COLONISTS BY PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN.

From Goodrich's *History of the United States*, (Revised by Seavey).

[19]

P. 101: The attempt of England to impose taxes upon her American colonies without their consent, led to a revolution which resulted in their independence, and the establishment of a republic under the name of the United States of America.

P. 103, FOOT NOTE, 2: The Stamp Act passed parliament by an overwhelming majority. Yet America found some friends in that body. (Here follows the celebrated answer of Colonel Barré to the speech of Charles Townshend.)

P. 105: Mr. Pitt and Edmund Burke were among the foremost advocates of repeal, which was at length carried (1766), but only by accompanying the repealing act by a declaratory act, asserting the right of Parliament "to bind the colonies in all cases whatsoever".

The joy of the colonies at the repeal of the Stamp Act was unbounded. They manifested, in various ways their gratitude to Pitt and others, who, in Parliament, had advocated the cause of America . . .

FOOT NOTE: Scarcely less lively was the feeling of satisfaction among the friends of America in London. Regarding Mr. Pitt as chiefly instrumental in the repeal, they crowded about the door of the House of Commons to receive him; and in the language of Burke, "They jumped upon him like children on a long-absent father. They clung about him as captives about their redeemer. All England joined in his applause." London warehouses were illuminated, and flags were displayed from the shipping in the Thames.

P. 110: Parliament, early in 1775, rejected a conciliatory bill introduced by Lord Chatham, and passed an act to restrain the trade of the New England provinces, . . .

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Holmes' *New School History of the United States*

[21]

P. 92, FOOT NOTE: Edmund Burke (1728-1797) was a great English statesman, and the most brilliant of English orators. He was a member of Parliament from 1766 to 1793. In 1771 he was appointed agent for the colony of New York. He was the friend of Franklin, and always favored the interests of the American colonies.

P. 95, FOOT NOTE: In the debates in the British Parliament on this bill, (Stamp Act) Charles Townshend remarked, that the Americans were "children planted by our care, and nourished by our indulgence." To this Colonel Barré made the indignant reply: "They planted by your care! No—your oppression planted them in America!—they fled from your tyranny to a then uncultivated and inhospitable wilderness, exposed to all the hardships to which human nature is liable. They nourished by your indulgence! No—they grew by your neglect; your care of them was displayed, as soon as you began to care about them, in sending persons to rule them who were the deputies of deputies of ministers."

P. 104: The British ministry were confident that the colonies would soon submit, or be subdued. They felt only contempt for the courage, the steadiness, and the discipline of the colonial militia.

FOOT NOTE: It was contemptuously said in England, that the sight of a grenadier's cap would be sufficient to put an American army to flight.

P. 128: Proposals of conciliation, supported in Parliament by the Duke of Richmond, were rejected, because they did not concede independence. When Richmond moved his resolutions, they were opposed by Chatham, in Chatham's last speech. The old earl, recently risen from a sick-bed, feeble with age and tottering with gout, rested on his son and his son-in-law, and denounced the proposal in the House of Lords.

P. 129, FOOT NOTE: In this speech he said, "I am old and infirm; I have one foot, more than one foot, in the grave. I rejoice that the grave has not closed upon me; that I am still able to vote against the dismemberment of this ancient and most noble monarchy. Let us at least make one effort, and if we must fall, let us fall like men!"

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION. PITT ONLY
MENTIONED WHEN HE SPOKE AGAINST
SEPARATION OF THE COLONIES FROM
ENGLAND.

From Montgomery's *The Leading Facts of American History*

[27]

P. 149: During the war, and for a long time before it, the laws which forbade the colonists to trade with any country except Great Britain had not been enforced. . . .

Now, all this profitable commerce was to stop. A new king—George III.—had come to the throne of England. He was conscientious but narrow-minded, obstinate, and at times crazy. The new government was determined that the old laws should be carried out. . . . In Boston and other large towns the king's officers began to break into men's houses and shops and search them for smuggled goods.

FOOT NOTE: The officers did this by general warrants called "Writs of Assistance". These were search-warrants in blank.

P. 150: It began to look as though the king and his "friends" meant to ruin every merchant and ship-builder in the country.

P. 151: The best men in Parliament—such men as William Pitt and Edmund Burke—took the side of the colonists. Burke said that if the king undertook to tax the Americans against their will he would find it as hard a job as the farmer did who tried to shear a wolf instead of a sheep.

FOOT NOTE: Pitt thought it was not right to tax America; Burke thought it was not wise to do so.

P. 152: When news of these vigorous proceedings reached London, William Pitt said in Parliament, "In my opinion, this kingdom has no right to lay a tax on the colonies . . . I rejoice that America has resisted". The Stamp Act was speedily repealed (1766), much to the delight of many people in England as well as of the colonists.

P. 153: But the Americans were not caught in this trap. They saw that George III. was endeavoring to exalt his own power and deprive them of theirs, and that the tax was for that purpose.

P. 154: Parliament again made the mistake of supposing that our forefathers did not mean what they said.

P. 156, FOOT NOTE: Yet this same Congress (October 26, 1774) sent a petition to the king, imploring him, "as the loving father of your whole people", to redress their wrongs. They might as well have petitioned the "Great Stone Face" in the White Mountains of New Hampshire.

NO PICTURE OF POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION AND
LITTLE REFERENCE TO THE SERVICES OF
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Sheldon's *American History*, (Mary Sheldon Barnes' Studies in American History)

[34]

P. 134: "In an American tax, what do we do? We—give and grant to your Majesty—What? Our own property? No. We give and grant to your Majesty the property of your Majesty's commons in America. . . . The gentleman tells us America is obstinate; America is almost in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has resisted."—Pitt, to the House of Commons.

P. 135: Barré, who had been the friend and companion of Wolfe at Quebec, sprang to his feet and replied:

"Children planted by your care! No! your oppression planted them in America; . . . they nourished by your indulgence! they grew by your neglect of them: as soon as you began to care about them, that care was exercised in sending persons to rule over them . . . whose behaviour, on many occasions, has caused the blood of those sons of liberty to recoil within them. They protected by your arms! they have nobly taken up arms in your defence. . . . And the same spirit which actuated that people at first, will continue with them still."

But in spite of Barré's gallant speech, the Parliament voted that the Stamp Act should become law.

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Swinton's *Condensed United States School History*

[36]

P. 114: A very serious question now was, "Would Great Britain *force* the Colonies to obedience?" It did *not*; for, at the next meeting of Parliament, the STAMP ACT was repealed.

There were several reasons for this. First, there were some noble men in England who took sides with America, for they believed America was right. Secondly, British merchants, finding themselves severely punished by the Americans not importing any British goods, petitioned for the repeal.

Parliament repealed the Stamp Act, February 22, 1766. Those great men, William Pitt and Edmund Burke, then both members of Parliament, were advocates of the repeal.

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, BUT AT LEAST
MENTION OF "THE NOBLE MEN IN
ENGLAND".

From Swinton's *School History of the United States*

[38]

P. 148: The attachment of the American colonies to the "mother country" was never stronger than at the close of the French War. The colonists were proud of being descended from British ancestors, and gloried in sharing the rights of subjects of England. The trials and triumphs of the French wars made colonists and Englishmen feel more than ever like brothers. . . .

How was it that the colonies began a revolt which resulted in their independence? The usual answer is that the attempt of England to impose taxes upon the American colonies without their consent was the cause of the Revolutionary War.

This is true in part only. The imposition of taxes was the occasion of the revolt of the colonies; but its cause was that the whole history of the American colonies meant independence. Providence so designed it.

P. 149: The colonists were, from an early date, unwilling to be taxed. Various colonial legislatures had denied England's right to tax the colonies.

P. 153: Parliament repealed the Stamp Act, March 18, 1766. Two great men, William Pitt and Edmund Burke, then both members of Parliament, were advocates of the repeal.

FOOT NOTE: Pitt agreed with the colonists that there should be "No taxation without representation". Burke's argument was the common-sense one. He declared that it was worse than folly to throw away the good-will of three million subjects in America merely for the chance of a small increase of revenue.

P. 157, FOOT NOTE: Late in December of 1774, Franklin, then living in London as the agent of the colonies, called by appointment on William Pitt, Lord Chatham "to obtain his sentiments" upon this declaration. Franklin says: "He (Lord Chatham) received me with an affectionate kind of respect that was extremely engaging; but the opinion he expressed of the Congress was still more so. They had acted, he said, with so much temper, moderation, and wisdom, that he thought it the most honorable assembly of statesmen since those of the ancient Greeks and Romans in the most virtuous times."

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

BOOKS IN USE MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS
AGO

GROUP FOUR

Text-books
which
deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make no reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
but mention, at least, PITT.

From Anderson's *Popular School History of the
United States*

[1]

P. 127: The repeal of the Stamp Act caused great rejoicing throughout the colonies. Virginia and New York voted statues to the king. New York also voted a statue to Pitt, who, in Parliament, had declared "that the kingdom had no right to levy a tax on the colonies." A second statue was voted to Pitt by Maryland.

NO OTHER REFERENCE TO MEN OR CONDI-
TIONS CONNECTED WITH THE ENG-
LISH SIDE OF THE CONTROVERSY.

From Anderson's *A New Grammar School History
of the United States*

[2]

P. 145: Great was the joy of the colonists when they heard the good news. They lighted bonfires, raised banners, fired guns, rang bells, and, in their gratitude, voted statues to England's great statesman, William Pitt, who had boldly said in parliament that England had no right to tax America.

P. 181: In the British Parliament, Lord Chatham said: "We cannot conquer America. In three campaigns we have done nothing. We may traffic and barter with every little German prince that sells his subjects; our efforts are forever in vain. If I were an American as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I never would lay down my arms; never, never, never."

THESE ARE THE ONLY REFERENCES TO MEN
OR CONDITIONS CONNECTED WITH THE
ENGLISH SIDE OF THE CONTROVERSY.

From Anderson's *Junior Class History of the
United States*

[3]

P. 92, FOOT NOTE: William Pitt, first Earl of Chatham, was born at Westminster, England, in 1708. At the beginning of the American Revolution he was opposed to the measures of the British ministry in the American colonies; but, at the close of a speech, made in 1778 in Parliament, in which he spoke against a motion to acknowledge the independence of America, he fell in an apoplectic fit, and was borne home, where he died in a few weeks afterward.

P. 105: The English government, therefore, soon after the close of the war, set up a claim that, as it had been waged on behalf of the colonies, they should bear a part of the burden. Accordingly, a law was passed in 1765 called the Stamp Act.

P. 106: Andrew Oliver, who had been appointed the agent for the sale of the hated stamped paper, was hung in effigy; his house was torn down, and he was obliged to resign the odious office.

P. 107: . . . a large body of soldiers were sent to keep them in subjection. The presence of these hirelings caused constant affrays,
. . .

P. 110: They did not desire a conflict with the "mother country", but were prepared for it, should it prove unavoidable.

NO MENTION OF POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND. NO MENTION OF THE GREAT
EFFORTS MADE ON BEHALF OF THE
COLONISTS BY MANY PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN.

From Magill's *History of Virginia*

[24]

P. 169: When the news of this opposition (to the stamp tax) reached England, it created a great excitement in Parliament. Many members thought America was perfectly right in her course, and one of them, William Pitt, rose from a sick bed to make a speech in behalf of the Americans. "We are told", said he, "that America is obstinate, America is in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has resisted oppression; three millions of people so dead to all feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest."

NO OTHER REFERENCE TO ANYTHING ENGLISHMEN DID IN THE INTEREST OF THE COLONIES.

From Quackenbos' (Appleton's) *School History of the World*

[29]

P. 390: On the ground that the recent French and Indian War had been carried on for the protection of the American colonies, the English government resolved that the latter should share the expenses incurred. But the Americans remembered that much of their success was due to their own brave troops, and claimed that Parliament had no right to tax them unless they were represented in that body. Notwithstanding, in 1765 the Stamp Act was passed, requiring stamps of different values to be affixed to all deeds, notes, newspapers, etc. Upon this the indignation of the colonies blazed forth, and resistance was determined upon; but the obnoxious act was repealed in 1766.

Yet harmony was not restored, for other taxes were imposed, and British regiments were sent from England to enforce the submission of the people. The king regarded the Americans as "rebels," and Pitt, their champion, now Earl of Chatham, as "a trumpet of sedition". "Four regiments", wrote George, "will bring them to their senses; they will only be lions while we are lambs." Vainly Chatham strove to avert the conflict; his advice was rejected, and in 1775 the eight years' war of the American Revolution began.

NO OTHER REFERENCE TO PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO SIDED WITH THE COLONISTS, NOR TO THE POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Ridpath's *History of the United States*

[31]

P. 179: The Most general cause of the Revolution was THE RIGHT OF ARBITRARY GOVERNMENT, claimed by Great Britain and denied by the colonies. . . .

First of these was the *influence of France*, inciting the colonies to rebel. . . .

Another cause was *the natural disposition of the colonists*. They were republicans in politics. The people of England were monarchists. The colonists had never seen a king.

P. 180: Another cause of the revolution was the *personal character of the king*. George III. was one of the worst rulers of modern times. He was a stubborn, thick-headed man, who had no true notion of human rights. His ministers were, for the most part, men of like sort with himself.

P. 183: The colonists had their friends in England. Eminent statesmen espoused the cause of America. In the House of Commons Mr. Pitt delivered a powerful address. "You have", said he, "no right to tax America. I rejoice that America has resisted." On the 18th of March, 1766, the Stamp Act was formally repealed. But at the same time a resolution was added declaring that Parliament had the right *to bind the colonies in all cases whatsoever*.

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE
SERVICES RENDERED THE COLONISTS
BY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN,
EXCEPT THIS MENTION OF
PITT.

From Thalheimer's *Eclectic History of the United States*

[No. 39]

P. 123: The colonists insisted upon their privilege as Englishmen,—that as they were not represented in the British Parliament, they could not be taxed by it, but only by their own assemblies, which were to them precisely what the House of Commons was to their countrymen at home; and some of the best and wisest men in England declared that they were right.

P. 124: Though hard things must be said of the British government as it was then administered, we ought never to forget that our fathers had the spirit and ability to repel English injustice precisely because they had been trained to the rights and duties of Englishmen. . . .

The throne of Great Britain was now occupied by George III., a narrow-minded and obstinate young king, who had succeeded his grandfather in 1760. He hated Pitt, the friend of America, and his ruling purpose was to exalt kingly authority at the expense of all popular rights.

P. 127: Surprised at the firmness of the colonists, Parliament, in 1773, repealed all taxes excepting that of three pence a pound upon tea, . . .

P. 128: In England Mr. Pitt, now the Earl of Chatham, urged Parliament to desist from the cruel injustice of oppressing three millions of people for the act of thirty or forty.

P. 130: (NOTES). William Pitt (b. 1708, d. 1778), first Earl of Chatham, was America's warmest champion in England during the troubles that led to the Revolution. He had the reputation of being "one of the most powerful, vigilant, and patriotic opponents in Parliament of unconstitutional and unwise measures." He opposed the stamp act of 1766, and from 1775 to 1777 his voice rang warning and prophecy to the British ministry in their oppression of the colonies. In 1778 he rose from a sick-bed to speak in the House of Lords against a motion to acknowledge the independence of America. At the close of his speech, he fell in an apoplectic fit from which he never recovered.

P. 133: The Earl of Chatham declared in Parliament that no body of men ever surpassed the first American Congress in "solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion"; and to Franklin he remarked, that the success of the American cause was the last hope of liberty for England. The debates in Parliament proved to the colonists that their contest was with the king and ministry, not with the people of England. Several Englishmen of rank resigned their places in the army and government rather than fight against America.

NO PICTURE OF POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

BOOKS IN USE MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS
AGO

GROUP FIVE

Text-books
which

deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make no reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
nor to any prominent Englishmen who devoted themselves to
the cause of the Americans.

From Armstrong's *Primer of United States History*

[4]

P. 38: . . . and the English Parliament thought the colonies ought to help pay it. This they were quite willing to do, but wanted to do it in their own way. . . . But William Pitt was not now prime minister, and those in power were not as friendly to America as he had been; and besides, the king, George III., was very stubborn, and cared not nearly as much for the good of the colonies as for his own selfish plans.

P. 39: When the English Parliament saw how strongly the people in both countries felt about the Stamp Act, it was repealed.

In 1773 all taxes were withdrawn except that on tea, and that was reduced to a small sum, the ministers thinking that the people would be content.

NO REFERENCE TO THE CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO LABORED IN THE INTEREST OF THE COLONIES.

From Barnes's *Primary History of the United States*

[5]

P. 90: **Origin of the Trouble.** While they were perfectly willing to tax themselves for England, they denied her right to tax them, because she would not allow them to be represented in the British Parliament, where the tax laws were made. In this the colonists were only insisting on their rights as Englishmen. The British would not listen to this reasonable argument, but continued to treat the Americans as though they had no rights whatever.

The Stamp Act.—In 1765, a law called the Stamp Act was passed. It required the Americans to buy British tax-stamps, and put them on all their deeds, bonds, and notes, as well as upon their newspapers and almanacs. This was more than the Americans would endure.

They, therefore, mobbed the men who were sent over from England to sell the stamps, and resolved to resist not only this law, but all other unjust laws. The day the stamps arrived in Boston, so profound was the sorrow of the people, the church bells were tolled, minute-guns were fired, and the vessels in the harbor hung their flags at half-mast. The people in every colony now pledged themselves not to use British goods of any kind, and manufactures soon started up in spite of the laws forbidding them.

A Congress was held in New York to declare the rights of the colonies, and societies called Sons of Liberty, were formed to resist their wrongs. From Massachusetts to Carolina, the people were full of indignation. The British Government, seeing the determined opposition of the colonists, repealed the Stamp Act the following year (1766).

This, however, did not make matters better, for Great Britain still claimed the right to tax the Americans, and it was this claim alone which the Americans were resisting. They did not care for the stamp tax any more than they cared for any other, but they denied the right of the British government to tax them at all, unless they had a voice in making British laws.

When, therefore, the Stamp Act was repealed, and, instead of it, taxes were laid on tea, glass, paints, and other articles brought into the country, the Americans resisted as stoutly as ever. Soldiers were then sent over from England to compel them to obedience. . . .

(Then follow paragraphs on The Mutiny Act, The Boston Massacre, The Tea Tax, etc.)

NO ATTEMPT MADE TO SHOW THAT MANY
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN TOOK AN AT-
TITUDE DISTINCTLY FAVORING
THE COLONISTS.

From *A Brief History of the United States* by Steele,
(Barnes Historical Series.)

[6]

P. 101: Revolutionary War. Remote Causes.—England treated the settlers as an inferior class of people. Her intention was to make and keep the colonies dependent. The laws were framed to favor the English manufacturer and merchant at the expense of the colonist. The Navigation Acts compelled the American farmer to send his products across the ocean to England, and to buy his goods in British markets. American manufactures were prohibited. Iron works were denounced as "common nuisances." Even William Pitt, the friend of America, declared that she had no right to manufacture even a nail for a horseshoe, except by permission of Parliament.

The Direct Cause was an attempt to tax the colonies in order to raise money to defray the expenses of the recent war. As the colonists were not represented in Parliament, they resisted this measure, declaring that TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION IS TYRANNY. The British government, however, was obstinate, and began first to enforce the odious laws against trade. Smuggling had become very common, and the English officers were granted

Writs of Assistance, as they were called, or warrants authorizing them to search for smuggled goods. Under this pretext, any petty custom-house official could enter a man's house or store at his pleasure. The colonists believed that "every man's house is his castle", and resisted such search as a violation of their rights.

The *Stamp Act* (1765), which ordered that stamps bought of the British government, should be put on all legal documents, newspapers, pamphlets, etc., thoroughly aroused the colonists. The houses of British officials were mobbed. Prominent loyalists were hung in effigy. Stamps were seized. The agents were forced to resign. People agreed not to use any article of British manufacture. Associations, called "Sons of Liberty", were formed to resist the law. Delegates from nine of the colonies met at New York and framed a Declaration of Rights, and a petition to the king and Parliament. The first of November, appointed for the law to go into effect, was observed as a day of mourning. Bells were tolled, flags raised at half-mast, and business was suspended. Samuel and John Adams, Patrick Henry, and James Otis, by their stirring and patriotic speeches, aroused the people over the whole land.

Alarmed by these demonstrations, the English government repealed the Stamp Act (1766), but still declared the right to tax the colonies. Soon, new duties were laid upon tea, glass, paper, etc., and a Board of Trade was established at Boston to act independently of colonial assemblies.

Mutiny Act.—Anticipating bitter opposition, troops were sent to enforce the laws. The "Mutiny Act", as it was called, ordered that the colonies should provide these soldiers with quarters and necessary supplies. This evident attempt to enslave the Americans aroused burning indignation. To be taxed was bad enough, but to

shelter and feed their oppressors was unendurable. The New York assembly, having refused to comply, was forbidden to pass any legislative acts. The Massachusetts assembly sent a circular to the other colonies urging a union for redress of grievances. Parliament, in the name of the king, ordered the assembly to rescind its action; but it almost unanimously refused. In the meantime, the assemblies of nearly all the colonies had declared that Parliament had no right to tax them without their consent. Thereupon, they were warned not to imitate the disobedient conduct of Massachusetts.

Boston Massacre.—Boston being considered the hot-bed of the rebellion, General Gage was ordered to send thither two regiments of troops. They entered on a quiet October morning, and marched as through a conquered city, with drums beating and flags flying. Quarters were refused, but the Sons of Liberty allowed a part to sleep in Faneuil Hall, while the rest encamped on the Common. Cannon were planted, sentries posted, and citizens challenged. Frequent quarrels took place between the people and the soldiers. One day (March 5, 1770) a crowd of men and boys, maddened by its presence, insulted the city guard. A fight ensued, in which three citizens were killed and eight wounded. The bells were rung; the country people rushed in to help the city; and it was with difficulty that quiet was restored.

Boston Tea Party (Dec. 16, 1773).—The government, alarmed by the turn events had taken, rescinded the taxes, except that on tea—which was left to maintain the principle. An arrangement was made whereby tea was furnished at so low a price, that, with the tax included, it was cheaper in America than in England. This subterfuge exasperated the patriots. They were fighting for a great principle, not against a paltry tax. At Charleston, the tea was stored in damp cellars, where it soon spoiled. The tea-ships at New York and Philadelphia were sent home. The British authorities refused to let the tea-ships at Boston return. Upon this, an immense public meeting was called at Faneuil Hall, and it was decided that the tea should never be brought ashore. A party of men, disguised as Indians, boarded the vessels and emptied three hundred and forty-two chests of tea into the water.

The Climax Reached.—Retaliatory measures were at once adopted by the English government. General Gage was appointed Governor of Massachusetts. The port of Boston being closed by act of Parliament, business was stopped and distress ensued. The Virginia assembly protested against this measure, and was dissolved by the governor. Party lines were drawn. Those opposed to royalty were termed Whigs, and those supporting it, Tories. Every-where were repeated the thrilling words of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death." Companies of soldiers, termed "Minute men", were formed. The idea of a continental union became popular. Gage, being alarmed, fortified Boston Neck, and seized powder wherever he could find it. A rumor having been circulated that the British ships were firing on Boston, in two days thirty thousand minute men were on their way to the city. A spark only was needed to kindle the slumbering hatred into the flames of war.

THE ENGLISH SIDE AND LEADING ENGLISHMEN
WHO FAVORED THE COLONISTS NOT
MENTIONED.

From Chambers' (Hansell's) *School History of the United States*

[8]

P. 110: In order to make the colonists pay the expenses of the French and Indian war, different laws were made to raise money. . . .

These tax laws were made in England. English laws are made by men from different parts of the kingdom. These men represent the parts they are from, in the Parliament, or assembly of English law-makers.

The colonists did not send representatives to this Parliament, and it should not have imposed these taxes, for TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION is not right. There were many brave men among the colonists willing to fight and die for what they thought to be right, so they determined to resist.

NO PICTURE OF POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION AND
NO REFERENCE TO THE GREAT SERVICES
RENDERED THE CAUSE OF THE
COLONISTS BY PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN.

From Eggleston's *A First Book in American History*

[11]

P. 115: But, as time went on, the English Parliament tried to collect a tax from the Americans. The Americans declared that, so long as they elected no members of Parliament, that body had no right to tax them without their consent. But the men who governed in England, did not think that people in the colonies had the same rights as people in England, so they oppressed the Americans in many ways. Without asking consent of the colonies, they put a tax on all the tea that came into America; and when some of the tea got to Boston, the people turned Boston Harbor into one big tea-pot by pitching the whole shipload of tea into the water.

P. 117: But neither the king of England nor the English Parliament would repeal the laws which the Americans disliked.

P. 118: The Americans at first were fighting only to get their rights as subjects of England. But since neither the King nor the Parliament of England would let them have their rights, they got tired of calling themselves Englishmen.

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND WHICH CAUSED PARLIAMENT
TO WORK HAND IN HAND WITH THE
KING, NOR TO THE SERVICES
RENDERED THE COLONISTS BY
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Eggleston's *A History of the United States and Its People*

[12]

P. 161: The Causes of the Revolution. Long before the Revolution there was much dissatisfaction in the colonies. Many of the governors sent over were tyrannical and dishonest. The Americans did not like the transportation of criminals, nor the action of the British government in annulling the laws made to keep out slaves. They were also much annoyed by English laws, which prevented them from sending away woolen goods, hats, and iron-wares of their own make, from one colony to another. Most of all, they disliked the "navigation laws", the object of which was to compel them to do most of their trading with England.

The enforcement of these unpopular laws was in the hands of customhouse officers. The customhouse officers in Boston, in 1761, asked the courts for "writs of assistance", which would give them the right to search any house, at any time, for the purpose of finding smuggled goods. This produced a great excitement, and made the navigation laws still more unpopular. The trial which took place about these writs was a kind of beginning of the quarrel which brought on the Revolution fourteen years afterward.

But England and the colonies, while always carrying on a family quarrel, had little thought of separating. Separation would probably have come when the colonies grew too large to be dependent, but this might at least have been postponed for two or three generations if the men who ruled England had not tried to tax the American colonies. Parliament passed, in 1765, what was known as "The Stamp Act". This law required that all bills, notes, leases, and many other such documents used in the colonies, should be written on stamped paper, which should be sold by officers at such prices as should bring a revenue to the English government. All newspapers were required to be printed on stamped paper.

The American people quickly saw that, if the British Parliament could pass such an act, they could tax America in any other way. The cry was raised in all the colonies, "No taxation without representation"! Patrick Henry, a brilliant speaker, took the lead in the agitation in Virginia, and James Otis, an eloquent Boston lawyer, was the principal orator in Massachusetts. The rivalries and jealousies between the various colonies died out in the new patriotic feeling, and the excitement ran like a flame of fire from New Hampshire to Georgia. There was everywhere a call for union among the colonies. . . .

NO REFERENCE TO THE FACT THAT MANY
ENGLISHMEN FAVORED THE COLONISTS.

From Ellis' *Eclectic Primary History of the United States*

[13]

P. 89: *The Cause of the American Revolution:*

1. We have brought the history of the American colonies down almost to the Revolution. Before studying that period, let us try to learn what causes brought about the war for independence.

2. There were thirteen colonies, with a population of more than two millions. The French and Indian War had given the Americans a knowledge of military matters, and had shown them their strength. It had, in fact, made them one nation.

3. England was not wise in her treatment of the colonies. She wished to keep them dependent, and she passed many oppressive laws for their government. She would not permit American goods to be sent anywhere, except to Great Britain: She would not allow our forefathers to manufacture any thing. One of the leading British statesmen said the colonists had no right to make even a nail for a horseshoe.

4. Few people would submit quietly to such injustice, but the Americans were not yet ready to rebel. Finally, England determined that the colonies should pay the expenses of the French and Indian War. This was unjust; but, besides, she would not allow them to have any one of their number in the English Parliament, or lawmaking body, to protect their interests. This was called *taxation without representation*.

5. George III. was king of England. He was a narrow-minded ruler, who favored the severest measures toward his American colonies. He strove to crush out all hope of independence on their part, but the course he took was the very one which brought about their independence.

6. The British Parliament passed the famous Stamp Act. It required all newspapers, pamphlets, advertisements, and legal documents to bear a stamp, bought of the British government. The prices of the stamps ranged from three pence to thirty dollars, according to the importance of the document.

7. The Americans were indignant. The houses of the British officials were mobbed; the stamps were burned, or sent back to England, and the most violent speeches were made at the meetings held in every part of the country.

8. The British government was alarmed, and repealed the Stamp Act; but, while doing so, took care to show the Americans that she still claimed the right to tax them as she thought best. She therefore imposed a new tax on tea, glass, paper, and painters' materials.

9. The anger of the Americans flamed up again. The mother country sent soldiers to America, and ordered the people to take care of them. This caused many fights in Boston, New York, and elsewhere, and several lives were lost.

NO INFORMATION AS TO MEN OR CONDITIONS
CONNECTED WITH THE POLITICAL SITUATION
IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From MacMaster's *School History of the United States*

[25]

P. 115: **The English view of representation.**—We, in this country, do not consider a person represented in a legislature unless he can cast a vote for a member of that legislature. In Great Britain, not individuals but classes were represented. Thus, the clergy were represented by the bishops who sat in the House of Lords; the nobility, by the nobles who had seats in the House of Lords; and the mass of the people, the commons, by the members of the House of Commons. At that time, very few Englishmen could vote for a member of the House of Commons. Great cities like Liverpool, Leeds, Manchester, did not send even one member. When the colonists held that they were not represented in Parliament because they did not elect any members of that Body, Englishmen answered that they were represented, because they were commoners.

Sons of Liberty.—Meantime, the colonists had not been idle. Taking the name of "Sons of Liberty", a name given them in a speech by a member of Parliament (named Barré) friendly to their cause, they began to associate for resistance to the Stamp Act.

THESE ARE THE ONLY REFERENCES TO MEN
AND CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND, HAVING
HAD AN INFLUENCE ON THE CON-
FLICT; PITT, BURKE, FOX, ARE
NOT MENTIONED.

From Montgomery's *The Beginner's American History*

[26]

P. 100: The war with the French lasted a number of years. It ended by the English getting possession of the whole of America from the Atlantic ocean to the Mississippi river. All this part of America was ruled by George the Third, king of England. The king now determined to send over more soldiers, and keep them here to prevent the French in Canada from trying to get back the country they had lost. He wanted the people here in the thirteen colonies to pay the cost of keeping these soldiers. But this the people were not willing to do, because they felt they were able to protect themselves without help of any kind. Then the king said, If the Americans will not give the money, I will take it from them by force,—for pay it they must and shall. This was more than the king would have dared say about England; for there, if he wanted money to spend on his army, he had to ask the people for it, and they could give it or not as they thought best. The Americans said, We have the same rights as our brothers in England, and the king cannot force us to give a single copper against our will. If he tries to take it from us, we will fight. Some of the greatest men in England agreed with us, and said that they would fight, too, if they were in our place.

But George III. did not know the Americans, he did not think that they meant what they said. He tried to make them pay the money, but they would not.

THE REFERENCE TO "THE GREATEST MEN IN ENGLAND" IS THE ONLY MENTION OF THE ATTITUDE OF PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Quackenbos' *Elementary History of the
United States*

[28]

P. 85: The colonies were willing to bear the expense of the war. But they claimed that Parliament had no right to tax them, because they were not represented by any delegates in that body. Taxation without representation they would not submit to.

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE
SERVICES OF PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN
IN FAVOR OF THE COLONISTS.

From Quackenbos' *School History of the United States*

[30]

P. 190: Meanwhile the British ministry, no longer guided by the liberal counsels of Pitt, pushed through Parliament a bill, which laid an impost on wines, increased the duty on sugar, and provided for the more rigid enforcement of the regulations for collecting the revenue.

P. 191: The reading of these resolutions (Patrick Henry's) produced unbounded consternation in the House. The Speaker and many of the members were Royalists, and a protracted and violent debate followed.

P. 197: The merchants of America adhered to their resolution not to import British commodities, and the effect began to be felt across the Atlantic. An appeal was made to Parliament by London merchants; and, in 1770, Lord North having become Prime minister, the offensive duty was removed from every article except tea, . . .

NO LIGHT THROWN ON GENERAL POLITICAL
CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE
REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE SERVICES
RENDERED THE COLONISTS BY
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Scudder's *A Short History of the United States*

[32]

P. 104: From the beginning, England had been wont to think of the colonies as existing for the convenience of England. English merchants sold their goods to the colonies; English ships traded with them. Laws were made by Parliament forbidding the colonists to manufacture articles.

P. 106: Although Englishmen generally knew little about America, there were some who knew well how valuable the colonies were. They advised the king to be more strict in preventing smuggling, so that the ships which sailed out of, and into, the colonial ports should pay more money into the king's treasury.

P. 109: If they obeyed Parliament when they had no voice in Parliament, they were obeying a tyrant. . . .
They were so determined, and it was so impossible for England to make them buy the stamps, that the Stamp Act was repealed; . . .

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE
SERVICES RENDERED THE COLONISTS
BY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Swinton's *First Lessons in Our Country's History*

[35]

P. 74: Well, very soon they found that they could make better laws than the king could make for them. Thus there was independence in the very *air* of America.

This was the deep *cause* of the revolt of the colonies: Providence designed that on this continent should be seen an example of democratic government, which means government "*of the people, for the people, by the people*".

P. 76: The Stamp Act was passed in 1765. The colonists thought it was a mean trick, intended to make them pay taxes whether they would or not.

P. 77: The result was that when the British government saw the terrible storm which the Stamp Act had raised in America, they had sense enough to do away with it. . . .

You may imagine they hated the red-coats, and it was not long before collisions began.

P. 79: Even then, if England had been wise, the trouble might all have been settled. But it seemed as though Providence made the British rulers blind.

NO PICTURE OF CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR ANY
REFERENCE TO THE GREAT SERVICES
RENDERED THE COLONISTS BY
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Swinton's *Outlines of the World's History*

[37]

This text-book reviews History by treating certain epochs in general outline. It does not go into detail.

ABSENCE OF REFERENCE TO THE SPECIAL
SUBJECTS OF THIS STUDY NATURAL.

BOOKS IN USE AT PRESENT

GROUP ONE

Text-books
which

deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
give an account of general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
and give credit to prominent Englishmen
for the services they rendered the Americans.

P. 111: In 1760 George III. ascended the throne. Born in England, he was ambitious to rule well and to regain for the monarchy the power which the kings had once wielded in the state. To accomplish this he destroyed the power of the old governing aristocracy and appointed men to high office who would do his bidding.

P. 112: Regarding the system as a whole, it is impossible to say that it was to the disadvantage of the colonists, for what they lost in one direction, they gained in another. The Virginians, for instance, were forbidden to ship their tobacco to a foreign port, but they were given a monopoly of the British tobacco markets.

P. 113: Pitt ordered the customs officials to do their duty, and, by a display of zeal, they endeavored to atone for their former laxity. . . .

From the strictly legal standpoint the case seemed to be in favor of the royal side. Otis, therefore, boldly asserted that Parliament could not legalize tyranny and the use of writs of assistance was often tyrannical.

P. 117: The Act (Stamp) in itself was on the same lines as a law in force in Britain at that time. . . . It was not intended to draw the money thus raised to England, but to expend it in America in the purchase of food and other supplies for the soldiers. The evil feature of the act as a law was that persons accused of offences under it might not enjoy the benefits of trial by jury, at the discretion of the prosecuting officer. . . .

The members of the latter body (House of Commons) were elected, and were supposed to represent all classes of people. Some of the electoral districts, indeed, contained no inhabitants. In one of these, Old Sarum, it was possible in dry seasons to trace the foundations of old buildings by the color of the grass; . . . Yet each of these returned members to the House of Commons.

P. 119: The English idea of representative government signified representation of all classes of the community, and not at all representation by population. The great mass of Englishmen belonging to any particular class had no vote for a member of the House of Commons, but other Englishmen of the same class had a vote. It was held, therefore, that all the members of that class were virtually represented. It was easy to extend the theory and to argue that the colonists were also represented, inasmuch as merchants interested in colonial trade were represented in the House of Commons.

P. 123: Pitt denied the right of Parliament to lay internal taxes on the colonies and rejoiced that America had resisted. . . . The same view was enforced in the House of Peers by Lord Camden, who urged that taxation without representation was against the con-

stitution. Their arguments were ably met in the Commons by George Grenville, and in the Peers by Lord Mansfield, who had the law clearly on their side, although expediency was as plainly with Pitt and Camden. The English merchants petitioned for the repeal of the Act, on the ground that the disturbances which it had caused in America were disastrous to colonial trade. Thus urged, and with the means of retreat pointed out by Pitt, the ministers brought in two bills,—one to repeal the Stamp Act, the other declaring that Parliament had power to “legislate for the colonies in all cases whatsoever.” . . . The colonists, considering that they had won, rejoiced greatly, and no name was more popular with them than that of William Pitt. . . . There can be no question that Pitt was wrong in his attempt to separate the taxing power from the general legislative power, and that Mansfield and Grenville were right in asserting that one could not exist without the other.

P. 138: To this policy, the opposition in the House of Commons, led by Burke and Charles James Fox, offered stout resistance, but their espousal of the colonial cause only deepened the hostility of the king. Chatham’s proposals for a more conciliatory policy were set aside with contempt.

P. 148: In 1776, Washington wrote, “When I took command of the army (July, 1775), I abhorred the idea of independence; now, I am convinced, nothing else will save us.”

PICTURE OF CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR
TO THE REVOLUTION AND SOME OF THE
CLAIMS OF BOTH SIDES PRESENTED.

From Dickson's *American History for Grammar Schools*

[52]

P. 146: The genius of Pitt had been shown, however, in the Old World as well as in the New; . . .

P. 152: . . . So smuggling became common, and it was often quite impossible to find out where it was going on. . . .

P. 153: There were men in England who believed that the colonists were right; some of these men were members of Parliament, and they voted against the Stamp Act.

But these friends of America in England were fewer than those who upheld the Parliament; . . .

P. 154: Many of the members wished to repeal the act, and the question was fiercely debated. At last it was voted to repeal it, and great was the joy in America when the news came. It is said that the people of London, many of whom sympathized with the colonists, were rejoiced at the victory of their kinsmen over the sea. William Pitt, who was strongly in favor of the American ideas in regard to "taxation without representation", was loudly cheered as he passed along the streets.

P. 156: A few far-seeing men like Pitt and Edmund Burke and Colonel Barré could see that it was the familiar English principle of self-government that the colonists wished to preserve; and they warned Parliament to let the whole question alone. . . .

Since 1688, when the throne of England had been taken from James II. and given to William and Mary, Parliament had ruled the country. But there was now on the English throne a king who was not satisfied to be anything less than a real ruler. He took an active part in political affairs. He set to work to make friends among the members of Parliament.

Whom do you think he chose for his friends? The wisest and best men of England? No, for if they were wise and honest, they would not be willing to be led by the king, but would wish to be leaders themselves. So the "king's friends", as they came to be known, were usually the weaker men, who would do just as the king wished, or even bad men, who cared nothing for right and wrong, but wanted to be in favor with the king.

It was one of the "king's friends" who proposed the tax on tea, glass, and the other articles; and the king was perhaps the loudest in saying that the colonists must be made to see that Parliament could rule them in any and every way. . . . For there were in England itself many thousands of people who elected no representatives to Parliament. No change had been made in the assignment of members for two centuries, and in that time many new towns—large towns, some of them, such as Leeds and Birmingham and Manchester—had sprung up, and had no members in Parliament at all. On the other hand, some members in Parliament represented old towns which had dwindled away until there were no voters left to

elect a representative. These places were sometimes called "rotten boroughs", and the men who represented them usually obtained their seats in Parliament because they paid money to the men who owned the land. Thus the British Parliament no longer truly represented the people, and many men in England were demanding reform.

For many reasons King George wished no reform. He preferred Parliament as it was; whether the people were truly represented or not did not disturb him. "Taxation without representation" seemed to him perfectly proper if by it he could gain his own ends. So we find the king and his friends in Parliament always against the colonists on this question, and from this time on it is really the king and his friends who are responsible for the coming of war.

P. 163: The king was taking with each succeeding year a larger part in the government. He had succeeded in getting a prime minister, Lord North, who was willing in all things to follow the king's wishes. In fact, some one has said that during the years of Lord North's holding office, "the king was his own prime minister".

P. 166: . . . in spite of the protests of Edmund Burke, who made a great speech in the House of Commons, and of Fox, Barré, and other men who saw the dangers into which the government was blindly stumbling, Parliament proceeded to punish the "lawless town".

PICTURE OF CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR
TO THE REVOLUTION AND OF THE EFFORTS
MADE BY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN IN
FAVOR OF THE COLONISTS.

From Fiske's *History of the United States*

[61]

See extracts under "Books in use more than twenty years ago", No. 16, page 37.

"PARLIAMENT DID NOT TRULY REPRESENT
THE PEOPLE OF GREAT BRITAIN."

From Gorton's *Elementary History of the United States*

Book Two

[67]

P. 46: It does not appear that as yet they had gone so far as to object to English rule itself, but only to the way in which it was used.

P. 55: We have seen in the first part of this history, that about all the nations of Western Europe undertook to plant colonies in America. Their purpose in so doing was, almost without exception, to extend their own power and possessions and by this means to enrich themselves. . . . The theory was that colonies existed mainly for the benefit of the parent country.

P. 58: However, England had the power, and proceeded to tax the colonies, though even in England there was a strong party, led by Edmund Burke and William Pitt, that very strongly opposed such a policy.

P. 60: As Burke said before Parliament, "We never seem to gain a paltry advantage over them (the Americans) in debate, without attacking some of those principles, or deriding some of those feelings, for which our ancestors shed their blood."

P. 62: In the stormy debates that followed, the bill (The repeal of the Stamp Act) was warmly supported by some of England's great men—William Pitt, Edmund Burke, and Colonel Barré. . . .

In the debates, Pitt had said, "I rejoice that America has resisted! Three millions of people, so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest"; and Colonel Barré had said, "The Americans are a people jealous of their liberties, and who will vindicate them, if they should be violated."

P. 81: Although Parliament voted to send new supplies to the army in America, and continue the struggle, the war was mostly of the king's making and was not popular among the English people. They were not very much inclined to enlist in the army, and the king was compelled to hire an additional force of seventeen thousand men from Germany, mostly Hessians, to help him overcome the Americans.

P. 110: From the first, many of the best people and the wisest statesmen had felt that the war was a mistaken policy.

MORE SIGNIFICANT THAN THESE QUOTATIONS IS CHAPTER XVIII (Pages 111ff.), HEADED "LEADERS OF THE REVOLUTION", IN WHICH ONE PARAGRAPH IS DEVOTED TO EDMUND BURKE AND WILLIAM PITT. CHILDREN WHO ARE SO INSTRUCTED ARE NOT APT TO BE UNJUSTLY PREJUDICED.

From Woodburn and Moran's *Elementary American History and Government*

[91]

P. 117: Unfortunately at this time the British government was not very wisely conducted. George III., an obstinate and in some ways a stupid king, had just come to the throne (1760), and he attempted to take the government into his own hands instead of allowing able ministers to rule. In England the prime minister governs through Parliament, and the king must act on the minister's advice. George III. sought to make his ministers do as he wished. By means of royal favors and money bribes the king controlled the votes of a group of members in Parliament who came to be called "the king's friends", while the Whig party that had been in control of the government for many years was divided into factions.

Moreover, Parliament did not represent the people. There were populous towns that had no representation at all in Parliament, while "rotten boroughs", like "Old Sarum", where no people lived at all, still had members of Parliament because they had had them long ago. The members for these places were chosen by some lord or rich landowner. These conditions were bad and were most unfavorable to the adoption of wise and unselfish laws for the colonies.

Besides these bad conditions at home and the free and independent spirit of the colonies, there were other causes leading to the quarrel with the mother country.

P. 118: For many years these trade laws had not been enforced. John Adams said that they were old and out of use and nobody expected them to be enforced. Their violation was so common and smuggling was so generally practiced that it was costing the government three dollars to collect one dollar in Revenue at American ports.

P. 119, FOOT NOTE: In trying to get a monopoly of her colonial trade Great Britain was doing only what other nations were doing at that time, but that did not make any difference with the colonies whose interests were interfered with by the trade laws.

P. 134: The war had begun. But it must be remembered that it was not for independence that the Americans had taken up arms. Washington said, "When I first took command of the army I abhorred the idea of independence", and he still hoped for "a lasting and happy union with Great Britain." Jefferson said, "Before the 19th of April, 1775, I had never heard a whisper of a disposition to separate from the mother country." Franklin said that the colonists did not desire independence and that they did not oppose the measures of Parliament for this purpose.

. . . In this quarrel, and in the war to which it led, the American cause had warm friends in England. William Pitt, or Lord Chatham, the greatest English statesman of that day, said he rejoiced that America had resisted. He said Parliament had *no*

right to tax America. Edmund Burke, another great English statesman, pleaded with Parliament to pursue a wiser policy towards the colonies. He said it was not *expedient* to tax America. Charles J. Fox, another English leader, spoke of Washington and his troops as "our army", and he rejoiced at American victories. These men were English *Whigs* who were disposed to favor popular rights and to oppose the king's power. On the other hand, many Americans favored Great Britain and some of them fought in the British armies during the war. Perhaps a third of the people in America, in some places a majority, opposed the Revolution. . . . So the war of the Revolution is to be thought of as a civil war. It was not entirely a war of the English against the Americans, but was rather a war between two parties, and in some places it became a very bitter partisan warfare. However, the majority in Great Britain favored the war against America. . . .

The colonies did not wish to cut themselves off from the mother country. They were proud of the English name and dominion and they gloried in English history, but they insisted also upon having the rights of Englishmen.

"PARLIAMENT DID NOT REPRESENT THE PEOPLE . . . THE AMERICAN CAUSE HAD WARM FRIENDS IN ENGLAND."

From Woodburn and Moran's *American History and Government*

[92]

P. 114: She had to do this (to organize an imperial system) at a time when her government was corrupt and when a stupid and obstinate king was coming to the throne who would no longer trust great ministers to rule. The cause of the American Revolution lay in England as well as in America, and one of its principal causes was George III. . . .

He would not choose for his ministers the great men of the realm, like Pitt and Fox and Burke. He set about systematically to get a body of supporters in Parliament who came to be known as the "King's friends", and who could control enough votes in that body to do what the king wanted. George was able to do this by bribes and threats, titles and appointments, and by royal attentions and favors which were then, even more than now, powerful social forces in controlling public men. Thus the king managed Parliament by a kind of bribery.

Members of Parliament did not represent the people. In America the representatives, who taxed and governed, represented a body of people who lived in certain definite local areas, in towns and counties. In England representation was of interests and classes, not of districts of people, and many of the populous manufacturing cities in north and central England that had grown up in recent years had no representation at all in Parliament, while little "rotten boroughs", like Gatton and "Old Sarum", consisting only of a green mound and a ruined wall, still had members of Parliament merely because they had had them long ago. Thus we see that Great Britain was facing new colonial problems with a stupid and wrong-headed king and a deformed and corrupt legislature.

P. 117: Now these restrictive trade laws had not been carefully enforced. Colonial merchants, especially those in New England, had evaded them. John Adams said that they had ceased to be used, and their enforcement was no longer expected. Much smuggling was indulged in. It was the attempt to prevent this evasion of the trade duties that had led to the celebrated "Writs of Assistance" in 1761.

P. 122: The English people did not mean to oppress the Americans or deprive them of their rights. We ought not to think of this quarrel over taxes and the rights of the colonies as between the English people on one side and the Americans on the other. It was rather between two *parties*, the *Tories* in England and America, on one side, and the *Whigs* in both countries, on the other. Pitt and Burke and Fox and Barré and Camden, the ablest statesmen of England, were on the American side. Pitt (Lord Chatham) said he rejoiced that America had resisted, and he spoke boldly for the same principle of taxation as that advocated in America by Hancock, Adams, Henry, and Otis. He said Parliament had no right to tax

America. It had a right, he said, to legislate for the Americans and "to bind them in all cases whatsoever, except to take their money out of their pockets without their consent." Burke did not think so much of the right of taxation but he pleaded for the old *practice* (of requisitions), which, he said, had worked well. He thought it was *unwise* to tax the Americans, as it would cause disturbances and ill feeling.

P. 127: Burke pleaded in vain for its (Tea tax) repeal and for full restoration of the old way of letting the colonies tax and govern themselves.

P. 128: The true policy would have been to do as Pitt and Burke advised,—to repeal the tea tax and seek peace and conciliation with America. But instead of this Parliament turned to the fatal policy of coercion.

P. 135: It was not for independence that they took up arms. Washington said, "When I first took command of the army I abhorred the idea of independence"; he even then hoped for "a lasting and happy union with Great Britain". Jefferson said, "Before the 19th of April 1775, I had never heard a whisper of a disposition to separate from the mother country". Franklin told Pitt in England that the colonists did not desire independence and such was not their purpose in resisting the measures of Parliament.

“WE OUGHT NOT TO THINK OF THIS QUARREL
AS BEING BETWEEN THE ENGLISH
PEOPLE ON THE ONE SIDE AND THE
AMERICANS ON THE OTHER.”

BOOKS IN USE AT PRESENT

GROUP TWO

Text-books
which

deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make some reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
and mention some prominent Englishmen
who rendered services to the Americans.

P. 89: It is certain that a new spirit of loyalty and devotion to the mother country had sprung up, when in 1760, one year after the fall of Quebec, George III., then a young man of twenty-two, ascended the throne. He had a great opportunity to conciliate the colonists and to increase their growing affection; but he defiantly took the opposite course.

The young king brought to the throne a very unfortunate mixture of good and bad qualities. He had an unblemished character; he had a strong will and was very conscientious and industrious; but he was possessed with the idea that the power of the throne should be greatly strengthened, and that all opposition to such increase of power should be put down, if need be, by main force. His ambition was to restore to the Crown the power which it had unlawfully exercised before the two English revolutions had made it subordinate to Parliament. For the accomplishment of this purpose he committed the fatal blunder of pushing aside the great statesmen he found in office and of surrounding himself with ministers who would aid him in carrying out his own policy.

Another peculiarity of the situation was the prevalence of a decided spirit of independence of one another among the individual colonies. . . . And James Otis, one of the foremost of American patriots, said in 1765, "Were the colonies left to themselves, tomorrow America would be a mere shambles of blood and confusion before the little petty states could be united." When George III. ascended the throne, the colonies seemed more afraid of one another than they were of England, and more likely to drift into separate nationalities like those of Europe than they were to unite in a common effort to secure independence of the mother country.

P. 91: In the course of centuries the British people had come to recognize the principle, "No taxation without representation". But in the time of George III. representation, even in England, was absurdly imperfect. Boroughs of not more than half a dozen voters sometimes sent two members to the British Parliament, while some large towns like Manchester and Birmingham sent no representatives. The people permitted this bad state of affairs to continue, because the doctrine was held that every member of Parliament, no matter by whom he was elected, represented all the people of the kingdom, and not merely those who had chosen him. According to this theory, the colonies were as much represented in Parliament as Manchester and Birmingham; and if those towns could be taxed without direct representation, there appeared no just reason why Massachusetts and Virginia and the other colonies should complain of the same method.

But the colonists, and a small but very influential minority in Parliament, took another view of the case.

P. 92: But George III. stubbornly held that if the colonies resisted

the supreme authority of the king and Parliament, they must simply be forced into obedience. This doctrine, for which the king, and the king alone, was responsible, was the fatal error that cost Great Britain the American colonies.

P. 93: This belief shows how generally the spirit of the colonists was misunderstood. Only a few of the greatest and wisest of the British statesmen saw the danger in the policy proposed. These men, of whom Chatham and Burke were the leaders, did not deny the constitutional right of Parliament to tax all British subjects, but they held that it would be madness to try to enforce that right, since such an attempt would probably result in the loss of the colonies. The very thing they feared and predicted took place.

P. 101: The passage of these acts (Five Acts of 1774) was strenuously opposed by several of the strongest men in Parliament. The opposition of Fox, Burke, Pitt, and Barré was particularly energetic. In the House of Peers, Lord Rockingham and his friends entered a protest on the journal of the House, and the Duke of Richmond declared, in his indignation, "I wish from the bottom of my heart that the Americans may resist and get the better of the forces sent against them".

BLAME FOR THE TROUBLE PLACED SQUARELY
ON THE KING, AND THE SERVICES REN-
DERED THE COLONISTS BY PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN RECOGNIZED.

From Barnes' *American History for Grammar Grades*

[43]

P. 180: In each colony, *self-government by the people* had been tried, and the result was good. They had found that there was no need for kings. Yet they had no thought of breaking away from the mother country.

P. 182: On goods so bought they paid no taxes to England. Bringing taxed goods into a country without paying taxes on them is smuggling.

Merchants in England complained that they were losing trade in America because of smuggling, and in 1761 England tried to prevent it. . . . England had been liberal with her colonies, yet she had been kind only so far as kindness was gainful, and she did not always act with far-seeing wisdom.

P. 183: In 1760 George III., a man of twenty-one, had come to the English throne. He was jealous of the power of Parliament and he determined to lessen it. He schemed and plotted and became very much disliked by his subjects. The greatest, wisest, and fairest-minded of England's statesmen were against him. He cared little for the rights of Englishmen in England, and less for the rights of those in America.

P. 184: The people of England had, by this time, begun to see that the Stamp Act was most unjust to their distant friends in America, and at length Parliament repealed it.

P. 186: In all the unfairness that had been shown, it was not England that oppressed the colonies. Her best and wisest statesmen said that such harsh laws were wrong. It was the young and headstrong king, who abused the colonies. Since wise and good men would not help him in his course, he called to his aid those who had more craft and selfishness than honesty. He spent a large part of the vast fortune left him by his father, in bribing members of Parliament to do his will. . . .

As in England, so it was in America. The Tories in the colonies took sides with the king, and favored the Stamp Act, while their neighbors, the Whigs, were against the Stamp Act, and all else that cut off their rights as Englishmen. Had the great Whig party in England been in power with Edmund Burke as its leader, it would have checked the king in his foolish course.

P. 192: There was, as yet, no strong feeling of union among them, and they had not overcome the feeling that each colony was for itself and none for all. Many people sided with the king, and were ready to fight their neighbors.

NO SPECIFIC MENTION OF PITT, NOR OF OTHER
ENGLISHMEN WHO EXERTED THEMSELVES
IN BEHALF OF THE COLONISTS.

From Barnes' *Short American History by Grades*, Part One

[44]

P. 130: In each colony *self-government by the people* had been tried, and the result was good. They had found that there was no need for kings. Yet they had no thought of breaking away from the mother country.

P. 312: On goods so bought they paid no taxes to England. Bringing taxed goods into a country without paying taxes on them is smuggling. Merchants in England complained that they were losing trade in America because of smuggling, and in 1761 England tried to prevent it. . . . England had been liberal with her colonies, yet she had been kind only so far as kindness was gainful, and she did not always act with far-seeing wisdom.

P. 313: In 1760 George III., a man of twenty-one, had come to the English throne. He was jealous of the power of Parliament and determined to lessen it. He schemed and plotted and became much disliked by his subjects. The greatest, wisest, and fairest-minded of England's statesmen were against him. He cared little for the rights of Englishmen in England, and less for the rights of those in America.

P. 316: The people of England had, by this time, begun to see the Stamp Act was most unjust to their distant friends in America, and at length Parliament repealed it.

P. 318: In all the unfairness that had been shown, it was not England that oppressed the colonies. Her best and wisest statesmen said that such harsh laws were wrong. It was the young and headstrong king, who abused the colonies. Since wise and good men would not help him in his course, he called to his aid those who had more craft and selfishness than honesty. He spent a large part of the vast fortune left him by his father, in bribing members of Parliament to do his will. . . .

As in England, so it was in America. The Tories in the colonies took sides with the king, and favored the Stamp Act, and all else that cut off their rights as Englishmen. If the great Whig party in England had been in power with Edmund Burke as its leader, it would have checked the king in his foolish course.

P. 326: . . . There was, as yet, no strong feeling of union among them, and they had not overcome the feeling that each colony was for itself and none for all. Many people sided with the king, and were ready to fight their neighbors.

NO SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO PITT, NOR TO
OTHER ENGLISHMEN WHO EXERTED THEM-
SELVES IN BEHALF OF THE COLONISTS.

From Barnes' *Short American History by Grades*
Part Two

[45]

P. 3: In each colony, *self-government by the people* had been tried, and the result was good. The Americans knew more about it, and believed in it more than other people that had ever lived. They had found that there was no need for kings. Yet they were true to England and had no thought of breaking away from the mother country.

P. 4: But some of the Englishmen at home thought differently. To their minds, a colony was simply a number of people living away from home, from whom money might be wrung. Their sole thought was, "How much gain can we get from the colonies?"

P. 5: Other nations treated their colonies in the same way, so England was no worse than they.

P. 9: On goods so bought they paid no taxes to England. Bringing goods into a country without paying such taxes on them as the law demands is smuggling. But the colonists felt that the law was unjust, and that breaking it was neither wrong nor disgraceful. . . . Many leading merchants were smugglers. . . .

Merchants in England complained that they were losing trade in America because of so much smuggling there, and in 1761, England tried to break it up.

P. 10: If we judge her (England) doings by those of other nations, England had been liberal with her colonies from the very first. Governments were not very generous in those days.

P. 11: In 1760, when everything looked bright for England, George III., a man of twenty-one, as ignorant and stupid as he was well meaning, had come to the English throne. He was a king of the old style. He believed that the king's will should be the law. He thought that people were made for kings, rather than that kings were made for people. He wanted to be such a king as the Jameses and Charleses had been. He was jealous of the power of Parliament, just as they had been, and he set about bending it to his will. He schemed and plotted for power in dishonest ways. In a short time, he became very much disliked by his subjects. The greatest, wisest, and fairest-minded of England's statesmen were against him. He cared little for the rights of Englishmen in England, and less for the rights of those in America.

P. 14: The stamp law was unfair. And, since the colonists were not asked to say what they thought about it before it was put in force, the law was an insult.

P. 15: The people of England had, by this time, begun to say, that

it was most unjust to their distant friends in America, to keep the Stamp Act alive, and at length Parliament repealed it.

P. 19: In all the unfairness that had been shown, it was not England that oppressed the colonies. Her best and wisest statesmen said that such harsh laws were wrong. It was the young, headstrong and ill advised king, that abused the colonies. He, in his conceit, was set upon gaining for himself such powers as English kings had and used before the time of Cromwell. Since wise and good men would not help him in his course, he called to his aid those who had more craft and selfishness, than honesty. He spent a large part of the vast fortune left him by his father, in bribing members of Parliament to do his will. . . . In his later life, he became so openly insane that he was kept in restraint.

P. 20: As in England, so it was in America. The Tories in the colonies took sides with the king, and favored the Stamp Act, or anything else that the king wanted. Their neighbors, the Whigs, were against the Stamp Act, and all else that cut off their rights as Englishmen.

P. 21: The disputes that brought about the war, were not between the colonists and all the English at home. They were rather between the Tories and the Whigs on both sides of the sea, neighbor against neighbor. Had the great Whig party been in power with Edmund Burke as its leader, it would have checked the king in his foolish course. . . . Had there been no war, this great country would probably now be a great branch of the British Empire.

P. 33: There was, as yet, not such a strong feeling of union among them, as was needed at the beginning of a war. They had yet much to do to overcome the feeling, that each colony was for itself and none for all. Many of the people in each colony sided with the king, and were ready to fight their neighbors at his command.

P. 35: The little colonies wanted to have as much power as the big ones, and the big ones wanted to control the little ones.

NO MENTION OF PITT, NOR OF OTHER ENGLISH-
MEN WHO EXERTED THEMSELVES IN BE-
HALF OF THE COLONIES.

From Bourne and Benton's *History of the United States*

[46]

P. 161: Pitt was angry at the conduct of these colonial traders. He was told that the best way to stop such trade with the enemy was to enforce the Sugar Act. This he resolved to do, and the news caused a panic among the Boston merchants.

P. 165: It was hardly fair that they should regulate colonial trade in such a way as to increase their profits, and at the same time try to shift the burden of taxation from their shoulders to those of the colonists. But they could not be expected to see this, believing, as they did, that the main use of colonies was to increase the riches of the mother country.

The king of England was George III., then at the beginning of his reign of sixty years. He was shrewd but narrow-minded, and disliked the colonists because they were inclined to manage their own affairs. He heartily approved Grenville's plan. As many members of Parliament were chosen through his influence, they voted as he wished. All through the troubles with America the "king's friends" were on the wrong side of nearly every question.

P. 166: In England multitudes of tax-payers could not vote. If a town centuries before had not been big enough to send members to parliament, it could not now send members, however big it was. At the same time towns which once had received the right to send members and had grown small did not lose the right. If now the same lord owned all the property in a town or in three or four of them, he chose the members. Scores of members were in reality named by great lords or by the king. The colonists would not have endured a legislature like that. Their objection, however, was that parliament did not represent them in the sense in which they understood representation.

P. 168: Parliament hesitated to drive the colonies into open rebellion and ruin its own merchants besides. In March, 1766, the famous Stamp Act was repealed. . . .

As Pitt had urged repeal, the colonists, forgetting his enforcement of the Sugar Act, displayed his portrait in shop windows. New York and South Carolina voted him a statue.

P. 175: Many colonists thought that resistance to the English government had gone too far.

THIS IS THE ONLY REFERENCE TO PITT; THE
OTHER PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO
LABORED HARD IN THE INTEREST OF
THE COLONIES NOT MENTIONED.

From Burton's *Builders of Our Nation*

[47]

P. 144: Thirteen colonies lay along the sea-coast, all loyal to the English crown.

P. 149: It was soon whispered about that his majesty, George III., was jealous of his prime minister's fame and wished to dismiss him from office.

P. 150: The colonists felt that Pitt was the best friend they had in England. . . .

"Parliament must put a tax on the Americans", persisted the king's ministers.

"They have their own parliaments called Assemblies", said Pitt. "Our Parliament has no right under heaven to lay a tax without their consent."

P. 152: "Repeal the Stamp Act," he said to the stubborn king's ministers. "I repeat, my lords, it is not in accord with the English constitution."

P. 153: The stubborn king would have his own way in American affairs. Because Englishmen were too slow in taking up arms against their kinsmen, his majesty hired some Hessian troops to help the English regulars.

Chatham again spoke out in the House of Lords. "You cannot conquer America!" he said. "If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I would never lay down my arms. Never, *never*, NEVER!"

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE QUOTATIONS IS NOT NEARLY AS GREAT AS THE FACT THAT IN THIS AMERICAN TEXT-BOOK A SEPARATE CHAPTER IS DEVOTED TO WILLIAM PITT, AND THAT HE IS SHOWN TO THE PUPILS AS ONE OF THE BUILDERS OF OUR NATION!

From Elson's *History of the United States of America*

[56]

P. 226: The colonies were not without friends in the Commons during the debate that preceded the passage of the law, the foremost of whom was Colonel Barré, who had fought by the side of Wolfe at Louisburg and Quebec.

P. 229: It was Townshend, above all men except his sovereign, who was responsible for the Revolution.

P. 232: He (George III.) showered favors on his obsequious followers, while men of independent character whom he could not bend to his will became the objects of his hatred. Pitt he pronounced a "trumpeter of sedition"; Burke and Camden were the objects of his wrath. . . .

At the door of George III. must be laid the American Revolution.

P. 236: When the addresses issued by this Congress (Continental) reached England, Chatham paid the following remarkable tribute to the men who framed them:—

"When your lordships look at the papers transmitted us from America—when you consider their decency, firmness, and wisdom, you cannot but respect their cause. . . . For myself I must declare and avow, that in all my reading and observation . . . that for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion . . . no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the Congress at Philadelphia. I trust that it is obvious to your lordships, that all attempts to impose servitude upon such men, to establish despotism over such a mighty continental nation, must be vain, must be fatal."

P. 241: The principle for which the colonies contended was not misunderstood in England. In reply to the statement that the tax on tea was trifling, Edmund Burke (April 19, 1768) replied: "Could anything be a subject of more just claim to America, than to see you go out of the plain high road of finance . . . merely for the sake of insulting your colonies? No man ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of threepence. But no commodity will bear threepence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated, and two millions of people are resolved not to pay."

P. 279: It was believed that he (Pitt) and he alone could yet conciliate America. The king, with his usual obstinacy, hesitated to put the government into the hands of his old enemy. He would probably have been forced to do so by public opinion had not death come to his rescue by removing Chatham.

"AT THE DOOR OF GEORGE III. MUST BE LAID
THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION."

From Foster's *History of the United States*

[63]

P. 136: Most of the colonists were thorough Englishmen. They were loyal to their country and proud of their origin. . . . King George had no more devoted subjects than were those in America. . . . But these Americans cherished the Englishman's ideals of right, justice, and liberty. . . .

The colonies belonged to England, but the King and Parliament would not concede to them the same political and commercial rights as to England. . . . This theory of colonial government, then common among the nations of Europe, gave England a temporary benefit, but finally resulted in disaster.

P. 138: But when George III. came to the throne, 1760, he took the reins of government into his own hands. . . . It was no easy task to get Parliament to yield to his will. But, by bribes in money and by the appointment of many members of Parliament and their friends to good offices, he secured control of a majority in Parliament, who worked with him to further his schemes. George III. was self-willed, arbitrary, and determined to rule England and the colonies in his own way, without regard for the wishes of the people. With his bribed Parliament, he soon began to modify old laws, to enact new ones, and to enforce obedience to the laws, and thus drove the colonies first into *union*, then into *rebellion*.

P. 142: These difficulties, combined with the cry of distress from the manufacturers in England, led Parliament to repeal the Stamp Act, in March, 1766. But, with the repeal of the act was a declaration that Parliament had the right to tax the colonies "in all cases whatsoever".

P. 144: But this was the very thing that the colonies opposed. They cared little for the tax; everything for the principle.

P. 148, FOOT NOTE: The great William Pitt said of the document (The Colonial Declaration of Rights): "The histories of Greece and Rome give us nothing equal to it."

P. 149: The people neither in England nor in America were wholly united. Parliament had a large majority favoring radical measures of King George, but some of the greatest statesmen, like Pitt, Burke, and Fox, were favorable to the colonies. In America the people were divided. The majority opposed the acts of England.

CLEAR SUGGESTION OF POLITICAL CONDITIONS
IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE
REVOLUTION.

From Gordy's *A History of the United States*

[66]

P. 126: In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries European countries planted colonies as a means of increasing their own trade. In accordance with this theory, England valued her American colonies according to the wealth she gained from them.

P. 129: The colonies had submitted to such indirect taxation of their trade and industries because (1) it was usual, the world over, for colonies to have their trade thus taxed by their mother country; (2) the English navy protected the commerce of the colonies; and (3) the Trade Laws were not strictly enforced.

P. 133: The debate in Parliament over the repeal showed that many English Statesmen stoutly defended the colonies in their opposition to the direct taxation without representation. Said William Pitt in a stirring speech in the House of Commons: "Sir, I rejoice that America has resisted! Three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest."

P. 134: We cannot understand the real meaning of the Revolution in America without looking into a similar struggle that was at the same time going on in England. Some Americans did not oppose England and some Englishmen did not join hands against America. It was in each country the same kind of struggle—a struggle between hostile principles. There was taxation without representation in England as well as in America, and many Englishmen, like William Pitt, were as much opposed to it there as men like Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry were opposed to it in America. William Pitt and his followers represented the true feeling of the English people toward America.

At this time Parliament did not fairly represent the people of England. Great towns like Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Leeds were not represented at all, and members were returned for boroughs that had no existence except in name. Such boroughs were called rotten boroughs, or pocket boroughs, which were owned by the great families. Long after Old Sarum, a noted rotten borough, had no population, a member, representing its owner, was returned to the House of Commons. In a population of 8,000,000 only about 160,000, or one tenth of the men of voting age in England, could vote. A few great families controlled the House of Commons. Certainly the mass of Englishmen could justly complain of taxation without representation. Among them was the great William Pitt, who urged upon the people the justice of parliamentary reform, with a fair and full representation of the English people in the House of Commons.

P. 135: His (George III.) controlling purpose was to establish personal government in England. His desire for arbitrary power, together with his narrowness and bigotry, had much influence in

bringing on the Revolution. He cared little for the rights of the people. The more power they had the less he would enjoy. By the corrupt use of money he succeeded in controlling the elections. His desire was to make Parliament represent him and a few great families that were in the political ring with him. He maintained his influence largely through boss-like methods, keeping his followers under control by the use of an immense corruption fund. As long as a large number of small boroughs remained under the control of his friends, the king could maintain his tyrannical hold upon the government.

But if the Americans should succeed in their struggle for "No taxation without representation," there was little doubt that in time Englishmen would succeed in a similar struggle for parliamentary reform, or "No taxation without representation" in England.

P. 139: Again English merchants begged for a repeal. But the stupid king could not understand the Americans. Thus far he had failed. He now resorted to a trick by which he hoped to induce the colonists to pay a small tax levied by Parliament.

PICTURE OF POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, BUT ONLY PITT MENTIONED AMONG THE MANY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO ESPOUSED THE CAUSE OF THE COLONISTS.

From Hall, Smither and Ousley's *Student's History of our Country*

[68]

P. 119: The colonists were loyal to the mother country, although they looked to her chiefly as a means of protection from foreign foes; and England, however much she desired to control the colonies, was forced, first by civil strife and then by frequent foreign wars, to leave them largely to their own devices.

P. 120: George III. was a well-meaning man, but he had an exaggerated idea of his own importance and greatness, and he was resolved to exercise the utmost of royal power. . . . But in an effort to further exercise his power over his American subjects he lost for England, as we shall presently see, her fairest possessions beyond the seas. . . .

According to the ideas of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, colonies existed only for the benefit of the mother country.

P. 123: It will be seen that the revenue thus raised was to be devoted to the colonies, but they resisted the right of England to tax them and joined issue directly on the principle that they should control their own affairs. The colonists always maintained that the power of laying taxes for revenue in the colonies belonged to each colonial government and not to the English Parliament, for they were not represented in that body, and could not well be, as it sat thousands of miles away. The view advanced by the British, that they were as fairly represented by the English members as the great majority of English people were, seemed to the colonists utterly absurd; the American idea was that each member of the colonial legislatures represented a body of people living in some definite area, and the English idea was that the members of Parliament represented the different classes of society in the British Empire.

P. 125: There was stern resistance in the English Parliament to this act. The great Pitt and a group of liberal English statesmen contended for the same rights which the Americans asserted. They openly espoused the cause of the colonists and urged the repeal of the law. . . . In America the repeal of the Stamp Act was received with the wildest joy. There were celebrations in every town and there were widespread expressions of loyalty to King George III.

GULF BETWEEN THE KING AND THE MASS OF
THE ENGLISH PEOPLE NOT SHOWN.

From Higginson's *Young Folks' History of the United States*

[71]

See Quotations under "Books in use more than twenty years ago", No. 20, Page 48.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN ATTITUDE OF THE
KING AND THAT OF PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN INDICATED.

From Lemmon's (Cooper, Estill, and Lemmon's) *The History of Our Country*

[73]

P. 156: The Parliament which proposed to tax the American colonists did not truly represent the people of England. In the United States today, we know that members of Congress are elected from districts of nearly equal population; and as population increases much more rapidly in some parts of the country than in others, we rearrange our representative districts every ten years in order to prevent unfairness in representation. In England, however, members of Parliament had been originally elected from "shires" or "boroughs", as such, and without reference to population. At the time of George III. these parliamentary districts, never regular, had not been changed for 200 years. As a consequence, cities like Manchester and Birmingham, which had sprung up in recent years, had no representatives, while other districts, whose population had decreased to hardly a dozen inhabitants, were yet allowed to choose members of Parliament. The votes in these "rotten boroughs" were controlled by the king and a few wealthy families. The people of the unrepresented cities had begun to complain of their unjust treatment, and they sympathized with the Americans in their cry of "no taxation without representation."

P. 158: The colonies, moreover, were not without sympathizers in England. When Parliament met in 1766, a petition against the Stamp Act was presented by the London merchants trading with America. William Pitt, now old and suffering with disease, appeared in the House of Commons on crutches, and fiercely opposed the policy of the British government. "I rejoice that America has resisted," said he. "If her people had submitted, they would have voluntarily become slaves. My opinion is that the Stamp Act should be repealed, absolutely, totally, immediately." The result was the repeal of the Stamp Act before it had been in operation six months. At the same time a resolution was passed declaring that Parliament had the right to tax the colonies in all cases. Thus the principle of taxation without representation was still maintained.

NO OTHER REFERENCE TO PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO FOUGHT FOR THE COLONIES, NOR TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Perry and Price's *American History*, Second Book

[84]

P. 1: "The people, I believe, are as truly loyal as any subjects the king has; but they are a people jealous of their liberties, who, if those liberties should ever be violated, will vindicate them to the last drop of their blood." Thus spoke a member of the British House of Commons during a heated discussion concerning the British colonies in North America.

. . . Like the other leading nations of Europe, she believed that colonies were particularly useful for trading purposes. One reason why England maintained colonies was that she might sell goods to them at great profit. So her Parliament made many laws that benefited the English merchants.

P. 5: We must not think of the colonists at that time as rebellious people, anxious to be rid of the mother country. Far from this, they were true patriots asking but for the rights of Englishmen.

P. 6: One of the rights an Englishman holds most precious is that of being represented in the law-making body that decides upon the taxes. It is true that the Americans had their own Assemblies, but they were not represented in Parliament, the English taxing body. And it was Parliament that had levied the Stamp Tax and had made other unsatisfactory laws for the colonists. Moreover, the colonists did not admit that a standing army was needed in America in time of peace.

P. 7: At last Parliament saw that a great mistake was being made in the treatment of the colonists. Within a few months it repealed the Stamp Act. But here the king stepped in and made matters worse. . . . We do not doubt that he meant to do right, but he was head-strong and conceited. He would not listen to his best advisers, but only to those who gave the advice that he wanted to hear.

P. 21: The Second Continental Congress even sent one more petition to George III. asking for fair treatment. The king paid no attention to it, but closed American ports and called the people rebels.

P. 52: Our stanch friend, William Pitt, came from a sick bed to make a last great speech in Parliament. In it he said, "No man more highly esteems and honors the English troops than I do. I know their virtues and their valor; I know they can achieve anything but impossibilities; and I know that the conquest of English America is an impossibility. You cannot, my Lords, you cannot conquer America. . . . If I were an American as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms—never, never, never!"

NO FURTHER REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS OR
MEN IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Tappan's *Elementary History of Our Country*

[87]

P. 135: It was different with this stamp tax. In each colony there was an assembly of men elected by the people, and only that assembly had ever imposed taxes. The colonists replied, "This is not just. In England only the House of Commons can impose a tax; so in America, only the assembly of each colony can tax that colony. But, if the king *asks* us to help England, our assemblies will grant money as we have often done before. . . ."

England was startled that mere colonies should dare to be so independent. In these days a nation is proud of her colonies and glad to have them prosper; but in the earlier times the countries of Europe felt differently. They looked upon a colony as a convenient place to send men for whom there seemed no work and no room at home. It was also a place where a man whom the king wished to favor could receive a grant of land or hold some office, and thus make his fortune. In matters of trade, the mother country never thought of trying to help the colonies; and when laws were made in England, they always aimed at getting as much money as possible from the colonies.

In 1765 the Stamp Act was passed, though many clear-headed statesmen in England were against it. Edmund Burke said it was unjust. William Pitt, who was always a friend to America, said, "England has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies."

NO FURTHER REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS OR
MEN IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE
REVOLUTION.

BOOKS IN USE AT PRESENT

GROUP THREE

Text-books
which
deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make no reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
but make, at least, favorable mention
of several prominent Englishmen.

From Gordy's *Stories of Later American History*

[65]

P. 1: The English Parliament, being largely made up of the King's friends, was quite ready to carry out his wishes, and passed a law taxing the colonists. This law was called the Stamp Act.

P. 9: But perhaps you will be surprised to learn that even in England many leading men opposed it. They thought that George III. was making a great mistake in trying to tax the colonies without their consent. William Pitt, a leader in the House of Commons, made a great speech in which he said: "I rejoice that America has resisted". He went on to say that if the Americans had meekly submitted, they would have acted like slaves.

Burke and Fox, other great statesmen, also befriended us.

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION
WHICH EXPLAIN THE GULF SEPARAT-
ING THE KING FROM THE MASS OF
THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

From Hamilton's *Our Republic, A History of the United States*

[69]

P. 155: When the time came to put the Stamp Act into operation, all the collectors had resigned. A number of English statesmen became convinced that the Stamp Act was an unwise, if not an unjust, measure. Edmund Burke questioned the wisdom of the tax, while the great William Pitt questioned the right of Parliament to levy it.

NO OTHER REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS OR
MEN IN ENGLAND CONNECTED WITH THE
ENGLISH SIDE OF THE CONTROVERSY.

From Hart's *Essentials in American History*

[70]

P. 135: Opposed to the king's policy was a group of brilliant statesmen, of whom the most famous were William Pitt (later Earl of Chatham), Charles James Fox, and Edmund Burke; they counseled wise and moderate dealing with the colonies. Notwithstanding this opposition, for a long time the king by shrewd means, by bestowing titles here, appointments there, reproofs to a third man, and banknotes where other things failed, was able to keep up in the House of Commons a majority, usually called "the king's friends".

P. 139: The proceeds of the tax (estimated at 100,000 Pounds a year) were to go toward the expense of troops which were to be sent to America for the defence of the colonies.

P. 141: The opposition to the Stamp Act caused much perplexity in England. William Pitt warmly defended the colonists: "We may bind their trade, confine their manufactures, and exercise every power whatsoever", said he, "except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent."

P. 146: In spite of Edmund Burke's protests against a policy "which punishes the innocent with the guilty, and condemns without the possibility of defence", a series of coercive statutes, sometimes called "the Intolerable Acts", were hastily passed by Parliament.

P. 154: Up to 1766 the theory of the Americans was that they were fighting simply to compel the British to return to the legal principles of colonial government; they still hoped for an honorable settlement of the trouble. As the war went on, they lost their habitual loyalty to the sovereign and began to accuse George III. of all kinds of gross tyranny, and to think of independence.

NO PICTURE OF CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Mace's *Primary History, Stories of Heroism*

[74]

P. 141: King George III, however, thinking only of England's debt, decided that England ought to tax the colonies to pay for an army which he wished to keep in America.

P. 144: Many great Englishmen, such as William Pitt and Edmund Burke, opposed the Stamp Tax. Finally, King George and his Parliament repealed the unpopular act.

P. 145: More British soldiers were sent there to force the people to obey these detested laws.

P. 151: The king now tried to trick the Americans into paying the tax by making tea cheaper in America than in England.

P. 172: Washington took Henry's side, but his friends, the Fairfaxes, took the king's side in favor of the Stamp Act.

P. 177: Nine miles away, in Trenton, lay the Hessians, those soldiers from Hesse-Cassel, in Europe, whom George III. had hired to fight his American subjects, because Englishmen refused to fight Americans.

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, AND ONLY
THIS CASUAL REFERENCE TO THE
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO
ESPOUSED THE CAUSE OF
THE COLONISTS.

From Mace's *Beginner's History*

[75]

P. 154: He (Franklin) wrote many letters to great men, and long articles to the English newspapers, explaining how the Stamp Act injured America. . . .

He often talked with William Pitt, the great friend of America, who introduced into Parliament a plan for making friends between the two countries. But the plan was defeated.

P. 162: Many great Englishmen, such as William Pitt and Edmund Burke, opposed the Stamp Tax.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD IS TREATED IN
THIS TEXT-BOOK IN THE CHAPTERS ON
WASHINGTON, FRANKLIN, SAMUEL
ADAMS, PATRICK HENRY. ABOVE
ARE THE ONLY REFERENCES TO
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Mace's *School History of the United States*

[76]

P. 144: The great Edmund Burke favored repeal because it was not *wise* to tax America, while William Pitt and Lord Camden argued for repeal because England had *no right* to tax America. Pitt became a greater favorite with the colonists than ever. He praised them and said: "I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of ourselves".

P. 154: William Pitt (Lord Chatham) introduced a motion for the removal of the British troops from Boston. He declared: "When your lordships look at the papers; when you consider their decency, firmness, and wisdom, you cannot but respect their cause and wish to make it your own. For myself, I must declare—that for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion—no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the general Congress at Philadelphia".

Later, by the aid of Franklin, who was then in England, Chatham prepared a plan for restoring good feeling between England and her colonies, but Parliament voted it down. Edmund Burke also made a powerful plea for conciliation, but all in vain.

P. 177: Lord Chatham and Edmund Burke had already violently denounced the use of Indians by the English.

AT LEAST SOME NOTICE TAKEN OF THE HELP
OF LEADING ENGLISHMEN.

From MacMaster's *Brief History of the United States*

[78]

P. 147: We are often told that taxation without representation was the cause of the Revolution. It was indeed one cause, and a very important one, but not the only one by any means. The causes of the Revolution, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, were many, and arose chiefly from an attempt of the mother country to (1) enforce the laws concerning trade, (2) quarter royal troops in the colonies, and (3) support the troops by taxes imposed without the consent of the colonies.

P. 149, FOOT NOTE: While the Stamp Act was under debate in Parliament, Colonel Barré, who fought under Wolfe at Louisburg, opposed it. A member had spoken of the colonists as "children planted by our care, nourished by our indulgence, and protected by our arms". "They planted by your care!" said Barré. "No, your oppression planted them in America. Nourished by your indulgence! They grew up by your neglect of them. They protected by your arms! These Sons of Liberty have nobly taken up arms in your defence."

P. 150: In the opinion of the British people the colonists were represented in Parliament. British subjects in America, it was held, were just as much represented in the House of Commons as were the people of Manchester or Birmingham, neither of which sent a member to the House.

P. 153, NOTE 2: Pitt in a great speech declared, "the kingdom has no right to lay a tax on the colonies, because they are unrepresented in Parliament. I rejoice that America has resisted." Edmund Burke, one of the greatest of Irish orators, took the same view.

NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS TO ENGLISH
CONDITIONS OR MEN CONNECTED WITH THE
PERIOD PRECEDING THE REVOLUTION.

From Montgomery's *Leading Facts of American History*

[82]

P. 134: During that war, and for a long time before it, the laws which forbade the colonists to trade with any country except Great Britain had not been enforced. The New Englanders had made a great deal of money by trading with the French and the Spanish West Indies—sending them lumber and fish, and bringing back molasses and sugar from the French islanders, and kegs of silver dollars from the Spaniards.

The new king, George III. (1760), resolved to enforce the English laws and so break up this profitable commerce. He was conscientious but narrow-minded, obstinate, and at times crazy. He stationed ships of war along the American coast to stop trade with the French and Spaniards with whom England was at war. Moreover, in Boston and other large towns, the King's officers, armed with general warrants called "Writs of Assistance", began to break into men's houses and shops and search them for smuggled goods.

P. 135, FOOT NOTE: The King had his first attack of insanity—a mild one—in 1765, while the Stamp Act was under discussion. In 1788 he felt that his mind was seriously affected; bursting into tears, he exclaimed that "he wished to God he might die, for he was going mad". He soon became so.

P. 136: The best men in Parliament—such men as William Pitt and Edmund Burke—took the side of the colonists. Burke said that if the king undertook to tax the Americans against their will, he would find it as hard a job as the farmer did who tried to shear a wolf instead of a sheep.

FOOT NOTE: Pitt thought it was not right to tax America; Burke thought it was not wise to do so.

P. 138: When news of these vigorous proceedings reached London, William Pitt said in Parliament: "In my opinion, this kingdom has no right to lay a tax on the colonies . . . I rejoice that America has resisted." The Stamp Act was speedily repealed (1766). Parliament however, put a sting into its repeal, for it passed a Declaratory Act, maintaining that the British government had the right to bind the colonies "in all cases whatsoever".

P. 139: This duty was retained to show that England meant to tax the colonies without their consent.

P. 141: They humbly petitioned the king to redress their wrongs. They might as well have petitioned the "Great Stone Face" in the White Mountains of New Hampshire. . . .

But the Carolina paper forgot the Tories, who constituted a third of the population. They positively refused to take up arms against the king. Like the patriots they were brave men; they loved their country; but they believed that the quarrel could be settled without drawing a sword or firing a gun. In the end the Tories were driven out of the United States, and the patriots seized their houses and lands.

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN PARLIAMENT PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Morris' *History of the United States of America*

[83]

P. 172: He (George III.) was a man not well fitted to deal with a people as sensitive on the subject of political liberty as the Americans. Obstinate in disposition and dull in mind, with an exaggerated view of the royal prerogative, he was seconded by ministers and a Parliament who could not be made to understand the feeling of the colonists, and who persisted in a policy that in a few years drove them into rebellion.

P. 174: It was declared by William Pitt, a friend of the Americans, that not even a horseshoe nail could be legally made without permission from Parliament.

P. 180: The great orators, William Pitt and Edmund Burke, opposed the law in Parliament.

FOOT NOTE: Pitt declared that Parliament had no right to tax the Americans, and said, "I rejoice that America has resisted". Burke said that if the king tried to tax the Americans against their will, he would find it as hard a job as the farmer did who tried to shear a wolf instead of a sheep.

P. 191: Pitt proposed measures of conciliation. They were rejected, and . . .

P. 220, FOOT NOTE: Pitt denounced in Parliament the employment of Hessians and savages. "If I were an American, as I am an Englishman", he exclaimed, "while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms,—never, never, never!"

THESE ARE THE ONLY REFERENCES TO THE
SERVICES RENDERED THE COLONISTS
BY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Sheldon's *American History*, (Mary Sheldon
Barnes' Studies in American History.)

[85]

See extracts under "Books in use more than twenty years ago",
No. 34, Page 63.

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Swan's *History and Civics*, Fifth year—Second half

[86]

P. 90: But England's interest in her colonies was more selfish than this. She valued the Americans chiefly for their usefulness in building up British trade and making English merchants rich.

P. 116: Many of the members of the English Parliament had not favored the Act, among them, William Pitt and Edmund Burke. . . . So in March, 1766, Parliament repealed the Stamp Act.

P. 120: The king, who could easily get Lord North to do anything, now had his own way about the treatment of the colonies.

NO REFERENCE TO THE POLITICAL CONDI-
TIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE
REVOLUTION.

From Thomas' *An Elementary History of the United States*

[88]

P. 187: They (the colonists) laid heavy taxes upon themselves, to pay the expenses of their own troops, and did it willingly; but when England began to tax them they objected.

They claimed that, as they were not represented in the English Parliament, that body had no right to tax them. Many of the people of England could have made a similar claim, for Parliament was elected by a small number of voters, and many large towns were unrepresented. But the Americans felt that, if their money was to be spent, they should have some voice in deciding what should be done with it.

There were many Englishmen who thought that the Americans were right. The English government, however, thought differently, and in 1765 Parliament passed the Stamp Act, a law which required all law papers, all agreements, all marriage certificates, and many other papers, in order to be of any use, to be written on paper which had a certain value stamped upon it. These sheets of stamped paper varied in value from one cent to sixty dollars, or even more.

P. 194: The course followed by the king and the majority in Parliament was opposed by some of the ablest English legislators, such as Edmund Burke and William Pitt, and also many English citizens, but without avail.

NO FURTHER REFERENCE TO THE SERVICES
RENDERED THE COLONISTS BY
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Thwaites and Kendall's *History of the United States*

[90]

P. 137: King George was an obstinate and narrow-minded person. He had formed a hatred for his American subjects because of their "disobedience and lawlessness." He was eager to teach them a lesson, and announced that any opposition to the new taxes would promptly be crushed.

William Pitt, Lord Chatham, and his friend, Edmund Burke, one of the greatest British orators, warned his Majesty, from their seats in Parliament, that harshness was neither a proper nor a safe method of managing dissatisfied Englishmen, whether at home or in the distant colonies; but words of wisdom like these were thrown away on a man like King George.

FOOT NOTE: Pitt's eldest son was in the army; but his father withdrew him, fearing that he might be called on to serve against the colonies.

P. 141: A great debate arose in Parliament over the rights of the Americans, during which Pitt exultingly cried: "I rejoice that America has resisted! Three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be made slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest. . . ."

In order to please the merchants the Government now repealed the Stamp Act.

P. 148: Pitt told Parliament, "For solidity of reason, force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusions under a complication of difficult circumstances, no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the general Congress at Philadelphia."

Plans for conciliation were urged in Parliament by him and by Burke. But all their efforts proved vain, for the insolent majority seemed eager to please the hot-headed king.

P. 158: But up to the close of 1775 most people disliked the thought of independence.

FOOT NOTES: Not all of the Americans sided with the Revolutionary Party. In every colony many remained loyal to the King.

Washington once wrote: "When I first took command of the Continental army, I abhorred the idea of independence."

NO OTHER REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDI-
TIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE
REVOLUTION.

BOOKS IN USE AT PRESENT

GROUP FOUR

Text-books
which
deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make no reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
but mention, at least, PITT.

From Connor's *The Story of the United States*

[51]

P. 189: England wanted to use the colonies simply as a means of enriching herself.

P. 190: The laws against manufactures and trade did not keep the Americans from looking up to the mother country. . . . They were proud of their connection with England.

P. 195: The colonies were not left to fight their battles alone. Many of the leading men in England declared that Parliament had no right to tax the Americans. "I rejoice", declared William Pitt, "that America has resisted." The British merchants whose trade with America was suffering, joined in the cry against the Stamp Act. The King had to give way, and Parliament repealed the unpopular law.

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION,
NOR ANY FURTHER MENTION OF
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO
ESPOUSED THE CAUSE OF
THE COLONIES.

From Elson and MacMullan's *The Story of Our Country*

[57]

P. 148: But the colonists had a friend in the wise statesman William Pitt. "The Americans ought not to be taxed without their consent," said he. "Do we allow them to be represented in Parliament? No. Then they should not be taxed unless they are represented."

P. 149: "I rejoice that America has resisted", said William Pitt, "three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest."

NO REFERENCE TO THE POLITICAL CONDI-
TIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REV-
OLUTION, NOR TO OTHER PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN WHO SERVED THE
CAUSE OF THE COLONISTS.

From Gordy's *Elementary History of the United States*

[64]

P. 137: Many Englishmen believed that the king had made a mistake, and that the Americans were right in refusing to be taxed without being represented in the body that taxed them. One of these, William Pitt, took up the cause of the colonists in Parliament. In an eloquent speech he said, "Sir, I rejoice that America has resisted. The Americans have been wronged! They have been driven to madness by injustice!"

P. 152: But if there were many in the colonies who went over to the side of England, so in England not a few took up the cause of the colonies. King George found that many Englishmen were unwilling to fight against the Americans, some of whom were their kinsmen. As it was hard to get English soldiers, the King hired German troops, thirty thousand in all, from Hesse-Cassel, his German possession. These soldiers were called Hessians.

THE ONLY REFERENCE TO ANYTHING DONE
ON BEHALF OF THE COLONIES BY
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Hodgdon's *A First Course in American History*, II

[72]

P. 2: In the year 1765 a bill called the Stamp Act was passed by the English Parliament. Parliament makes England's laws just as Congress at Washington makes our own.

P. 8: George III. was slow to learn that the people have rights as well as the king. He would have done well to give heed to the discontent of the colonists and to the counsel of wise English statesmen. Many members of Parliament, among them William Pitt, sympathized with the Americans, and were glad when they refused to pay the stamp tax. "I rejoice", said Pitt in a great speech in the House of Commons, "that America has resisted".

P. 79: William Pitt, always America's true friend, rose in Parliament and said: "My Lords, *you cannot conquer America*. And if I were an American, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I would never lay down my arms—never—never—never!"

NO REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND
PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO ANY
OF THE PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN,
ASIDE FROM PITT, WHO LABORED
IN THE INTEREST OF THE
COLONIES.

From Thompson's *History of the United States*

[89]

P. 145: The colonial policy of Great Britain was in accordance with the view, accepted by all nations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, that the trade and manufactures of colonies should be controlled in the interest of the mother country. Few statesmen of Europe could then be found who would deny that the system was proper. The policy of Great Britain was more liberal than that of other nations, for while laws were passed to secure a monopoly of the colonial trade, other laws were passed to build up that trade.

P. 146: They were proud of being Englishmen, and although they resented the unjust course pursued towards them, they willingly acknowledged their allegiance to the mother country.

P. 153: Parliament, realizing the temper of the American people, repealed the law in the spring of 1766, but at the same time declared its right to tax America. Those who favored the repeal were led by William Pitt, the great friend of the colonies, and by Edmund Burke.

NO FURTHER REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR
TO THE SERVICES RENDERED THE
COLONIES BY PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN.

BOOKS IN USE AT PRESENT

GROUP FIVE

Text-books
which

deal fully with the grievances of the colonists,
make no reference to general political conditions in England
prior to the American Revolution,
nor to any prominent Englishmen who devoted themselves to
the cause of the Americans.

From Barnes's *School History of the United States*,
by Steele

[42]

P. 120: *Causes of the Revolution.*—The French and Indian War, by driving the French from America, rendered it less necessary for Great Britain to heed the wishes of the colonists. Accordingly, the British officers now began to enforce the odious Navigation Act (1761). Moreover, the British Parliament, urged on by King George III., made a series of attempts to tax the colonists. The colonists resisted these attempts, at first by peaceable means and finally by force of arms, declaring that "taxation without representation is tyranny".

The Stamp Act (1765) ordered that stamps should be put on all legal documents, newspapers, pamphlets, etc. The money paid for the stamps was a tax to support an army for the defence of the colonies. But the colonists, who insisted that they could be rightfully taxed only by their own assemblies, were thoroughly aroused by this law. The houses of British officials were mobbed. Prominent Loyalists were hanged in effigy. Stamped paper was seized. The stamp agents were forced to resign. People agreed not to use any article of British manufacture. Associations, called the "Sons of Liberty", were formed to resist the law. Delegates from nine of the colonies met at New York (the "Stamp Act Congress") and framed a Declaration of Rights, and a petition to the king and Parliament. The 1st of November, appointed for the Stamp Act to go into effect, was observed as a day of mourning. Bells were tolled, flags were raised at halfmast, and business was suspended. Samuel and John Adams, Patrick Henry, and James Otis, by their stirring and patriotic speeches, aroused the people over the whole land.

Alarmed by these demonstrations, the British Parliament repealed the Stamp Act (1766), but still declared its right to tax the colonies.

The Townshend Acts, soon after passed by Parliament, laid a tax upon tea, glass, paper, etc., and established a Board of Trade at Boston to act independently of the colonial assemblies. The money raised by the new tax was to pay the salaries of the colonial governors and other officers to be appointed by the crown.

Mutiny Act.—Troops were sent from England to enforce the laws. The Mutiny Act ordered that the colonies should provide these soldiers with food and shelter. To be taxed illegally was bad enough, but to support armed oppressors was unendurable. The New York assembly, having refused to comply, was forbidden to pass any legislative acts.

The colonists, meanwhile, made new agreements not to buy any British goods till the duties were repealed. The Massachusetts assembly sent a circular letter to the other colonies, urging a union for the redress of grievances. The King's secretary for colonial affairs

ordered the assembly to rescind its action; but it almost unanimously refused. By this time, the assemblies of nearly all the colonies had declared that Parliament had no right to tax them without their consent. (Paragraphs follow on "Boston Massacre", "Boston Tea Party", etc.)

NO REFERENCE TO THE ENGLISH SIDE OF THE
CONTROVERSY, NOR TO THE EMINENT
SERVICES RENDERED THE COLONISTS
BY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Chandler and Chitwood's *Makers of American History*

[48]

This book teaches History by reviewing the lives of all the men prominent in public life in this country. In doing so, it touches upon all the principal events which led to the estrangement between the two countries and to the Revolutionary War, but in no word refers to the attitude of that part of the population of England which understood and championed the claims of the colonists.

NO MENTION OF PITT, BURKE, BARRE, OR OF
ANY OTHER PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN
WHO DEVOTED THEMSELVES TO THE
CAUSE OF THE COLONISTS.

From Chambers' (Hansell's) *A School History of the United States*

[50]

P. 99: Why the Colonists resisted.

1. From time to time some very unjust laws had been made by England for the government of the colonies. When laws are unjust and people are forced to obey them, we call this use of power tyranny. Brave people seldom submit to tyranny.

2. One of the laws, made by England as far back as 1660, forbade the colonists to build or use their own ships. Although many things were exported or sent to Europe, the law was that only English vessels were permitted to be used. This law was known as the Navigation Act.

3. In 1764, Acts of Trade were passed. These compelled the colonists to send their products, such as sugar, rice, tobacco, and indigo, to England only. They were forbidden to trade with any other country. At one time the colonists were not permitted to manufacture certain articles for themselves. The object was to make them buy these articles abroad, and they were allowed to buy from none but English merchants.

4. Laws were also made in England to tax the colonists for the expenses of the French and Indian War. One of these laws was known as the Stamp Act. It compelled the colonists to write or print on stamped paper every promissory note, bond, or other legal document, and also every newspaper and almanac. The stamped paper was sold only by the English Government.

5. Another way by which England tried to raise money in America was to require the colonists to pay a tax on the tea they used. Taxes were also imposed upon paint, varnish, glass, and other things.

6. These tax laws were made in England. English laws are made by men from different parts of the kingdom. These men represent the people of England and form the Parliament, or legislature.

7. The colonists did not have representatives in Parliament, and it should not have imposed taxes upon them, for taxation without representation is not right. Among the colonists there were many brave men who were willing to fight and die for what they thought to be right; so they determined to resist.

8. The stamped paper that was sent over was either destroyed or returned to England. When the tax was placed on tea, the colonists stopped using it altogether. A number of men disguised as Indians went one night on board a vessel loaded with tea, and threw it all into the water. This took place in Boston harbor, and is known as the Boston Tea Party.

9. England became angry at the resistance of the colonists, and sent soldiers over to compel them to obey. These soldiers were quartered in Boston. Very soon trouble arose between them and the people.

NO INDICATION OF THE ENGLISH SIDE OF THE
CONTROVERSY NOR OF THE GREAT SERVICES
PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN RENDERED THE
COLONISTS.

From Eggleston's *A First Book in American History*

[53]

See quotations under "Books in use more than twenty years ago".
No. 11, Page 84.

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND WHICH CAUSED PARLIAMENT
TO WORK HAND IN HAND WITH THE
KING, NOR TO THE SERVICES
RENDERED THE COLONISTS
BY PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN.

From Eggleston's *History of the United States and Its
People*

[54]

See quotations under "Books in use more than twenty years ago".
No. 12, Page 85.

NO MENTION OF THE FACT THAT MANY ENG-
LISHMEN FAVORED THE COLONISTS.

From Eggleston's *New Century History of the United States*

[55]

Summary of the Chapter "Causes of the Revolution".

P. 151: *Summary.* 1. England and the colonies quarreled almost from the beginning. Great Britain forced African slaves upon the colonies, and made hurtful laws, especially the laws to prevent manufacturing in the colonies and to interfere with their trade. For many years the colonists managed to evade these laws by smuggling and in other ways.

2. When George III. became king he made an effort to enforce the trade laws strictly. The colonists resisted, holding that a legislature in England in which they had no voice had no right to tax them.

3. Parliament passed the Stamp Act (1765). It required the colonists to pay a stamp tax on all documents and newspapers. But the colonists would not use the stamped paper, and not a single stamp was sold in all America.

4. In 1765 a congress of delegates from nine of the colonies met to consider plans of action. It adopted a declaration of rights and grievances, declared that the colonists alone had a right to make laws and impose taxes, and claimed for every accused person the right of trial by jury—a right which at that time was often denied to Americans.

5. The Stamp Act was repealed. But other equally bad laws were passed instead. On March 5, 1770, British soldiers in Boston fired upon the people, killing some of them.

6. In March, 1773, the Virginia legislature appointed a committee of correspondence to communicate with the other colonies and arranged for united action in self-defence. The other colonies liked Virginia's suggestion, and acted upon it.

7. The laws taxing the colonies were repealed, but a small tax on tea was retained. The colonists refused to pay this tax. From some ports all tea ships were sent back to England with their cargoes. In Boston, citizens threw the tea into the water. Tea sent to Charles Town, South Carolina, was put into storehouses, where it lay for several years.

8. These things angered the British, and they made four new laws for the injury of the colonies. One of these stopped all trade with Boston by forbidding ships to enter or leave the harbor. All the colonies treated this wrong to Boston as a wrong to themselves.

9. These things led to the calling of a Continental Congress, September 5, 1774, at which it was agreed that no British goods should be used in this country.

THE CHAPTER ITSELF CONTAINS NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS TO PERSONS OR MATTERS CONNECTED WITH THE PERIOD PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION.

From Evans' *First Lessons in Georgia History*

[58]

P. 103: The colonies denied both the justice of the new tax and the right of Parliament to levy it.

The tax was not just, because the colonies bore their share of the expense by furnishing and equipping soldiers of their own. The tax was not right, because English citizens could not lawfully be taxed except by the votes of their representatives. The colonists had no representatives in Parliament; they claimed that they should be taxed only by their colonial assemblies.

P. 104: The money raised by the tax was to be spent in support of the English army in the colonies.

P. 108: In March, 1766, the Stamp Act was repealed, and peace and order once more prevailed in the colonies.

P. 109: England was warned by one of her statesmen, who said, "If you persist in your right to tax the Americans, you will force them into open rebellion."

P. 119: These measures made the people more and more discontented. Those who sided with the colonists and were in favor of liberty were called "Whigs", while those who favored the king were called "Tories". "Tory" soon became a term of bitter reproach.

NO REFERENCE TO THE CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE SERVICES OF PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN FAVORING THE COLONISTS.

From Evans' *The Essential Facts of American History*

[59]

P. 174: When England planted colonies in America, or agreed to people coming here for that purpose, the king had in mind only the riches to be gained for England. He cared little for the colony; it was planted for the benefit of the mother country.

P. 177: We must not get the idea that the American colonists were opposed to the mother country in feeling. Such was not the case. They loved the Old England from which their fathers came.

P. 179: The British Parliament, seeing the opposition of the colonies, repealed the Stamp Act in 1766. Still Parliament believed that the British government had a right to tax the colonies.

NO REFERENCE TO THE POLITICAL CONDI-
TIONS IN PARLIAMENT PRIOR TO THE
REVOLUTION, NOR TO PROMINENT
ENGLISHMEN WHO ESPOUSED
THE CAUSE OF THE
COLONIES.

From Estill's *Beginner's History of Our Country*

[60]

P. 161: The kings of England did not seem to care what sort of men they sent to America to govern the colonies.

P. 162: The Americans did not mind paying a tax which they themselves had decided was right. But no Americans were allowed to be members of the English Parliament, by which the stamp law and all other tax laws of England were passed. To the colonists this taxing them without their consent—without their being represented in Parliament—was the last straw that broke the camel's back.

NO REFERENCE TO THE CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE SERVICES RENDERED THE COLONISTS BY PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN.

From Forman's *History of the United States*

[62]

P. 114: After the French and Indian War, therefore, England and her colonies ought to have been closer together than they had ever been before; as a matter of fact, however, after that war they were further apart.

P. 117: Adams knew the king only too well. George III. was not disposed to listen to petitions from the colonists; he intended to rule them with a rod of iron if he could. "We shall grant nothing to America", said one of the king's ministers, "except what they may ask with a halter about their necks."

NO REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN
ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR
MENTION OF PITT, BURKE, OR OTHERS.

From MacMaster's *Primary History of the United States*

[77]

P. 119: SUMMARY. 1. In order to defend the colonies Great Britain proposed to send over an army and have the colonists help to pay the cost.

2. Money was to be raised by new duties and by a stamp tax on newspapers and legal papers.

3. As the colonists had no representatives in Parliament, they refused to pay the stamp duties, and agreed not to buy British manufactured goods. This forced Parliament to repeal the stamp tax.

4. But Parliament soon laid new taxes on glass, paint, oils, and tea. Again the colonists refused to buy British goods, and soon all the taxes were repealed except that on tea.

5. As the people would not import tea, it was sent over. At some places the ships were forced to sail away. At Boston men disguised as Indians threw the tea into the water.

6. For this, Parliament punished Boston. But the colonies sided with Boston, and the first Continental Congress met at Philadelphia in 1774.

THE CHAPTER ITSELF CONTAINS NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS TO PERSONS OR MATTERS CONNECTED WITH THE PERIOD PRECEDING THE REVOLUTION.

From MacMaster's *School History of the United States*

[79]

See quotations under "Books in use more than twenty years ago".
No. 25, Page 87.

THESE ARE THE ONLY REFERENCES TO MEN
AND CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND HAVING
HAD AN INFLUENCE ON THE CONFLICT.
NO MENTION OF PITT, BURKE,
OR OTHERS.

From Montgomery's *An Elementary American History*

[80]

Page 115: Perhaps, then, if we look at both sides of the picture we shall think that, on the whole, the people in America were not very badly treated—at least, not up to this time.

Benjamin Franklin was a true American, and he was a good judge of such things. He said that the colonists were so contented then that the king of England could lead them "by a thread."

P. 117: After George the Third became king of England (1760) the American colonists began to resist being led. Benjamin Franklin said that they changed entirely in their feeling toward the king. They were no longer contented.

NO FURTHER REFERENCE TO POLITICAL CON-
DITIONS IN ENGLAND, NOR ANY MENTION
OF PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO
FAVORED THE COLONIES.

From Montgomery's *The Beginner's American History*
[81]

See quotations under "Books in use more than twenty years ago".
No. 26, Page 88.

THE REFERENCE TO "THE GREATEST MEN IN
ENGLAND" IS THE ONLY MENTION OF THE
POSITION TAKEN BY PROMINENT ENG-
LISHMEN IN FAVOR OF THE
COLONISTS.

From White's *Beginner's History of the United States*

[93]

P. 110: For a long time the English had been trying to make money out of the people of America.


P. 111: In 1765 the British Parliament made a law which declared that every deed for land, every marriage certificate, every will or other important writing must be on stamped paper. This special kind of paper was to be sold by the British government at a very high price, and the money received from this tax was to be used in supporting the British army in America. This law was called the "Stamp Act."

P. 113: The other colonies then spoke out against the Stamp Act, the agents for selling stamped paper were forced to resign, and the stamped paper was never sold in the thirteen colonies.

NO REFERENCE TO THE CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND PRIOR TO THE REVOLUTION, NOR TO THE PROMINENT ENGLISHMEN WHO CHAMPIONED THE CAUSE OF THE COLONIES.



Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing Agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: SEP 1997



PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Twp., PA 16066
(412) 779-2111

WERT
BOOKBINDING
Groutville, Pa.
March - April 1989
We're Quality Bound

