

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University Echahid Hamma Lakhdar- El Oued
Faculty of Arts and Languages
Department of English Language



**From Political Resistance to Armed Revolution: The Emergence of the
American Revolution in Massachusetts (1763- 1775)**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Master's Degree in Literature and Civilization**

Submitted by:

Boutkhil GUEMIDE

Isra LALA

Supervised by:

Dr. Asma NESBA

Board of Examiners:

Dr. Ahmed ANAD

President

University of El-Oued

Dr. Asma NESBA

Supervisor

University of El-Oued

Dr. Mohammed CHOUCANI ABIDI

Examiner

University of El-Oued

Academic year: 2021/2022

Dedications

To my beloved parents who are the reason for all the successes in my life;

Their love has been always my motivation;

Without them, I might not be the person I am today.

To my beloved brothers and sisters;

To my best friends: Amine, Kaddour, Imad, Said, Salim, and Samir.

Boutkhil Guemide

To my beloved parents whose love and dedicated partnership paved
the way for my success in life;

To my teachers who made me keen on learning;

To my friends who supported me along the way.

Isra Lala

Acknowledgements

First of all, we thank almighty Allah for giving us the volition and strength to accomplish the present work.

Studying at the English Department, Faculty of Arts and Languages, at the University Echahid Hamma Lakhdar of El Oued has empowered us with efforts to develop our English skills during the master studies. The present dissertation is the result of continuous success in developing our own English skills.

We are greatly indebted to our supervisor Dr. Nesba Asma; without her our present work would not be achieved. The words will not be enough to thank her for accepting us as her supervisees; the time and patience she devoted to supervise us and direct our work. We thank her for her guidance, patience, advice, support, feedback, and constructive criticism. We really appreciate her tremendous efforts.

We would like to thank to the members of jury for their precious time in reading and evaluating our work.

Abstract

The American Revolution brought ideas about government, political bonds between the governors and the governed, taxation and representation, liberty, and individual freedom. Although it indicates the Americans' break up with Great Britain, it was not a sudden act. Instead, it was a culmination of series of events which began and escalated after 1763. Truly, studying the history of the American Revolution can never be isolated from the Massachusetts Bay Colony. For, all events which characterized the emergence of the American Revolution took place in the Massachusetts, which holds the belief that the aforementioned colony played a major role in sparking the revolution, united the other colonies against Great Britain, and convinced them to engage in fighting in the Revolutionary War and declare independence. The present research paper analyzes the emergence of the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts. It attempts to explore the causes and the origins which made the Province of Massachusetts lead the American Revolution, and the means used by the colonists in Massachusetts to direct the American Revolution. In addition, it examines the achievements of the revolutionary outbreak in the Province of Massachusetts. The researchers used qualitative, descriptive research method in order to analyze the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts. Moreover, document analysis is used as a supplementary research tool to analyze the historical documents of the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence and their contribution to the American Revolution. The study concludes that Massachusetts shaped the future of the United States of America. Fighting for independence to form a government where individual liberties would be protected had been the primary motive which motivated the Americans to wage their war. Therefore, the American Revolution presented a model for other countries to wage revolutions to get their independence.

Key Words: Great Britain, British imperial policy, Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts, The American Revolution.

List of Abbreviations

Adm.	Admiral
Capt.	Captain
Col.	Colonel
Gen.	General
Lt.	Lieutenant
Lts.	Lieutenants
Lt- Col.	Lieutenant- Colonel
Lt- Gov	Lieutenant- Governor
Maj.	Major
Maj- Gen.	Major- General
PM	Prime Minister
US	United States

Tables of Contents

Dedications	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract	III
List of Abbreviations	IV
List of Contents	V
General Introduction	1

Chapter One: The Emergence of the American Revolution in Massachusetts (1763- 1775)

Introduction	14
1.1.The Rise of the Resistance Movement in the Province of Massachusetts Province (1763- 1775)	15
1.1.1. Resistance as an Inherited, Historical Factor in the Province of Massachusetts	16
1.1.2. The Impacts of Enlightenment and Political Ideology on Colonial Thought	21
1.2.Political Resistance to the British Colonial Policy in the Province of Massachusetts (1763- 1775)	26
1.2.1. Resistance of the Navigation Acts	28
1.2.2. Resistance of the Stamp Act	31
1.2.3. The Bloody Massacre in Boston	35
1.2.4. The Boston Tea Party and the British Government’s Reaction	38

1.3.From Political to Military Resistance: Colonial Preparations for the Revolutionary War in Massachusetts	44
1.3.1. Drafting the Suffolk Resolves	45
1.3.2. The Creation of the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress	46
1.3.2.1.The creation of the Committee of Safety	48
1.3.2.2.The Creation of the Committee of Supplies	48
Conclusion	50

Chapter Two: The Beginning of American Revolutionary War in

Massachusetts: Achievements of the Battles of Lexington and Concord

Introduction	51
2.1.The Battle of Lexington Common Green (April 19, 1775)	52
2.1.1. The American Minutemen Vs. British Redcoats: Exchanging Fire in Lexington Common Green	52
2.1.2. Who Shot First in Lexington Common Green? Analysis of the First Shots Heard Around in the American Revolutionary War	57
2.2.The Battle of Concord North Bridge Fight (April 19, 1775)	61
2.2.1. The British Regulars at Concord	61
2.2.2. The Concord North Bridge Fight	63
2.3.The Achievements of the Battles of Lexington and Concord	66
2.3.1. The Creation of the Continental Army	66
2.3.2. The Rise of the Independent Spirit and Drafting the Declaration of Independence	70
Conclusion	77

Chapter Three: Analyzing the Historical Documents of the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence

Introduction	78
3.1.The Suffolk Resolves	79
3.1.1. Type of the Document	79
3.1.2. Author of the Suffolk Resolves	80
3.1.3. The Context of Creating the Suffolk Resolves	85
3.1.4. The Intended Audience of the Suffolk Resolves	87
3.1.5. The Purpose for Creating the Suffolk Resolves	88
3.1.6. Analysis of the Contents of the Suffolk Resolves	89
3.1.6.1.Statement of Purpose	90
3.1.6.2.Preamble	91
3.1.6.3.The Nineteen Grievances of the Suffolk Resolves	92
3.1.7. The Significance of the Suffolk Resolves	94
3.2.The Declaration of Independence	95
3.2.1. Type of the Document	96
3.2.2. Author of the Declaration of Independence	97
3.2.3. The Context of Creating the Declaration of Independence	102
3.2.4. The Intended Audience of the Declaration of Independence	106
3.2.5. The Purpose for Creating the Declaration of Independence	109
3.2.6. Analysis of the Contents of the Declaration of Independence	109
3.2.6.1.Preamble	110
3.2.6.2.Declaration of Natural Rights	111
3.2.6.3.List of Grievances	112
3.2.6.4.Resolution of Independence	114

3.2.7. The Significance of the Declaration of Independence	115
Conclusion	119
General Conclusion.....	121
References.....	125
Appendices.....	134
Appendix A. The Suffolk Resolves.....	134
Appendix B. The Declaration of Independence	141
الملخص.....	146

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study

In political theory, it is truly held, as a standard ideology, that governments' legitimacy and sovereignty are basically derived from the Social Contract Theory, which was originally termed by Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712- 1778) in 1762 in his published book *Du contrat social ou Principes du droit politique*. The aforementioned doctrine has been enormously influential in politics because it addresses to (1) the ruler's authenticity, (2) the individuals' freedom and equality, and (3) the issue of consent.

Central to Social Contract theories, governments are formed to manage the state's affairs, and to serve their populations. They are regarded as legitimate authorities which are limited by laws to respect peoples' rights and privileges. Moreover, the role of governments needs to adapt and take greater account of initiatives in the community. As a part of the participation, both governments and their representative authorities play a more supportive role by providing facilities, or making them available. In addition, they can use budgets to help residents get things done in their area. Meanwhile, people should do likewise by respecting and obeying these authorities. Furthermore, citizens should collaborate with their governments, and; actively, involve in activities to improve the quality of life in their countries. Therefore, when they collaborate actively, a trust is built between them.

When a state crisis occurs under whatever circumstances, or by any combination of several factors, the state's legitimacy is depleted in the eyes of the public, and the demand for change arises. In this context, the state achieves failure and cannot carry out its executive functions, and cannot cope effectively with any rising opposition, or revolutionary movement which emerges. This notion of revolution is derived from Locke's arguments for the Social Contract

Theory in which he stated the right of citizens to revolt against their established governments when their rights were subverted, and their properties had been confiscated. As a matter of fact, Locke's arguments were largely influential on the democratic revolutions which broke out during the eighteenth century, especially on Thomas Jefferson's *Declaration of Independence*, and the ideals of the Founding Fathers of the United States (US) (Bërdufi & Dushi, 2015, p. 393).

At the beginning of revolutionary movements, both political and social objectives are united. Since the revolutionaries' claims are laid on the fact that lower classes are always exploited, they; accordingly, act on behalf of all the 'enslaved' populations, and their most important discourse includes the aims of (1) throwing off the chains and authoritarianism and tyranny, (2) liberating the 'enslaved' populations, (4) establishing new governments, and (5) achieving political, economic, and social reforms.

The modern world witnessed revolutions which took place almost everywhere. Being seen as the powers of changing history, Karl Marx (1818- 1883) described revolutions as motivating factors which drive human societies forward for change. Through revolutions, the working class are able to change the world. Accordingly, Karl Marx (1818- 1883) believed; strongly, that the working class are capable of creating a new system that meets the needs of everyone, not making profit for a few people (Simkhovitch, 1912, p. 14). For Karl Marx (1818- 1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820- 1895), the ruling class' ideas are the dominant ideas which circulate in societies; however, they are not the only ideas. When people in society are mobilized towards change, revolution is necessary because the rising class to overthrow the existing ruling class is determined to found; successfully, a new system that fits for society (Marx, 2010, pp. 48- 51).

The US history includes an important chapter; namely, the revolutionary period which witnessed the rise of an American identity. Originally, the US grew as a part of the British

thirteen colonies which were established in North America, and formed part of the British Empire in the New World. The British colonies in America existed under the British flag for more than a century (1607- 1783), during which they served the British interests, and protected the British Empire in North America. However, colonial relationships worsened, and were deteriorated between the United Kingdom (UK) and its former colonies which succeeded to end the British presence in North America. Furthermore, the American colonies were successful in directing their *Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783) against the British Army. At the end, the American colonies dissolved all bonds which connected them to the British monarchy, their old mother- country, and formed a new, independent country with a republican system and a free, liberal ideology.

2. Statement of the Problem

Life in the 'New World' seemed different to the old one, to which the British were accustomed. When the British colonists settled along eastern board of the North American continent, they faced new climates and new living conditions. Since the British colonists adapted their old ways to the New World, an American identity was born. In fact, the British colonists in America were used to do things in their own way. Thus, they succeeded to manage their colonial affairs without direct British governmental interference. Moreover, the British culture remained the core foundation of all the colonial societies, and the British colonists were proud of their Britishness.

However, the stage of revolt against their mother- country was set in motion when the British Government decided to tighten and rule the American colonies, and to force the colonists contribute to imperial defence after the *Seven Year's War* (1756- 1763). Despite the fact that the *American Revolutionary War* occurred in the period (1775- 1783), its roots emerged even before 1775 when, by 1763, the British colonists in North America became aware that American

business and liberties were threatened by the British Parliamentary Acts and Government policies.

Historically, the Province of Massachusetts has been associated with the emergence and the beginning of the *American Revolution*; for the early protests, riots, and other acts of resistance and rebellion occurred there. The events of the *Boston Massacre*, the *Boston Tea Party*, and the first battles of the *American Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783) had already occurred in the aforementioned colony. In addition, Massachusetts was the home to notable revolutionary patriots; such as, John Hancock (1737- 1793), John Adams (1735- 1826), Samuel Adams (1722- 1803), and Paul Revere (1735- 1818). Due to their efforts, these men were successful in leading the revolutionary movement in Massachusetts. Therefore, Massachusetts played a crucial role in sparking colonial resistance against the British Government's policies shortly after 1763. This colonial resistance gave birth to an American radical movement towards independence.

Furthermore, the colonists of the Province of Massachusetts manifested their resistance to several British Parliamentary Acts through different means, political and economic tactics. Successfully, they raised colonial awareness through printed materials, speeches, and meetings. In addition, they succeeded to organize their struggle and resistance against the British Government. Together with the rest the British colonies in North America, committees were formed and became effective local authorities in the pyramid of revolutionary organizations to enforce and adopt nonimportation and non-exportation agreements so as to oblige the British Parliament to repeal the unjust measures and policies towards the American colonies.

Since Massachusetts was the seat of the crisis, it succeeded to to transform colonial resistance from the political to the military level, and led the way in making military preparations for the beginning of the *American Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783). Massachusetts' Provincial Congress, which was newly- created, directed town officials to formally enlist militiamen as Minutemen, began plans to combine local militia companies into

regiments, and started selecting generals to command the force. Additionally, Massachusetts militiamen started to collect arms, ammunition, artillery pieces, and other military stores at hidden locations in Concord; in particular, outside of the British reach.

Moreover, Massachusetts witnessed the first battles of *Lexington Common Green* and *Concord North Bridge Fight*, in which the Minutemen stood against the British Army. From Massachusetts; too, the Minutemen formed the core of the Continental Army which fought the British Red coats in the *American Revolutionary War (1775- 1783)* in the First Continental Congress. Moreover, it was Massachusetts which convinced the rest of the American colonies to issue a common declaration in favour of independence, in the Second Continental Congress.

Taking into account Massachusetts in the present research paper, the focus of this research is to analyze the causes and origins which made the *American Revolution* emerge from the aforementioned colony, and how Massachusetts led the revolutionary movement in the period (1763- 1775). In addition, it highlights what were the legal and political grounds upon which the Massachusetts' colonists relied in their resistance to the British Parliamentary Acts of trade regulation, colonial control, and enacting taxes, how the Massachusetts' patriots organized and carried the *American Revolution* in their Province, and how Massachusetts succeeded to unite the other colonies, and transform the cause of Massachusetts the cause of America.

3. Research Questions and Research Hypotheses

The present research addresses to the following questions:

- ✚ What were the origins which sparked the *American Revolution* in Massachusetts?
- ✚ What were the legal and political grounds which helped the resistance movement to emerge from the aforementioned colony?

- ✚ How did Massachusetts' colonists succeed to transform their political resistance to military, armed revolution?
- ✚ What were the achievements of the revolutionary outbreak in Massachusetts?

Based on the aforementioned research questions, it is hypothesized that:

- ✚ The *American Revolution* in the Province of Massachusetts emerged because of some political, historical, ideological, and economic reasons;
- ✚ The Massachusetts' colonists were so enlightened and largely affected by *Enlightenment* and succeeded to formulate legal and political grounds for their and resistance to the British Government's policies which were implemented in the American colonies after the end of the *Seven Year's War* (1756- 1763);
- ✚ The colonists of the Province of Massachusetts were better organized that they succeeded to transform their political resistance to armed revolution;
- ✚ The battles of *Lexington Common Green* and *Concord North Bridge Fight*, which announced the beginning of the *American Revolutionary War* in the Province of Massachusetts, had encouraged the Americans to form their Continental Army to fight in the *American Revolutionary War*. Moreover, it drove the Americans to unite themselves and ask for complete separation and independence from their mother-country.

4. Significance of the Study

In the eighteenth century, Europe was dominated by a world of ideas during the Age of *Enlightenment*. As a philosophical movement which stressed on human reason, *Enlightenment*

scholars stressed on the role of reason to search for knowledge. Moreover, this movement advocated the ideals of (1) liberty, (2) progress, (3) tolerance, (4) constitutional government, and (5) separation of Church and state. It is worth noting that *Enlightenment* gave birth to a radical movement which advocated democracy, individual liberty, freedom of expression, and eradication of religious authority. Therefore, the Age of *Enlightenment* is often associated with revolutions of that age. The most important revolution of the eighteenth century was the *American Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783) which influenced the history of the world because of its aftermaths: it gave birth to new ideologies of self- rule, self- government, and democracy which became a triggering force in the forging of nation- states of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Thus, the *American Revolution* (1763- 1775) was an idea and a political action against British colonialism.

The main point that makes the present paper significant is that the *American Revolution* is a worth subject to study, since it constitutes a major historical period in the US history which witnessed the emergence of a new identity, American. More importantly, the *American Revolution* took place at a time when absolute monarchies ruled over European countries, and monarchs believed in the *Divine Rights for Kings* and relied on it in policymaking. There were no other political regimes that were to substitute the old systems of governments which identified European monarchies. However, the coming of the Age of *Enlightenment* in the seventeenth century in Europe which would alter the political arena, and; therefore, people started to look for the source of legitimacy for their governments.

It was the British colonists, who lived in North America, who took advantage from the Age of *Enlightenment* and the ideas of John Locke (1632- 1704), Montesquieu (1689- 1755), and other *Enlightenment* philosophers, and started to look for better forms of government that suited their needs. When the conflict broke out between the British Government and the American colonies, the colonists; in their turn, believed that Great Britain did not protect America;

however, the British Government protected its own interests. Therefore, the British colonists in North America were not bound to yield obedience. Moreover, the American colonists assumed that the Parliamentary Acts, and the measures, of the British Parliament did not effectively unite the colonies with the mother- country, but rather intended to enslave the Americans. The present study has approached this research from an interpretive stance based on the data available; it explores the origins of the *American Revolution* in the Massachusetts' Province.

The present paper is designed to elucidate the significant and influential role of *Enlightenment* in leading the revolutionary movement in colonial America. It mainly tackles how Massachusetts played a crucial role in the revolutionary period through a descriptive analysis. It investigates what were the several legal and political grounds and arguments which were derived from *Enlightenment*, and were used by the American colonists in the Province of Massachusetts in their resistance against the British Government's policies.

5. Purpose of the Study

The present research focuses on the role of Massachusetts in sparking the revolutionary movement against the British authorities, mainly the Parliament and the Government, which issued a particular imperial policy, and which was implemented shortly following the *French Indian War* (1756- 1763) in the thirteen American colonies. As a matter of fact, the British Government's colonial policies, which was implemented since 1763, intended to tighten colonial control over the thirteen colonies in America, and make them serve the British interest within the framework of mercantilism.

Additionally, the present research demonstrates the means and tactics used by the Massachusetts' colonists; namely, the Patriots, in the Province of Massachusetts to organize their revolution and proceed with political mobilization in defying the British Government and

its imperial policy of controlling and taxing the American colonies shortly after 1763. Moreover, the present paper highlights the different political and philosophical grounds on which the Massachusetts' patriots relied in order to resist the different the British Parliamentary Acts, and lead the revolutionary movement throughout the thirteen colonies in America.

Furthermore, the present study attempts to fill the gap in the research field by exploring the role played by the Province of Massachusetts in sparking the *American Revolution* (1763-1775) throughout the American colonies, and how the aforementioned colony succeeded to lead the resistance movement in behalf of the rest of colonies. Moreover, the researcher intends to demonstrate how Massachusetts succeeded to transform political resistance into revolution, since Massachusetts witnessed the first battles of the *American Revolutionary War* (1775-1783); namely, Lexington Common Green and Concord North Bridge Fight.

Through the analysis of the events which took place in Massachusetts during the revolutionary era, the researchers' target is to demonstrate (1) how Massachusetts succeeded to unite the other twelve American colonies towards the common cause, (2) how the battles of *Lexington Common Green* and *Concord North Bridge Fight* convinced the twelve American colonies to form a Continental Army to fight in the *American Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783), and (3) how the colony of Massachusetts urged the other twelve American colonies to seek separation from Great Britain, and issue a common declaration of independence. These; in fact, were the seeds of creating a new, independent country with a newly emerging ideology.

The present research has been conducted in order to achieve the following objectives:

- ✚ To explore how the *American Revolution* emerged and started from Massachusetts;
- ✚ To investigate how Massachusetts played an important role in the awakenings of the *American Revolution* (1763- 1775);
- ✚ To highlight how the Age of *Enlightenment* had impacts on the *American Revolution* (1763- 1775);

- ✚ To reveal how the different legal, political, and philosophical grounds the colonists, in Massachusetts, used to justify their revolution;
- ✚ To highlight the role played by Massachusetts in urging the other twelve colonies towards forming the Continental Army to fight in the *American Revolutionary War*, and to declare independence from Great Britain;
- ✚ To analyze how the colonists in Massachusetts transformed successfully their political resistance to armed revolution.

6. Research Methodology

An analytical and descriptive route is pursued to achieve the objectives of the present study. Within this route, the present research analyses the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts to explore the different origins and causes which awakened the revolution in the aforementioned province and made it led the revolution in America.

Basically, the researchers focused on using qualitative research, which involves examining non- numerical data. As a part of historical research, which involves interpreting past events, the research design used in the present research involves synthesizing data from many different sources, public records, and archives. Purposefully, historical research is designed to describe what happened/ and occurred in the past. Additionally, historical research collects historical facts and evidences and verify them and synthesize evidence from the past to establish facts that defend, or refute a hypothesis.

Moreover, a qualitative, historical approach is used in the present research to highlight the several events that occurred in the aforementioned colony, test the validity of the research questions, and confirm the hypotheses of the present research. This is; in fact, an important part in the presentation and analysis of data to find out how resistance to the British Parliamentary Acts and government's policies (1763- 1775) which emerged in Massachusetts, how the

revolutionary movement was carried in the above- mentioned colony, what were the several political means and economic measures taken by the Massachusetts' colonists in the political resistance towards the British authorities in colonial America, and how the colonists in the Province of Massachusetts succeeded, at a last resort, to transform their political resistance into military battles.

In addition, the researchers, in the present research, used document analysis, qualitative research, in which documents are systematically interpreted, reviewed, and evaluated by the researcher. As an analytical method, it requires from the researcher an in- depth analysis of data to fully understand the document, obtain meaning, and develop an empirical understanding about the document under study (Bowen, 2009, p. 27).

As a supplementary research tool in the present research, the researchers relied on document analysis to strengthen their research. Believing that documents assist the researcher and provide extra information and supplementary research data, the researchers used document analysis to look for background information and data, and to contextualize their research within the subject under study. Obviously, the researchers proceeded with analyzing the *Suffolk Resolves* and the *Declaration of Independence* (1776) The main objective for choosing these historical documents to be analyzed in the present research is that they were; in fact, issued within the events which characterized the *American Revolution* (1763- 1775) in Massachusetts, and; more importantly, these documents helped the patriots in their revolutionary movements and their organization of the revolution.

7. Structure of the Study

The present research is divided into three main chapters. The first chapter is entitled the emergence of the American Revolution in Massachusetts (1763- 1775). It analyses the

emergence of the *American Revolution* (1763- 1775) in the aforementioned province. The researchers analysed the rise of the resistance movement in Massachusetts, and to what extent political ideology influenced colonial thought during the revolutionary period. Moreover, they discussed to which level the several acts of taxes had affected the colonists of Massachusetts, and how it drove Massachusetts' colonists to resist. In addition, the researchers explained the different means which were taken by Massachusetts' colonists in their resistance to the British Government's policies. The researchers; also, analysed the major events which took place in Massachusetts in the aforementioned era, and which were characterized as major events of the *American Revolution*.

In the second chapter, the researchers described thoroughly the beginning of the *American Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783) in Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts. They analysed the military battles fought between the British soldiers and the Minutemen, Massachusetts' colonial militia, in the battles of *Lexington Common Green* and *Concord North Bridge Fight*. The researchers highlighted the reasons of these military engagements, and how both troops, mainly the British Army and Massachusetts' Minutemen, got involved in these armed confrontations. Moreover, they examined the aftermath of the first battles of the *American Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783), and what the colonists had achieved from this important day of April 19, 1775. In addition, the researchers highlighted the factors which favored the Americans to form their Continental Army to fight in the *American Revolutionary War* (1775- 1783), and how the first battles of Lexington and Concord gave impetus to the Americans to declare their independence.

Lastly, the researchers, in the third chapter, analyzed the official historical documents; namely, the *Suffolk Resolves* and the *Declaration of Independence*. The analysis of the aforementioned documents takes into consideration the purpose, message, and audience of a text in order to uncover important background information about the historical documents. Moreover, the process of analysis centers on identifying (1) the context of drafting both

documents, (2) their purpose, (3) their significance, and (4) how did they contribute to the stages of the *American Revolution* in Massachusetts, both politically and militarily.

CHAPTER ONE

The Emergence of the American Revolution in Massachusetts (1763- 1775)

Chapter One: The Emergence of the American Revolution in Massachusetts (1763- 1775)

Introduction	14
1.4.The Rise of the Resistance Movement in the Province of Massachusetts Province (1763-1775)	15
1.4.1. Resistance as an Inherited, Historical Factor in the Province of Massachusetts	16
1.4.2. The Impacts of Enlightenment and Political Ideology on Colonial Thought	21
1.5.Political Resistance to the British Colonial Policy in the Province of Massachusetts (1763-1775)	26
1.5.1. Resistance of the Navigation Acts	28
1.5.2. Resistance of the Stamp Act	31
1.5.3. The Bloody Massacre in Boston	35
1.5.4. The Boston Tea Party and the British Government’s Reaction	38
1.6.From Political to Military Resistance: Colonial Preparations for the Revolutionary War in Massachusetts	44
1.6.1. Drafting the Suffolk Resolves	45
1.6.2. The Creation of the Massachusetts’ Provincial Congress	46
1.6.2.1.The creation of the Committee of Safety	48
1.6.2.2.The Creation of the Committee of Supplies	48
Conclusion	50

Introduction:

In the period (1763- 1775), heightened and fierce interaction between the British colonies in America and their mother- country led to a steady decline in the relationships between the two sides. They grew increasingly antagonistic. The issues of imperial defence, commerce regulation, and taxation emerged and continued at the fore throughout the American Revolution, and defined the primary quarrel with the British Government. They brought light during this period, and the lines of political resistance were drawn. The ideology of the American Revolution was built upon the principles that inspired the American colonists to act during the decade leading up to the revolution.

Since the state of Massachusetts has been associated with the Spirit of America, this; in fact, illustrates that the above- mentioned state has had a rich history of the American Revolution and the American Revolutionary War. As a matter of fact, this American resistance emerged from Massachusetts, the birthplace of the American Revolution. Moreover, most of the revolutionary events which symbolized the American Revolution occurred in the colony of Massachusetts. This resistance; too, was justified on certain grounds, and was manifested in different ways. Thus, the latter colony contributed heavily to the birth and rise of the revolutionary movement.

The present chapter analyses the emergence of the American Revolution in Massachusetts. It highlights the rise of political resistance, as a mobilization factor, which was firstly taken by the Massachusetts' colonists in their revolutionary process when they reacted against the British Government's policies, and the different acts of taxes. Therefore, political resistance which occurred in Massachusetts started in 1763 and continued till 1775. In addition, it analyzes the different means and tactics used by the Massachusetts' colonists to defend their rights, and react against the British policy of tightening and taxing the colonies.

1.1.The Rise of the Resistance Movement in the Province of Massachusetts (1763- 1775):

The British imperial policy which the British Government started to put into practice shortly after the end of the French Indian War to tighten control over the thirteen colonies could not be seen as the only reason which led to the emergence of the American Revolution in Massachusetts. In fact, there was another political, or ideological factor which had great impacts on the colonists in the Province of Massachusetts; in particular, and helped them to revolt against the British Parliamentary Acts: It was the impacts of political philosophy which gave birth to an ideology that the colonists in Massachusetts would use in their revolutionary movement, and the several tactics which they relied on in their resistance to the British imperial policy since 1763.

It is worth to mention that the British colonists in North America, especially in New England were more educated and enlightened than their counterparts in Great Britain. As Enlightenment prevailed, the British colonies became open doors for the philosophies and ideologies of Enlightenment. Additionally, newspapers and colleges, which adopted certain curricula in accordance with Enlightenment, helped the British colonists to form a new thought and a new culture of which the American colonial society was being known. Relying on liberal thought and self- government, the British colonists exercised their full control of their affairs, relying on elected bodies.

Eventually, the colonists believed that King George III, the British Monarch, and his Parliament intended to trample their rights as English subjects. In case English liberties are threatened, their contract to their government is totally dissolved, and their government had no political legitimacy. They had to revolt in order to (1) restore their rights, and (2) establish a new government where no persons, or laws should be imposed on them without their own consent, but only by representatives chosen by themselves. This; in fact, was the basics of self- government and self- rule and the roots of American democracy. Accordingly, the British

colonists relied on the ideas of Enlightenment to formulate legal grounds for their opposition and resistance to the British policymakers and their imperial policy which was implemented in colonial America since 1763.

1.1.1. Resistance as an Inherited, Historical Factor in the Province of Massachusetts:

The emergence of the American Revolution in Massachusetts proved the long historical struggle for political liberty of which the English were best known. Moreover, it demonstrated the repeated conflicts and struggles which broke out during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Religious conflicts between the English Monarchs and the religious groups which emerged as a result to Religious Reformation in the aforementioned periods symbolized; in fact, the right of the English to practice their religion freely, according to their beliefs and ideologies, without full intervention and control from their government. The Puritans' story for seeking autonomy in practicing their religion out of the established form of religion in the country shows the struggle of the British to gain independence in religious affairs. Moreover, the Magna Charta and the English Civil Wars are two main examples which can be illustrated in this struggle.

In 1215, King John was obliged by the rebellious barons to sign the Magna Charta. i. e. the Great Charter in which they asked for protection of their rights and liberties, and the right to control the King. This document was a step toward limiting the King's indisputable power of imposing taxes on his barons and his subjects against their will (Marx, 1967, p. 127).

It is worth noting that the English Civil Wars symbolized another aspect of political resistance was manifested during the Stuarts' era. Like his father King James I, Charles I believed in the Divine Rights of Kings— Kings could do what they wished and were only answerable to God. He chose to rule without Parliament if the latter refused to do what he wanted. After Charles I had dismissed the English Parliament in 1629, he levied heavy taxes

on his people to support his wars. Resistance and disagreements between him the English Parliament drove both parties to the Civil War which broke out in 1642 and led ultimately to Charles I's execution on January, 30, 1649, abolishing the monarchy, and establishing the English Commonwealth under the rule of Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector (Marx, 1967, p. 138).

In regard to the colony of Massachusetts, it was worth mentioning that it was established in New England area. More importantly, analyzing the rise of the American Revolution in relation to the Massachusetts Bay Colony is worth studying because resistance to the British imperial policy emerged there. Looking at the colony's origins is a key factor to understand its revolutionary mindset. Although Massachusetts was not the first British colony which was established in North America, nor was it the site of the most military battles during the American Revolutionary War- except for the revolutionary outbreak in Lexington and Concord, this colony had become associated with the revolutionary movement and the beginning of the War of Independence. From the Boston Massacre, Boston Tea Party, to the First Shots Heard Around the World in Lexington Common Green, Massachusetts and Boston, its capital, are the places most imagine when thinking of the American Revolution. Before violence and riots broke out, Boston had become a hotspot for protest and political gatherings. In fact, to understand its outsized role in the American Revolution, it is necessary to go back to the first European settlers of the New England area.

As far as Great Britain and Massachusetts' early relationships are concerned, it had been conflictual even before the establishment of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Although Massachusetts was tied to England as a British colony, it was a statement of dissension. Historically, New England area witnessed the establishment of the early colony which was commenced by the Puritans, a radical religious group which emerged in England during the seventeenth century. They were Calvinists who disagreed with some Catholic practices which

still existed in the Anglican Church in England- though it was officially established by King Henry VIII during the Reformation period; they believed that the Church must be purified. King Charles I persecuted the Puritans and crushed their ideas because of their beliefs. Since the Puritans were no longer comfortable with living within the Anglican Church, they thought of immigrating to North America to find their own community (Hart, 1927, p. 11).

So, to seek religious freedom and escape death, the Puritans thought of emigrating to North America where they could set up their Puritan Church. They established the Plymouth Colony (1620), and Massachusetts (1630). Neighboring the Puritans in Plymouth, Massachusetts became the first British settlement to not have its board of governors reside in England. Instead, Massachusetts was also a joint-stock company rather than a royal, or proprietary colony; its residents were in a financial relationship with a company rather than directly with the English Crown. It is worth noting that many, though not all, British colonies were joint-stock. In fact, it was because England was fairly cash- strapped around the settling of the New World after a number of wars on the European continent (Dickinson, 1975, p. 4).

Historically, Massachusetts had conflictual relationships with the mother- country. In this regard, Ellis (1888) believed that this centered on subordination and independence; on one hand, and subjection and freedom; on other hand. Massachusetts sought to get full autonomy from England so as to be independent in the management of its colonial affairs and to practice its self- rule, and the English Crown which intended to exercise total control over the colony. As a matter of fact, this conflictual relationship was due to some religious trends, since both sides had divergent views on religious beliefs and practices (p. 26).

For Ellis (1888), he assumed that some circumstances contributed to the above- mentioned political resistance: The colony was settled earlier by the Puritans whose ancestors had fled to America after they had been persecuted in England, seeking religious freedom in America. That persecution made them hate the English Church and the Government. In regard to their colonial

organization and affairs' managements, the Puritans developed the freest and most subtle debate of all religious questions. They relied on a democratic procedure to organize their church structure: they used to elect their own religious leaders and dismiss them whenever they pleased. Thus, they enjoyed this religious freedom for long (p. 30).

It is worth noting that the Massachusetts Bay Colony refused to allow the Anglican Church to be established following the English Civil Wars. Additionally, Massachusetts' colonists; consistently, resisted the Navigation Acts, which would force the colony to send their trade only to England rather than the myriad other countries merchants and shippers had fostered relationships with over the years. Massachusetts, which was temporarily dissolved in the mid-1600s, became to be known as the Province of Massachusetts in 1691 when both colonies of Plymouth and Massachusetts were joined together into a single charter, and Sir William Phips was nominated as the colony's new governor. Although this new charter did mean that Phips reported directly to the crown, protests from residents of Massachusetts had resulted in changes from other royal charters (Phelan, 2021, para. 5).

Dickinson (1975) reported that after the Restoration, King Charles II insisted on tightening colonial control over Massachusetts because of mistreating the Quakers inside the colony, and abending the Navigation Acts (pp. 39- 40). It is worth recalling that King Charles II tried to subject Massachusetts to the English Government's rule. He sent Edward Randolph who ordered the enforcement of the Navigation Acts in the colony. However, he was unable to do so because he was threatened to death by colonial captains if he came aboard to check what their cargoes carried, where they sailed, and where they came from. As a result, Charles II reacted severely by cancelling Massachusetts' charter in 1684. It became officially a Royal Colony (Ellis, 1888, p. 36).

Bailyn (1992) reported another event that symbolized the conflictual relationships between Massachusetts and the English Government. When James II became English Monarch in 1685,

he neglected colonial charters, and insisted on ruling the colonies without Parliament's support (p. 350). In regard to Massachusetts, King James II (1633- 1701) appointed Edmund Andros a Royal Governor of the aforementioned colony. The latter abolished the Legislative Assembly, levied taxes without the colonists' consent, made the laws himself, and executed them (Dickinson, 1975, p. 42). However, after King James II was removed in the Glorious Revolution, the news reached Massachusetts, and the Massachusetts' colonists went into action. They moved their cannons onward and shot against Edmund Andros. Being unable to resist, he was captured, and his rule was over (Bailyn, 1968, p. 43). From the Massachusetts colonists' point of view, this revolutionary act against the English Crown was considered as a lawful reaction. Since their rights were violated, they were mobilized to restore back their inherited tradition of self- rule (Trevelyan, 1987, p. 145).

In addition to those historical trends, another significant factor contributed largely to the political resistance which emerged in Massachusetts in the period. It was; namely, Enlightenment, or the Age of Reason, which emerged in Europe in the eighteenth century. In Massachusetts; in particular, colonial populations took advantage of Enlightenment. They started reading works and publications of leading influential scholars of that age. Notably, John Locke influenced enormously colonial thought in Massachusetts by the ideas he argued and cited in his publications. As a matter of fact, implementing the ideas of Enlightenment into practise; strongly, influenced the American colonists who; whether in Massachusetts, or other colonies, worked to spread the ideas of Enlightenment through publishing pamphlets, books, and newspapers. As a result, an American identity was born.

Originally, the ideas and philosophies of Enlightenment which were produced by John Locke played a major role in sparking the American Revolution in Massachusetts. Mainly stated, Locke's ideas emphasized the rights of citizens, and laid down the foundations for modern, rational, democratic societies. Therefore, putting these ideas of Enlightenment into

practice in the British colonies in America gave birth to a American Enlightenment. Moreover, Harvard College, which was founded in Boston, played a crucial role in promoting the ideas of Enlightenment through including ideas and works of Enlightenment in its teaching curricula.

1.1.2. The Impacts of Enlightenment and Political Ideology on Colonial Thought:

In addition to the British colonial policy, Enlightenment and the impacts of European philosophers' teachings contributed heavily to the rise of the American Revolution in Massachusetts (Countryman, 1985, p. 105). As Massachusetts led the resistance and the revolutionary movement against the British Government's imperial policy, it; also, became an intellectual center of knowledge, education, and the promotion of the ideas of Enlightenment. After it had been founded, Harvard College helped the colonists to be highly influenced by the philosophies of Enlightenment (Curti, 1964, p. 150).

Historically, being an intellectual movement, Enlightenment emerged in the eighteenth century in Europe. Being more enlightened, European thinkers and writers, particularly in England and France, started to teach and enlighten their compatriots. In this regard, Michael, Crews, Levenson, Marx, and Smith (1985) assumed that scholars and philosophers of that age believed that human reason could be used to combat ignorance and tyranny in order to build a better world. As a matter of fact, Enlightenment, which was basically a time of rational thinking, brought a remarkable change. Elites of this age started to search for the origins of authority, whether political or religious. They turned towards human rights to examine the relations between the governors and the governed (p. 169).

Among the influents of Enlightenment was John Locke, the celebrated English philosopher and political theorist. In regard to John Locke, it is worth mentioning that his works laid down the foundations of modern philosophy, empiricism, and political liberalism. Moreover, his

works inspired European Enlightenment and the US Constitution, too. Primarily, John Locke is commonly known of his philosophical ideology, which resembled that one of Sir Isaac Newton. Ideologically, his political thought centered on the notion of a social contract and toleration. His political ideology was integrated in English politics after the Glorious Revolution, and in the US after drafting the Declaration of Independence in 1776 (Rogers, 2021, para. 1).

John Locke is best known of his famous doctrine of natural rights that he preached earlier. According to him, all men are born and; naturally, possess basic important rights; namely, life, liberty, and property. In regard to government, the governor is bound by a certain contract between himself and his subjects. In fact, the governor derives his power from the subjects' consent. Accordingly, governments should act as a contract between the governor and the governed. The subjects give up certain of their rights in return for just rule. Meanwhile, the governor should hold his power only to rule justly and fairly (Cranston, 1985, p. 26).

John Locke had introduced his ideas of natural rights and social contract, which had great impacts on colonial political thought. The American colonists were; largely, influenced by these ideas. As a result, an American political thought was born in Massachusetts. Basically, this American political thought was mixed of Puritan theology, Locke's ideology, and the experience of colonial life. Moreover, the American Enlightenment was mainly derived from Locke's work of *Treaties of Civil Governments* (1690). Additionally, the US Declaration of Independence (1776) was based on Locke's ideas (Bailyn, 1968, p. 339).

John Locke explained his views on governments. He argued that the relationships between the governors and their subjects were based on a social contract. Accordingly, John Locke (1823) argued that when people leave the loosely, disorganized state of nature in order to join a social contract to form a political society, they should give up all their powers in order to be

integrated into society (p. 377). i. e. to give to a sovereign the authority to force men to cooperate in order to be integrated into a strong political association.

In regard to government's power, John Locke believed that the latter cannot be totally arbitrary so as to destroy the lives and the fortunes of his subjects. Moreover, he affirmed that a government with greater powers is needless. This; in fact, is seen as a means of controlling the subjects, and keeping them always under surveillance. John Locke argued that the power of the legislators should be limited to the good of the public in the society. It should be used appropriately to preserve the rights and liberties of citizens, instead of destroying, or enslaving them (Laslett, 1975, p. 54).

For John Locke, a government with greater powers is a real danger, when the absolute power is left to an individual. So, accordingly, the government's power should be limited by dividing government into several branches, each one with only definite powers needed to function. Otherwise, if any form of government subverts the basic rights of its subjects, by ruling arbitrarily, John Locke argued that popular rebellion against this form of government will be permissible to protect the subjects' ends: lives, liberties, and fortunes. So, under this circumstance, revolution is the only means to revolt against the government if popular ends are not fully protected (Laslett, 1975, p. 62).

John Locke (1632- 1704) believed that any form of government is met with great charges; so, it cannot support these charges without money and funds collected in form of taxes. Therefore, under the social contract, the subjects should contribute in these charges through paying definite taxes, under their own consent, for the maintenance of their protection (Cranston, 1985, p. 119).

In addition to the works of John Locke, political theories of Commonwealth men had influenced both the American Enlightenment and the American colonial thought. The Commonwealth men were English political theorists, mainly radicals, who believed in a

republic governed by a representative government, and that the monarchy should be abolished. Truly, a representative government would be elected by the people and for the people. It would function and act to serve the subjects and protect their rights and liberties (Schmidt, 2001, p. 180).

As a matter of fact, the philosophies of Enlightenment reached colonial populations, and Massachusetts' colonists; in particular, through education which was a key factor which helped the colonists to be enlightened in political ideology, government, and public affairs. When they founded their colonies; namely, Plymouth (1619) and Massachusetts (1629), the Puritans regarded education as an important factor in building society. Since their society was based on religion, they believed that it was necessary for everyone to read and understand the Bible (Ferguson, 1957, p. 142).

It is worth recalling that in 1647, and in response to the Legislature of Massachusetts, every town of fifty families, or more, established elementary schools. Those schools were opened to all children- boys and girls, rich and poor. They taught reading and writing. Moreover, towns which consisted of one hundred families, or more set up a grammar, or secondary schools to teach young people with necessary skills and knowledge to prepare them for university level (King et al., 1986, p. 57).

Moreover, the Puritans succeeded to set up their first college in Massachusetts in 1636. It was Harvard College, which was named for John Harvard, an English clergyman, minister, and principal benefactor of the College. Since its establishment, the college succeeded to develop academic teaching curricula for the sake of making citizens ready to the service of both society and the nation. Additionally, Harvard College allowed most colonists to read protests against British injustice printed in pamphlets and books. Furthermore, Harvard College provided education and the study of the writings of Greek, English, French, and other philosophers; such as, John Locke and John Jacques Rousseau (Bailyn, 1967, p. 342).

Therefore, according to Bailyn (1967), through teaching the ideologies of Enlightenment, Harvard College helped its graduates who to be more enlightened in politics and governmental affairs. They became well aware of their natural rights. When the American Revolution emerged in the Province of Massachusetts, they were awakened by the events and circumstances which took place there, and started to react against the British Government's policies following the Seven Year's War (p. 130). Furthermore, a great number of American patriots who led the American Revolution in Massachusetts against Great Britain and its imperial policies; such as, John Adams, John Hancock, and Dr. Joseph Warren studied in Harvard College (Bonwick, 1977, p. 3).

Ideologically, since these radicals, who were in Massachusetts, were highly influenced; mainly, by John Locke's ideas and philosophy, they; strongly, believed in parliamentary representation, natural rights, and contractual government. They argued that when the British Government started legislating for them and taxing them, it took their liberties away from them, prevented them from their inherited tradition of self- rule, and it dissolved the political bonds tying the Americans and the British. When Great Britain started to enforce its governmental policies in America, American patriots were affected hardly by the British Parliamentary Acts; they organized their revolution and directed it toward the British Government's imperial policies (Bailyn, 1967, p. 347).

When the British Parliament started to legislate different taxes, colonial political theorists— either radicals; such as, Samuel Adams and John Hancock, or moderates; such as, Benjamin Franklin and John Adams asserted that taxation without representation was a tyranny. Ideally, these patriots believed that the British Parliament had to the sole power to legislate in order to preserve the interests of the British Empire. However, it should only tax the subjects who were actually represented. As the British Parliament started taxing the American colonists against

their will, it dissolved the bonds between the Americans and their mother- country (Bailyn, 1967, p. 137).

As soon as the British Government started implementing its imperial policy of trade regulation, colonial control, and taxation in 1763, the American patriots who emerged in the Province of Massachusetts led the resistance against the British Government's imperial policy through several measures and tactics in order to preserve their rights and liberties. Truly, their resistance was based on certain political and legal frameworks which they had already formulated. In addition, during their struggle with the British authorities in North America, these patriots succeeded to mobilize large masses of colonial populations all over the thirteen colonies. Moreover, they convinced the other colonies to join their resistance because it is their cause, too. i. e. Successfully, they made Massachusetts the cause of all America: Saving America from a corrupt Monarchy and Government of Great Britain. Therefore, this success achieved in the resisting the British imperial policies, and turning this resistance into a revolutionary war could be attributed to the successful tactics, measures, and means used by the American patriots.

1.2. Political Resistance to the British Colonial Policy in Massachusetts (1763- 1775):

King George III's accession to the throne in 1760 brought the Tories into his government after three decades of Whig's rule. Ideologically, the Tories held an authoritarian vision of ruling the British Empire. They; strongly, believed in the idea of defending the British Empire, and that the American colonies should be subordinate to the government of the mother- country (Thomas, 1985, pp. 20- 1).

Therefore, the British reconstruction policy which was executed in America was; indeed, justified by the British Prime Ministers who looked for different ways to finance the for the

British Army's presence in North America after the French and Indian War. Being of a great strategic importance to the British Government, King George III and P. M. William Pitt decided to keep an army of eighty- five regiments to protect what had been won from the French in the Seven Year's War the colonies. Great Britain was financially exhausted after its struggle with France had ended; its national debt had soared to £133 million. Accordingly, taxation was the only financial solution to solve the huge financial problem from which the British Government suffered (Rice University, 2014, p. 129).

When the British Parliamentary Acts began to be implemented in America, the American colonists began to resist these Parliamentary Acts. At first, this resistance was; indeed, political. This political resistance was based on, and grounded on, different political arguments which justified their ideas, measures, and tactics. Additionally, it was manifested differently in protests, congresses, talks, speeches, and riots. However, according to Miler (1943), the American Revolution, which commenced in Massachusetts, could not be explained from the perspective of only a struggle for individual rights and liberties. Additionally, the economic factors are regarded amongst the major origins which led the American Revolution to break out (p. 20). Within this context, Miler (1943) argued that the colonists realized that the British Parliamentary Acts were mainly tyrannical. Moreover, they believed that Great Britain intended to impede their economic strength, and to tighten colonial control over them. i. e. Great Britain worked hard to bind the American colonies so as to make them serve only the British interests. This was; evidently, best symbolized in the fact that any American good started to flourish, or colonial business competed with British one and threatened its interests, the British Parliament intervened by striking it down through legislation (p. 24).

As a matter of fact, the colonists were afraid that the British Parliament intended to use the troops to control their movements and restrict their freedom. Subsequently, Massachusetts'

colonists started to resist the several British Parliamentary Acts. Thus, Massachusetts' colonists directed their efforts; firstly, toward resisting the Navigation Acts and the Writs of Assistance.

1.2.1. Resistance of the Navigation Acts:

Shortly after the French and Indian War, the British policymakers decided to protect the American colonies from foreign invasion. They tried to oblige the American colonies to adhere to commerce regulations, and pay revenue taxes in favor of Great Britain. All the legislations which were enacted by the British Parliament intended to subject the American colonies to the British economy. Therefore, the causes of the American Revolution, were economic.

Within this context, Louis Hacker (1985), an American historian, strongly argued that the origins of the American Revolution were primarily economic. The events which occurred in the period showed that the target of the British Parliamentary Acts was to protect the British economic interests. Therefore, the revolution had been carried over the issues of colonial industries and manufacturing, wild lands, furs, sugar, tea, ... ect. The objective of the British reconstruction policy was to protect the British commerce from collapse within the mercantilist system. Consequently, the British Parliament relied on the above- mentioned principle to legislate for the American colonies (p. 76).

Since they were affected by the British Parliamentary Acts, Massachusetts' colonists began their resistance to the British Government's policies. In this regard, Hart (1927) assumed that Massachusetts was a prosperous colony since its establishment, both economically and industrially. Ideally, as they realized that they would lose their business if they yielded to the British Parliamentary Acts, Massachusetts' colonists started to resist (p. 35).

In addition to Hart, Dickinson (1975) argued that merchants and tradesmen in Massachusetts had been hurt by the Navigation Acts, which were enforced shortly after the Seven Year's War

and other commerce regulations and taxes of the Grenville Administration. Since they realized that these rules and regulations would have bad impacts on their business. Moreover, as they noticed that the British Government would restrict colonial trade with Europe and the West Indies would be restricted, they became skillful in smuggling. To avoid the patrol and the search, they used to bribe customs' inspectors so that they would not acknowledge all the cargoes carried on ships (p. 52).

However, under P. M. Grenville's instructions, the British customs' officers were ordered to enforce laws strictly to end smuggling in Boston. They were ordered to use the Writs of Assistance, and the latter got the attention of the colonial populations Massachusetts. Consequently, one man stood and tried the British authority, in Massachusetts', Court which issued the Writs of Assistance. James Otis, a Massachusetts' lawyer, attempted to raise awareness amongst the colonists of how far the British Government could intervene in colonial affairs in America (Countryman, 1985, p. 69).

In February, 1761, James Otis, and his fellow Oxenbridge Thatcher, accused the British authorities in America for injustice after issuing the Writs of Assistance. What occurred in the Massachusetts' Court would represent the core ideological struggle which provoked the American Revolution in Massachusetts. Jeremiah Gridley, representative of the British authorities in Massachusetts, emphasized that the writs were legal measures implemented in Massachusetts' ports to end smuggling; since the British customs' officials in colonial ports were obliged to execute the King's laws. In addition, he argued that the writs did not include taxes to be collected from the colonists. However, these were only protective measures to avoid the colonies and Great Britain engage in foreign competition (Bailyn, 1992, p. 335).

In the court, James Otis emphasized that using the writs violated the inherited rights of Englishmen. According to him, if the writs were used forcibly, the colonists would be treated as slaves in their homes. This; in fact, would endanger the inherited privilege of the subjects'

lives. This would make families more vulnerable to random invasion of their houses. Accordingly, if the British Government insisted on using the writs, there might be serious consequences in America. The colonists would; also, speak out and express their anger towards the British authorities (Andrews, 1938, p. 6).

James Otis' speech complained; violently, against the use of the writs which were executed in Massachusetts. He believed that the writs were against the status of the English liberty which provided the Englishman with the freedom over his own house. Although the writs were declared legally, James Otis argued that the writs would destroy this privilege when customs' officers start entering the colonists' houses breaking anything they encountered. The American colonists would, in revenge, ask for their self- defense, and; therefore, more blood would be shed.

Countryman (1985) assumed that although James Otis lost the debate and the writs went into effect, his speech and ideas centered around an important issue: How much the British Parliament could interfere in the colonies? James Otis published his pamphlet; namely, *The Rights of the British Colonists Asserted and Proved*, which contained *No Taxation Without Representation*. Originally, this principle was introduced as 'taxation without representation is tyranny' and, eventually, reduced to 'no taxation without representation.' Historically, this principle stated by James Otis reflected the long historical struggle between the English Monarch and Parliament in the Glorious Revolution and the English Bill of Rights (1689) (pp. 68- 9).

Accordingly, Countryman (1985) agreed to the fact that as the colonists read James Otis' pamphlet, they were influenced by his ideas which were against the British Government's policies in America. Moreover, James Otis set into motion the rights of Englishmen which were threatened by the British Government's policies in America (p. 71).

Colonial resistance in the thirteen colonies was carried on. Now, the colonists had to resist another step of the British Parliamentary Acts. This step included; mainly, collecting revenue taxes. The patriots in Massachusetts formulated legal and political backgrounds in order to declare; officially, colonial resistance against the several British taxation acts which intended to (1) collect revenues from the colonies to contribute in the Seven Year's War's debts, and (2) overturn colonial right to be taxed by their own legislatures. Therefore, resisting the Stamp Act played a crucial role in the American Revolution (1763- 1775) in Massachusetts.

1.2.2. Resistance of the Stamp Act:

As colonial reaction against the British Parliamentary Acts of taxation commenced in Massachusetts, Samuel Adams was amongst the patriots who helped to organize this colonial resistance against the British Parliamentary Acts of taxation. Moreover, he defended colonial rights in Massachusetts (Cushing, 1904, p. 27).

A Bostonian who graduated from Harvard College, Samuel Adams was best noted as a political organizer of the *American Revolution* and the resistance movement. Harlow (1975) noted that Samuel Adams proved to be amongst the best expositors of radical political philosophy. In addition, his arguments seemed general, always convincing, and he possessed the rare skill of making abstract doctrines look alive to men on the street (p. 83).

Ideologically, Beach (1965) argued that Samuel Adams was heavily influenced by John Locke's writings, which focused on 'life, liberty, and a respect for private property' (p. 77). Samuel Adams' ideas of political philosophy seemed to be evident and helped in forming the Sons of Liberty. Moreover, Samuel Adams' ideas helped in the group's success in generating grassroots support for the organized resistance movement. Another aspect of Locke's philosophy, which was evident within Samuel Adams' leadership of the Sons of Liberty, was

the role of government in relation to civil rights. Moreover, Samuel Adams argued that government's role was to protect the colonists' rights, but not to subvert them (Puls, 2006, p. 26).

According to Samuel Adams, since the establishment of the British colonies, colonial charters had privileged colonial assemblies with exclusive right to enact colonial taxes to help manage colonial affairs. Therefore, the practice of self- rule had been, historically, rooted in the colonies (Bailyn, 1992, p. 351).

According to Edmund and Morgan (1959), Samuel Adams believed that since the British Parliament taxed the colonies, the British policymakers relied on 'Virtual Representation.' i. e. This principal held that members of the British Parliament represented all English subjects who lived in the British Empire. However, enacting revenue taxes was contrary to the English Common- Law which held that the British subjects could only be taxed with their own consent (p. 17).

After enacting the Stamp Act was enacted in 1765, Maier (1972) stressed that the aforementioned act arose public attention and angered the colonists in the thirteen colonies. As the Virginia Resolves refused Taxation without Representation, Boston was the home of violent protests. Emerged early in 1765, the Sons of Liberty emerged as a popular organization which led protests and riots in reaction to the Stamp Act. They comprised of Bostonian merchants and artisans. It was commanded by Ebenezer McIntosh, a Boston shoemaker (p. 129).

Bullion (1982) argued that the sons carried their resistance to the Stamp Act for one main purpose: To force stamp distributors and tax collectors to quit their jobs by seizure of stamps and destroying their offices in Boston and around Massachusetts' towns. Successfully, they grew in large numbers, and were present all over America. The sons hung Andrew Oliver, the Stamp Commissioner, in an old tree on Aug. 14, 1765. They forced him to resign after breaking

his house and burning his office. In addition, they attacked the estates of other the customs' inspectors. On August 26, 1765, as the sons went to the house of Lt- Gov. Thomas Hutchinson, they burnt records and books. Accordingly, he and his family were forced to leave Boston (p. 88).

According to Edmund & Morgan (1959), not only violence which contributed to the success of the sons' movements. However, their works were reported in newsprint. In their ranks, the sons included Benjamin Edes, a printer, and John Gill of the Boston Gazette. They; successfully, generated and arouse public opinion. Every newspaper reported news of the Sons' movements. As colonists read about the Sons of Liberty's movements, they became aware of the fact that political resistance existed in Massachusetts, and was directed and organized by the sons (p. 26).

According to Andrews (1938), the Massachusetts Assembly took the next move. It called the colonies for a meeting to discuss the latest news, and to direct resistance if other future taxes were legislated. Thus, nine colonies responded by sending representatives to the Stamp Act Congress, held in New York on Oct. 7, 1765. Colonial delegates stated their denial to be taxed against their will, and accused the British Monarch and his Parliament of destroying the colonists' rights and liberties. Additionally, they declared their allegiance to the British Monarch and wished to see British- American colonial relations be improved (p. 8).

Within the crisis, Bullion (1989) reported that Massachusetts' colonists used and exploited another most successful measure: non-importation agreements. As those agreements went into effect, they affected British merchants. However, these measures were exploited by radical members who intervened to give ideological perspective to the political resistance. Instead, they gave consideration to their constitutional grievance and refused No Taxation without Representation. Their main purpose was to ask the British Parliament to revise its policies and legislations about the American colonies, not to subvert their rights and liberties (p. 32).

In August 1768, Bostonian merchants signed a declaration, and agreed to implement a non-importation agreement not to import, or sell British goods. In Boston, as the boycott went into effect, it was promoted throughout the colonies. Moreover, more colonial populations became politically active. Many colonists who had not previously participated in politics, now found a way to voice out their opinions (Allison, 2011, p. 27).

According to Allison (2011), the non- importation agreement was amongst the successful means used by Massachusetts' colonists. Purposefully, these non- importation agreements intended to force the British Parliament revise its imperial policy towards the American colonies. To voice their own protests and participate bravely in this political activism, the Daughters of Liberty urged colonists to weave their own cloth and to use American products instead of British goods. To help ease the shortage of specific goods; such as, textiles in the colony, the Daughters of Liberty started spinning bees to spin yarn and wool into fabric (p. 27).

Within the Stamp Act crisis, the next move was taken by the British tradesmen. According to Bliven (1958), they appealed to the British Parliament and asked for the repeal of the act because they admitted that they would lose their business if they shipped their goods to a land which would not host them. Furthermore, the British customs' officers reported that were unable to collect taxes. Accordingly, the British Parliament annulled the Stamp Act, and; meanwhile, issued the Declaratory Act which authorized the British Parliament with ultimate right to legislate future acts for the colonies in whatever circumstances (pp. 13- 4).

As the British Parliament proceeded with its acts of taxation, colonial resistance continued in Massachusetts. Now, with the Townshend Acts being enacted, several protests rose in Massachusetts, and; accordingly, sparked throughout the thirteen colonies. In fact, the Townshend Acts another maneuver of the British Parliament to raise revenue from taxes on the colonists against their own consent. Again, they complained and protested that they could be

only taxed with their own consent and through their own locally elected officials, and not through the British Parliament which seemed to violate colonial rights and liberties.

In response to colonial resistance, Colin (1984) reported that Samuel Adams urged the colonies to adopt non- importation agreements and boycott until the Townshend Acts were repealed. In accordance with Samuel Adams' Circular Letter, the Boston Town Meeting authorized the boycott on British goods and the use of non- importation agreements. Thus, colonial merchants and citizens started the boycott of British commodities. As a result, Great Britain's trade with the American colonies fell down from twenty- five to fifty per cent. Thus, the British- American trade was hardly hit (p. 119).

As Political resistance was carried on in Massachusetts. However, it evolved and blood was shed. The British soldiers faced furious, angry colonists in Boston. The growing violent tensions between Bostonians and the British troops resulted in bloodshed.

1.2.3. The Bloody Massacre in Boston:

Early in March 1770, Boston became a hot place for citizens to openly express their frustrations and resentments towards the representatives of the British authorities. Archer (2010) reported that Bostonians encountered four serious problems; namely, (1) living through seventeen months of military occupation, (2) resentment of the presence of commissioners, (3) enforcing the Townshend Acts, and (4) economic hardships. Accordingly, they realized that they were considered by the British authorities as subordinates, and not citizens who live in the British Empire (p. 183).

Since the sons intended to attack the customs' officials after they seized John Hancock's ship, Gov. Francis Bernard called for military assistance to avoid more troubles in Boston, and to protect customs' officials from riots and assaults. Thus, the British Government responded

positively to his request and sent four regiments which arrived there (Howard, 1905, p. 203). This; however, angered the colonists. Samuel Adams announced ‘We will destroy every soldier that dare put his foot on shore. . . . I look upon them as foreign enemies!’ (Dallek, Garcia, Olge, and Risinger, 2008, p. 267). Samuel Adams; strongly, believed that the troops were seen as foreigners. They came to America not to protect that frontier, but to put the colonies under surveillance in order to take their liberties and rights out of them.

However, Barrow (1967) assumed that when the troops arrived, Gov. Francis Bernard’s problems were doubled. Bostonians believed that resistance would be increased and stiffened with the troops’ presence. In this regard, the Boston Town Meeting stated that raising and keeping an army in the colonies is unjust (p. 96).

In Boston streets, the British soldiers were insulted whenever they walked. The soldiers were ordered to avoid trouble with colonial populations. However, violence led to bloodshed, and the Boston Massacre occurred on Mar. 5, 1770 (Andrews, 2002, p. 9).

The aforementioned event started when colonial populations began to exchange words with the soldiers in the streets. At nine o’clock in the morning, Bostonian citizens- about on hundred- gathered at British sentry of the Customs’ House. Being hit in the street, this soldier called out for help, and soldiers came to his assistance. He feared to be killed, since the mob shouted ‘Kill the soldier! Kill the coward!’ Now, as a large mob gathered and started throwing snowballs and rocks at the soldiers, Capt. Preston arrived to support his soldiers (Bliven, 1958, p. 22).

Upon his arrival, Capt. Preston asked the mob to dissipate. However, they refused to do so. Capt. Preston ordered the soldiers to prime and load. The mob shouted ‘You cowards! Let’s see you fire! You dare not fire! ... Bloody backs!’ When they fired, one fell dead; six were wounded. The dead was Crispus Attucks, an American of African descent, who was the first person killed in the Boston Massacre. He was; thus, the first American who fell dead in the American Revolution (Kachun, 2017, pp. 31- 2).

Maier (1972) reported that the situation was to aggravate when the sons outnumbered the soldiers. However, when Lt- Gov. Thomas Hutchinson intervened, he calmed down the mob. In addition, he promised to arrest the accused soldiers. John Adams debated the case in the court, and acted for defending the soldiers. Accordingly, he insisted on not to blame the soldiers; they acted for their self- defense. However, the mob were to blame. Only two soldiers were charged for murder (p. 142).

In his interpretation of the Boston Massacre, Young (1966) assumed that the aftermath of the Boston Massacre was highly important. Paul Revere, succeeded to engrave the Boston Massacre with the following title: Fruits of Arbitrary Power: The Bloody Massacre Perpetuated at King Street. He wanted to increase the anti- British feeling all over the colonies and create a true image of the British tyranny (p. 114).

Samuel Adams conducted a town meeting in 1772 which recommended the formation of the Committee of Correspondence to communicate the rights of the British colonists in America. James Otis was elected chairman of the committee, and Samuel Adams and Dr. Joseph Warren became active members. The Committee of Correspondence's members worked hard to exchange communication among other patriots in the colonies (Axelrod, 1998, p. 73).

The Boston Massacre and colonial grievances obliged the British Parliament to repeal all Parliamentary Acts, except the tax on English Tea, Massachusetts' colonists believed that the above- mentioned tax meant that the British Parliament insisted on taxing them against their will. Accordingly, resistance was carried on. However, resistance was escalated and led to another violent event in Boston which, on one hand, hurt the British colonial trade, and; on the other hand, had serious impacts on Massachusetts (Chidsey, 1965, p. 145).

1.2.4. The Boston Tea Party and the British Government's Reaction:

Although British- American colonial relationships improved for a while, enacting the Tea Act in 1773 outraged the colonists and contributed to increase colonial resistance. From the colonists' point of view, the Tea Act meant that the British Parliament insisted on taxing the colonies against their will. The colonists boycotted English Tea; it caused the East India Company's sales to decrease sharply (Adams, 1923, p. 84).

It is worth recalling that the company faced serious financial problems. The British Parliament intervened to help the company: It authorized the latter to sell tea directly in America to undercut the prices of colonial merchants and smugglers. However, the company could not do so because colonial smugglers; such as, John Hancock, imported tea cheaply from Holland (Fischer, 1905, p. 162).

According to Maier (1972), if the colonists; however, agreed to pay the tea tax, they would acknowledge Parliament's right of taxation. Moreover, Bostonian merchants knew that the British Parliament passed the Tea Act only to privilege the company with full monopoly to export its merchandise directly to America without paying taxes (p. 153). Labaree (1964) reported that colonial merchants were angered furiously by enacting the Tea Act. They decided to resist because (1) colonial merchants feared of losing business, and (2) the act revived colonial protest No Taxation without Representation (p. 4).

According to Branson (2007), the tea boycott mobilized large categories of colonial populations. Colonial women, organized into the Daughters of Liberty, now led the boycott. They organized non-importation agreements and boycotted British goods. Most importantly, several colonial women signed a petition, promising not to drink British tea. Led by Abigail Adams, the wife of John Adams, the Daughters of Liberty decided to drink coffee instead (pp. 51- 2).

Since the tea boycott went into effect and mobilized large colonial populations, it linked the thirteen colonies together in their common cause. Moreover, it aimed at forcing the British Parliament to repeal the Tea Act. It is worth to mention that the Boston Committee of Correspondence led the resistance against the Tea Act. Its strategy was to mobilize Americans to prevent East India Company's ships from unloading tea in American ports (Adams, 1923, p. 86).

Nevis & Commager (1945) stated that despite the colonists began to prevent the company's ships from unloading tea, in Boston; however, the company was assisted by Lt- Gov. Thomas Hutchinson who insisted on unloading the company's tea. On December 16, 1773, a large mob of the sons spoke to Lt- Gov. Thomas Hutchinson to send the ships back to London, but he refused (p. 75).

When negotiations failed, Bliven (1958) stated that Samuel Adams said 'I do not see what more Bostonians could do to save their country.' The mobs agreed on the following action 'Boston Harbour a teapot tonight! Hurrah for Griffin's Wharf!' Accordingly, they were determined to act violently to destroy the East India Company's cargoes of tea in the Boston harbor on board. (p. 29).

It is worth recalling that Sarah Bradlee Fulton, a Bostonian woman and a notable member of the Daughters of Liberty, played a vital role in the Boston Tea Party. She is mostly known as 'Mother of the Boston Tea Party'. She is accredited with the idea disguising Boston's Sons of Liberty men as Mohak Indians ('Sarah Bradlee Fulton', 2017, para. 1). Accordingly, the sons wrapped in blankets and daubed red paint to look like Mohawk Indians. After they went down to Griffin's Wharf, they got into the 'Dartmouth', 'Eleanor', and the 'Beaver', and threw off about 342 chests of 'Ceylon' and 'Darjeeling tea' overboard (Bliven, 1958, p. 29).

Butterfield (1961) argued that throughout the American colonies, Bostonians were not believed that they would react severely and destroyed the company's tea. Colonial populations

never thought that the sons would dare to react severely to the company which intended to cut their lucrative tea trade. This act of resistance shows that the Massachusetts' men determined not to adhere to the British commerce regulations. As a matter of fact, the Boston Tea Party occurred because the British Parliament did not abandon enacting several acts which were directed to take the colonists' rights out of them. They determined to live under their colonial charters which enabled them freedom and self- rule which had been practiced since the establishment of the colonies. More importantly, it was a colonial manifestation of freedom and self- rule: they sought to carry their own trade without the British Government's interference. With the British Government's intended measures to rule the American colonies and burden them with revenue taxes, the American colonies would sooner be obliged to fight in order to secure their rights (pp. 85- 7).

A month later, the news about the Boston Tea Party's angered King George III, Parliament, and the British Government. Accordingly, the British Parliament passed the Coercive Acts. These were series of laws designed to punish the city of Boston. Purposefully, in his statement, Lord North, King's Prime Minister, explained, in front of the Members of Parliament, that the acts were proposed as executive power so that the British Government would act seriously in reaction to the damage made to the company (Fischer, 1902, p. 182).

As a matter fact, the Coercive Acts consisted of five punitive laws which intended to punish Massachusetts for the Boston Tea Party. These were:

- ✚ **The Boston Port Act:** Passed on March 31, 1774, it closed the Boston Harbor and forbade its use until reimbursements were made to the King's treasury and the East India Company for the damages which occurred (Fischer, 1902, p. 183);
- ✚ **The Massachusetts' Government Act:** Enacted on May 20, 1774, it annulled Massachusetts' Charter, and Massachusetts became a Royal Colony. The colony was made under military administration;

- ✚ **The Quartering Act:** Enacted on Mar. 24, 1774, the act required to help the British troops in North America. It stated that the British soldiers should be quartered in houses, food, and everything owned by the colonists (King et al., 1986, pp. 88- 9);
- ✚ **The Administration Act of Justice:** Being effective on May 20, 1774, the act stated that the new Governor would have the authority to transfer to England the trials of the British officials if they were accused of committing any offence in the colonies;
- ✚ **The Quebec Act:** It was passed on May 20, 1774. Specifically, the act made the Ohio Valley part of the Province of Quebec, and religious tolerance was granted to the Catholics living there. Moreover, it provided protection to the Roman Catholics. (Dickinson, 1975, pp. 71- 3)

In regard to the British purpose of implementing the Intolerable Acts, it is worth to mention that the British Government intended to isolate the aforementioned colony, and make an example of Bostonians and Massachusetts' colonists. i. e. The British Government intended to send a clear message to the rest of the American colonies that any rebellion which would rise in the colonies would be suppressed seriously, and the colonies would have the same punishment like that one of Massachusetts. However, this tactic completely failed. Instead of isolating Massachusetts from the other colonies, it united the colonies against a common enemy.

The Intolerable Acts assembled colonial delegates from the American colonies in Philadelphia for a meeting in the First Continental Congress in Carpenter's Hall; an act which gave birth to American unity. In the meeting, Patrick Henry Lee of Virginia stated 'Let freemen be represented by numbers alone. The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, New Englanders, are no more. I am not a Virginian, but an American!' (Hoskins, 2014, p. 19). In fact, Patrick Henry Lee's words emphasized on neglecting all differences

among the colonies, and get united as a strong front against the British Government's measures to enslave the Americans. Thus, Patrick Henry (1732- 1794) and Philadelphia were credited with the birth of this 'American identity.'

Throughout the colonies, mass protests greeted the news of the Intolerable Acts. In May 1774, the Virginia House of Burgesses set aside June 1, 1774, as a day of 'Fasting, Humiliation, and Prayer for Boston' (Jamestown Yorktown Foundation, 2014, p. 6). Another step of solidarity with Massachusetts was taken by the Virginia House of Burgesses, which was dissolved later by the Royal Governor of Virginia, when the members reconvened at Raleigh Tavern in July 1774 (Ammerman, 1974, p. 86).

George Washington, a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, and his neighbor, George Mason, drafted the Fairfax Resolves which detailed colonial complaints against British rule, called for activating non- importation agreements, demanded an end to the slave trade, and urged the calling of a general congress to draft a petition to King George III. George Washington carried the Fairfax Resolves to the Virginia Houses of Burgesses which debated the matter on August 1, 1774 (Broadwater, 2006, pp. 65- 6).

Furthermore, across the thirteen colonies, local groups were adopting similar resolutions to protest the Intolerable Acts. In Massachusetts, the Suffolk Resolves were drafted and were similar to the Fairfax Resolves. The Orangetown Resolutions captured the anger of the colonists in New York. Moreover, the Intolerable Acts convinced patriot leaders, committees of correspondence, and colonial legislatures to endorse the call for a general congress of the American thirteen colonies to discuss how to resolve the newest crisis and redress colonial grievances. This step; however, was the seeds which gave birth to the first Continental Congress. As a result, unity among the thirteen colonies was born; it was strengthened by the emergence of the Continental Congress. This newly- established institution would play a major role in the American Revolutionary War: It would act as the spokesman for the thirteen

colonies, and direct the American Revolutionary War when it commenced (Ammerman, 1974, p. 86).

Colonial resistance to the Tea Act, which was carried mainly in Boston, showed that colonial populations believed in the principal that people should not be taxed forcibly, but only by their own consent, and through their own legislatures. Thus, The Intolerable Acts contributed to the final break between America and Great Britain. On one hand, King George III insisted on ruling the colonies strictly, as he announced to his Prime Minister Lord North. On the other hand, Mrs. Abigail Adams, the wife of John Adams, in a letter to a friend in February 1775, stated that the only option left for the Americans in their struggle against the British Government is the weapon. The Americans had to take up arms to fight for their rights and protect their liberties against a corrupt, British government (Jamestown Yorktown Foundation, 2014, p. 6). Apparently, the conflict between Great Britain and the American colonies and the circumstances drove both sides into impasse, with no solutions, or options for reconciliation, but war.

As the conflict escalated between the British Government and the Americans; especially in Massachusetts, the British; however, used force to maintain law and order. As a matter of fact, the colonists were strongly convinced that the British Parliamentary Acts intended to subvert their rights, and take their liberties and properties out of them. With the conflict being aggravated, it was clear that the situation would develop into armed resistance, and the American Revolutionary War would break out, since the Province of Massachusetts was under the authority of Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage, Commander-in-chief of the British troops in North America.

Militarily, as Massachusetts witnessed the emergence of political resistance against the British Government's imperial policy, the American Revolutionary War would; also, break out from the above- mentioned colony. As a matter of fact, a clear- cut distinction is made between

both terms. Firstly, 'Revolution' in the US history is meant to be the period from 1763 to 1775 where the American colonists underwent struggle and resistance in defying the British colonial policies through several measures and tactics. As a result, when the conflict was not resolved politically and peacefully, the American Revolutionary War, or the War of the Revolution, broke out and was carried out by the Americans until independence was achieved. Massachusetts' colonists and patriot leaders started to defy the British Intolerable Acts and prepare for the Revolutionary War by collecting arms and ammunition, forming colonial militia, and start military trainings and drills to meet the Revolutionary War ready and well- prepared.

1.3.From Political to Military Resistance: Colonial Preparations for the Revolutionary War in Massachusetts:

In reaction to the Boston Tea Party, it is worth recalling that the British Parliament passed the Intolerable Acts to firmly assert its authority in the troublesome colony. In addition to annulling the provincial Massachusetts' Charter, the Massachusetts Government Act prescribed that the members of the Massachusetts Governor's Council would no longer be elected by the provincial assembly. Instead, they were appointed; directly, by the King.

In this regard, Dickinson (1975) reported that the Committees of Correspondence worked hard to unite the colonies against the British authorities. The Boston Town Meeting called towns and provinces of Massachusetts to adopt 'the Solemn League', to boycott the British goods, and stop commerce with Great Britain; they responded positively. This step would create; later, the Massachusetts Provincial Congress. The latter assume some important responsibilities, and take firm decisions; such as, calling colonial militia and preparing for war (p. 75).

1.3.1. Drafting the Suffolk Resolves:

In defying the Intolerable Acts, Dr. Joseph Warren called four Massachusetts counties, including Suffolk, to meet on August 26, 1774 for a meeting at Faneuil Hall to issue policy statements and resolutions in favor of the colonists of Massachusetts. On September 9, 1774, nineteen towns and districts of the Suffolk County sent delegates that met in Milton, Massachusetts (Webster and Morris, 1973, pp. 7- 10).

The delegates passed unanimously the Suffolk Resolves, written by Dr. Joseph Warren. Effectively, the Suffolk Resolves declared the Intolerable Acts unconstitutional: The delegates announced that they denied the Intolerable Acts and refused to obey neither the acts, nor the officials responsible for exercising those acts. Moreover, the Suffolk Resolves called on colonial populations in Massachusetts to form new governmental institutions funded by the taxes that would otherwise be paid to British authorities. The most provocative resolution called for the arming of local militias, doing their utmost to master the ‘Art of War’ and defiance of British military authority, if necessary.

According to Andrews (2002), the Suffolk Resolves mainly:

- ✚ Declared the Coercive Acts unconstitutional;
- ✚ Urged Massachusetts leaders to establish a separate state until the Coercive Acts were repealed;
- ✚ Advised Massachusetts leaders to retain all future tax collections, rather than passing them on to Great Britain;
- ✚ Urged colonists to boycott of British goods and trade with Great Britain;
- ✚ Advised colonial populations of Massachusetts to appoint militia officers and begin arming their local forces to learn the arts of war; and

- ✚ Warned British official that efforts to arrest citizens on political charges would result in the detention of the arresting officers. (p. 14)

To better organize the resistance in Massachusetts, the patriots established a provincial congress, a revolutionary political body, when Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage, the Royal Governor of Massachusetts, refused to convene the Massachusetts legislature in October 1774. In reaction to Gage's move, the majority of towns around Massachusetts succeeded to elect delegates who met at Salem and created the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress. This newly-established institution operated as the government of all Massachusetts' towns, and took care of Massachusetts' people.

1.3.2. The Creation of the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress:

According to Hallahan (2001), Massachusetts which took the initiative of creating the Provincial Congress. In fact, the Boston Town Meeting called towns' representatives to the Suffolk County to meet in September, 1774. They reacted against the Intolerable Acts, which were attempts by the British Parliament to take the rights and liberties out of them (p. 135). In addition, Morris (1963) stated that Coercive Acts intended to make colonial populations serve the British interests (p. 155).

Under the Massachusetts' Government Act, Massachusetts became a Royal Colony, and Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage was appointed the Colonial Governor of Massachusetts' Province. In addition, he was Commander-in-Chief of the British troops in North America. As a Colonial Governor of Massachusetts, Galvin (1996) stated that on September 28, 1774, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage cancelled both of the General Court and the Legislature of Massachusetts after

they met in Salem without his permission. However, Massachusetts' colonists found other channels to voice out their expressions (p. 54).

Thus, Massachusetts towns' delegates, members of the assembly, and other patriots, met on October 5, 1774, at Concord's First Parish Church for their Provincial Congress. John Hancock, who was newly selected, presided over the Congress (October 21- 26). In the debates, delegates drafted a letter of declaration which emphasized that the assembly was formed in response to the dissolution of the colonial government (Galvin, 1996, p. 54). Therefore, the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress functioned as a parallel government of Massachusetts outside the British jurisdiction. i. e. It became a parallel authority within Massachusetts.

In order to communicate colonial grievances and opinions, Lincoln (1838) admitted that members of the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress sent letters to Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage, the Royal Governor of Massachusetts, in regard to his decisions. The delegates of the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress denounced Thomas Gage's actions as 'warlike', acting violently with colonial populations in Massachusetts. In addition, the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress questioned the constitutionality of dismissing the province's assembly men and councilors. When the Congress adjourned; later, on December 1, 1774, five members were chosen to be Massachusetts' delegates to the First Continental Congress which would meet in April, 1775 at Carpenters Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to discuss the Coercive Acts. The Massachusetts' delegation members consisted of John Hancock, John Adams, Thomas Cushing, Robert Treat Paine, and Samuel Adams (p. 74).

These members; in fact, were carefully chosen to represent the Province of Massachusetts in the Continental Congress. Being mostly known as real patriots and zealous for the separation from Great Britain, these members would act seriously to defend the cause Massachusetts as the cause of America, play a crucial role in creating the Continental Army, and convince other colonial delegates to draft the Declaration of Independence.

1.3.2.1. The Creation of the Committee of Safety:

During the American Revolution, the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress needed a system of organization and networking to enforce their resolutions, organize activities, and to communicate with citizens. After the debates, the representatives of the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress drew up three important resolves. The first resolve created the Committee of Safety which was empowered to do whatever necessary to protect the province. i. e. The Committee of Safety was instructed to take every necessary step to protect Massachusetts. It consisted of nine delegates (Ketchum, 1999, p. 37).

Tourtellot (2000) believed that the Committee of Safety was appointed assume its duty: to do whatever was necessary to protect the province from any attempt of destruction. Furthermore, it was authorized to call out militiamen, and to maintain them in service. Moreover, the committee was instructed, by the Provincial Congress. Furthermore, this committee was responsible of calling the Minutemen and keeping them in service whenever the Province of Massachusetts' safety was endangered (p. 59).

Additionally, the Committee of Safety was organized as the executive authority; eventually, replacing the authority of the local colonial government. It became involved in organizing local militia (Ketchum, 1999, p. 45).

1.3.2.2. The Creation of the Committee of Supplies:

The second resolution which was drawn by the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress established the Committee of Supplies. It was given authority to make necessary provisions for supporting the militia, and purchasing cannons and arms and ammunition at any time. Furthermore, general officers were appointed to take command of the militia. These officers were empowered to select and enlist the Minutemen and make them ready to march at the first

call of the Committee of Safety. Moreover, the inhabitants were asked to train themselves militarily (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 63).

According to Tourtellot (2000) through these resolutions, the Provincial Congress foresaw that war would occur; it was determined to meet it well prepared. The Committee of Safety should choose the decisive time to call the troops to assemble (p. 66).

After the Committee of Safety had taken command of the military, Galvin (1996) reported that the Provincial Congress urged the Committee to start military trainings of the militiamen. Thus, Massachusetts started to prepare for war and defy the British military authorities in Massachusetts. These notes were emphasized in a letter sent by the Provincial Congress to all the towns of Massachusetts in December, 1774 which ordered each town and district to show a high level of readiness because of the current circumstances which the entire colony was undergoing (pp. 57- 8).

Moreover, Galvin (1996) added that the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress ordered the minutemen to be ready, well- equipped, and exercise militarily every week. This decision explained that the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress intended to meet the war ready and well-prepared if it occurred suddenly. Moreover, in a letter which was addressed to the Massachusetts' towns, districts, and provinces, the Provincial Congress ordered that the whole colony should pay the Minutemen for their services so that citizens should be encouraged to take the skill of complete soldiers (p. 59).

With these decisions and orders, the spare head of the American Revolutionary War would emerge from Massachusetts. The creation of the Minutemen was one of the greatest achievements of the Provincial Congress. On the other hand, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage intended to take effective control of Massachusetts. In order to maintain law and order in Massachusetts, he asked for additional military reinforcements. Therefore, four additional regiments were sent for his support. These were; namely, the 10th and 52nd regiments of Quebec,

along with the 18th and 47th of New York. With those British reinforcements; on one side, and the Minutemen's military preparations; on the other side, an immediate military outbreak between both sides would break out in Massachusetts (Galvin, 1996, p. 61).

Conclusion:

Political resistance symbolized the events which occurred in Massachusetts. Massachusetts' colonists used several tactics and means to voice out their expressions of No Taxation without Representation, and the British Government intended, through several Parliamentary Acts, to subvert their rights and their inherited tradition of self- government. As Massachusetts became the spearhead of the American Revolution, the British policymakers suppressed political resistance in Massachusetts. However, Massachusetts' colonists reacted against the British Parliamentary Acts during their political resistance which would develop into armed revolution against the British troops in Massachusetts.

To meet the war well- prepared, Massachusetts' colonists began their military preparations. They created their own militia; namely, the Minutemen, and started collecting arms and ammunition. Preparing for war meant that the Massachusetts' colonists were determined to fight to restore their inherited right: the practice of self- rule, and to be governed by their own legislatures and local assemblies. The British Red coats and the Massachusetts' Minutemen would start fighting in Lexington and Concord. Moreover, the Americans would achieve political and military advantages from the day of Lexington and Concord.

CHAPTER TWO

The Beginning of American Revolutionary War in Massachusetts: Achievements of the Battles of Lexington and Concord

**Chapter Two: The Beginning of American Revolutionary War in
Massachusetts: Achievements of the Battles of Lexington and Concord**

Introduction 51

2.4.The Battle of Lexington Common Green (April 19, 1775) 52

2.4.1. The American Minutemen Vs. British Redcoats: Exchanging Fire in Lexington
Common Green 52

2.4.2. Who Shot First in Lexington Common Green? Analysis of the First Shots Heard Around
in the American Revolutionary War 57

2.5.The Battle of Concord North Bridge Fight (April 19, 1775) 61

2.5.1. The British Regulars at Concord 61

2.5.2. The Concord North Bridge Fight 63

2.6.The Achievements of the Battles of Lexington and Concord 66

2.6.1. The Creation of the Continental Army 66

2.6.2. The Rise of the Independent Spirit and Drafting the Declaration of Independence
..... 70

Conclusion 77

Introduction:

Indeed, the American Revolution constituted a debate of divergent opinions and views over commerce and trade regulations, colonial control, and revenue taxes which began early in 1763. All these were manifested shortly after the end of the French Indian War, the British policy makers sought to consolidate their empire by expanding Parliamentary control over the American colonies, revoking the old charters that privileged the British colonists of freedom and self-rule, and by the radical alterations in the British tax structure so as to impose unfamiliar taxes upon the colonists. Accordingly, these measures inspired colonial attention, and mobilized the colonists in the Province of Massachusetts to resist the British imperial policy.

It is worth recalling that after Massachusetts had undergone political resistance in which colonial populations defied and resisted the British Parliamentary Acts, this resistance would now, develop a step further into a military, armed revolution against the British troops in Massachusetts. Thus, the Massachusetts' Minutemen would engage in the first battles of the American Revolutionary War.

The present chapter analyzes the first battles of the American Revolutionary War which occurred on April, 19, 1775 in Lexington and Concord. It narrates how the Massachusetts' colonists transformed their political resistance into armed revolution, and how the American Revolutionary War started in Massachusetts. Moreover, this chapter highlights the achievements that the colonists had from the revolutionary outbreak.

2.1. The Battle of Lexington Common Green (April 19, 1775):

After political resistance had been successfully achieved in Massachusetts; now, resistance would be transformed into armed revolution, which would be directed against the British presence in Massachusetts. It is worth to mention that Bostonians had already determined that they would ‘... be ready to sacrifice our estates and everything dear in life, yea and life itself, in support of the common cause’ (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 46).

To carry out the resolution of the Massachusetts’ Provincial Congress, which created militia force in Massachusetts, Tourtellot (2000) assumed that Lexington, and other Massachusetts’ towns, organized their manpower into the ‘Minutemen’ and ‘Alarm List.’ The Being asked to take up arms, the Minutemen were instructed to get ready at any minute’s notice, and to march on orders of the Committee of Safety, or on orders of their officers. On the other hand, the Alarm List’s duty was keep an eye on the British troops’ movements and reported them to the militia (pp. 47- 8).

As political resistance emerged from Massachusetts, the latter would; now, be the area which would witness the first battles of the American Revolutionary War: Lexington Common Green (Countryman, 1985, p. 105). In the battle of Lexington Common Green, the first ‘Shot Heard ‘round the World’ had been fired out.

2.1.1. The American Minutemen Vs. The British Redcoats: Exchanging fire in Lexington Common Green:

In the first Provincial Congress, it had been resolved to create the Minutemen to counter possible British attacks and defend their province. Sullivan (1996) argued that Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage, the Royal Governor of Massachusetts, was facing the threat of outright rebellion. James Barrett, Col. of Concord Militia, was selected to collect and store military supplies for a

future army of 14,000 men. Moreover, the town of Concord was chosen to be the place for these supplies because of its location and safe distance. To prevent violence there, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage ordered the seizure of weapons and powder being stored in Concord (p. 70).

Fischer (1902) believed that in reaction to the Massachusetts Provincial Congress' measures, the British Parliament declared Massachusetts in state of rebellion. Additionally, Parliament asked King George III to take serious measures to end rebellion which was growing there. Accordingly, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage was ordered by the British Cabinet to seize military stores, and to arrest revolutionary leaders in Lexington (Andrews, 2002, p. 15). In order to get wind of Gage's plans and counter the British measures, Paul Revere set up the Committee of Observers, which consisted of thirty persons who acted as spies on the British soldiers' movements (p. 296).

Alden (1944) reported that when Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage was informed by the British Cabinet, he began planning the Concord march. Having been informed about the barrels of gunpowder which were hidden in Concord, he decided to seize them, and to arrest rebel leaders; namely, Samuel Adams and John Hancock (p. 446).

To get more information about Concord, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage sent Capt. Brown and Ensign Henry De Berniere with a letter to report the necessary information that Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage needed to plan for his military expedition to Concord, the target location of the hidden weapons. Tourtellot (2000) cited that both Capt. Brown and Ensign Henry De Berniere had orders to fully examine the town of Concord, and to know exactly what quantities of weapons, ammunition, food, and provisions which were collected there. Geographically, Concord is situated between hills, with a river running through it, and two bridges. In regard to weapons and ammunition, the Minutemen had already succeeded to collect fourteen cannons, two cohorns, gunpowder and cartridges, and a store of provisions. Hidden in secret locations,

the Minutemen were determined to meet the war ready and well- prepared. Moreover, they worked to make it impossible for the British to seize their arms and ammunition (p. 89).

Secretly planned, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage had chosen and prepared his best units for this military expedition. He ordered the Light Infantry and the Grenadiers to be ready for the Concord march, which was commanded by Lt– Col. Francis Smith (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 90).

In his order issued to Lt– Col. Francis Smith, Galvin (1996) reported that Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage insisted on the following instructions of destroying the quantities of weapons, ammunition, and provisions which were collected at the town of Concord for raising and supporting rebellion there, commanding the Concord march with the Corps of Grenadiers and Light Infantry secretly, Concord being the main target of the expedition is to seize and destroy all stores of weapons, ammunition, and provisions which were outlined in the map, ordering the British soldiers to pay careful attention not to plunder the inhabitants, or hurt their private properties, and the necessity to secure the bridges in time of war. Accordingly, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage intended to secretly surprise the Minutemen in Concord, and seize the weapons, ammunition and provisions collected there. Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage had no intention to harm the inhabitants, hurt them, or destroy their properties. He only wanted to arrest outlawed rebels and slow down rebellion that would arise in Concord (p. 96).

To surprise the rebels in Concord, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage decided to send a detachment of troops, which comprised seven- hundred men. They consisted of the 23rd Regiment, led by Lt. Frederick Mackenzie, the 38th Regiment led by Lt. William Sutherland; and the 10th Regiment of Lt- Col. Francis Smith who commanded these troops with Maj. John Pitcairn of the Second Marines Regiment. Accordingly, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage chose the best troops for this military expedition to fully execute the mission successfully (Galvin, 1996, p. 121).

To reach Concord safely, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage chose to use a water route: He ordered his men to assemble at the shore of the Back Bay to sail out for Lexington on April 18, 1775 at 11H00 p. m. (Hallahan, 2001, p. 18).

After the British troops sailed for three hours, they landed on the Cambridge shore. There, they encountered some problems during their march. In fact, the soldiers were very tired because of the long march and the road they took. Furthermore, lack of food and provisions made it worse for them. They waited for a long time until food and provisions arrived from Boston (Galvin, 1996, p. 122).

Dr. Joseph Warren had already known about the Concord march. One of his men told him the march would be tonight (Hallahan, 2001, p. 19). Dr. Joseph Warren thought that if Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage marched by land, the route would be longer. However, if they selected a water way, it would be shorter (Hallahan, 2001, p. 20).

Andrews (2002) reported that; accordingly, Dr. Joseph Warren decided to send Paul Revere and William Dawes to deliver the message to Lexington and warn Samuel Adams and John Hancock, and the Concord Minutemen (p. 17).

Hallahan (2001) reported that Paul Revere set out for Lexington at about 11H00 p. m. After he had ridden from Medford down through Menotomy, Paul Revere reached Jonas Clarke's house at midnight and gave John Hancock a letter from Dr. Joseph Warren (p. 17), which informed him about Thomas Gage's march to Concord and to arrest patriots' leaders, Samuel Adams and John Hancock. Afterwards, both William Dawes and Paul Revere left for Concord (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 107).

Following the alert, scouts were sent to surveil the British if they marched to Lexington, or not. In the meantime, Capt. John Parker, Commander of the Lexington Minutemen, assembled one hundred and thirty of his militiamen in the Lexington Common Green waiting for orders

(Nolan, 1963, p. 95). As a matter of fact, the situation which Capt. John Parker was facing was critical; whether to fight the Red coats, or not.

Galvin (1996) reported that at 04H30 a. m. a scout arrived and reported that the British were marching to Lexington. Immediately, the Minutemen were recalled, of whom seventy- seven assembled on the Common Green in two ranks (p. 125). Half an hour later, the British entered Lexington Common Green. Maj. Gen. John Pitcairn led the first advancing column, which comprised two hundred soldiers of the Light Infantry, and was followed by five hundred soldiers of the Light Infantry and the Grenadiers, led by Lt- Col. Francis Smith (Hallahan, 2001, p. 30).

Being outnumbered, Capt. John Parker believed that it was impossible to face the British. In fact, realizing the current situation, Capt. John Parker was obliged not to fight the British because the military stores in Concord had already been moved to another safe place, and Patriot leaders Samuel Adams and John Hancock had already left the town. Therefore, it would be unnecessary for Capt. John Parker, and his Minutemen, to engage with the British soldiers (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 132).

In Lexington Common Green, Maj- Gen. Pitcairn shouted out at the militia and ordered them to throw their arms (Sullivan, 1996, p. 78). Accordingly, he decided not to engage with an army in Lexington because the action involved British subjects in rebellion to the King's laws. More importantly, the purpose of the expedition was to seize and destroy the military stores in Concord, and; then, go back to Boston. So, he ordered his soldiers not to fire, surround, and disarm the rebels (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 32). Meanwhile, Capt. John Parker ordered his men to disperse and to let the British troops pass by (Fischer, 1902, p. 302).

As they obeyed their captain, the Minutemen started to disperse. They turned back walking from the British soldiers, except two of them; Jonas Clarke and Robert Munroe. All Capt. Parker's men dispersed (Nolan, 1963, p. 110).

In this situation, Tourtellot (2000) reported that within the militia dispersed, a shot was fired out. As a result, the British lost control and started firing at the Minutemen. They were firing without orders from their officers (p. 179).

Until nowadays, no one is certain where the shots came from. They might have come out from the British ranks, or from the Lexington Militia ranks. They might have been from a bystander, or might have occurred accidentally. In the present chapter, the researchers analyzed the different views, statements, and beliefs about the first shots of the American Revolutionary War. In addition, some of the historical researches that were much concerned with the event and which were conducted are; therefore, presented to carefully examine the above- mentioned event, and explain it.

2.1.2. Who Shot First in Lexington Common Green? Analytical Approach of the ‘First Shots Heard Around’ in the American Revolutionary War:

Although the Lexington outbreak was acknowledged as the glorious day in the history of the American Revolution, it was a vexed question in historical research. Researchers, historians, and scholars have much dealt with these first shots fired in Lexington. They searched hard in order to understand what happened and who shot first. Since we researched the topic, it is; also, our turn to ask who fired the first shots? There have been divergent statements, declarations, and beliefs about these first shots, from both the British soldiers’ side and the Lexington Minutemen’s side.

As for the Lexington Minutemen, they believed that the first shots did not come from their ranks, but; rather, from the British officers, instead. Some of the colonial testimonies confirmed these statements. For instance, Capt. John Parker, Commander of the Lexington Minutemen, in

his testimony, emphasized that the British officers were the first to shoot fire in Lexington. His testimony was written in the letter below:

I, John Parker ... Commander of the Militia in Lexington, do testify and declare that on the 19th Instant, in the Morning, about one of Clock, being informed that there were a Number of Officers riding up and down the Road in order to take the Province Stores at Concord, ordered our Militia to meet on the Common in said Lexington, to consult what to do, and concluded not to be discovered, nor meddle or make with said Regular Troops unless they should insult or molest us— and upon their Approach, I immediately ordered our militia to disperse and not to fire— immediately said Troops made their Appearance and rushed furiously, fired upon and killed eight of our Party, without receiving any Provocation therefore from us. (Nixon, Kuting, and Rhoads, 1970, p. 73)

Capt. John Parker's testimony clearly accused the British soldiers of firing the first shots in Lexington. Additionally, another testimony was stated on April 19, 1775 by Elijah Sanderson, Lexington bystander, who said:

I heard one of the Regulars, whom I took to be an officer, say, 'Damn them we will have them,' and immediately the Regulars shouted . . . and fired on the Lexington Company, which did not fire a gun before the Regulars discharged them. (Andrews, 2002, p. 31)

In his turn, Patriot rider Paul Revere made his testimony about the issue when he returned back to Lexington after he was captured by the British patrol. He blamed the British soldiers of firing the first shots in the battle of Lexington Common Green. In this context, he said:

While we were getting the trunk, we saw the regulars very near, upon a full march. We hurried towards Mr. Clarke's house. In our way, we passed the through the militia. There were about fifty. When we had got about one hundred yards from the meeting- house. In their front was an officer on horseback. They made a short halt when I saw, and heard, a gun fired, which appeared to be a pistol. Then I could distinguish two guns and then continual roar of musketry; when we made off with the trunk. (Andrews, 2002, p. 32)

On the other hand, the British believed that the first shots fired in Lexington did not come from their ranks, but from the Minutemen. British testimonies blame the militia for shooting fire first in Lexington. For example, Maj- Gen. John Pitcairn of the Royal Marines stated in his report that 'Some of the rebels, who jumped over the wall, fired four or five shott at the soldiers'. Lt. John Barker, of the Fourth Regiment, said in his diary 'The British in Boston' that: '[O]n our coming near [the rebels] they fired one or two shots, upon which our Men without any orders rushed in upon them, fired and put 'em to flight' (Andrews, 2002, p. 33).

Furthermore, Ensign De Berniere's report to Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas General Gage stated that '[W]hen one of the rebels fired a shot, our soldiers returned the fire and killed about fourteen of them' (Hallahan, 2001, p. 37).

In order to fully analyze the first shots fired in Lexington, Professor Fischer, a British Military Historian, argued that the first shots came neither from the American side, nor from the British. Accordingly, he stated that 'Nearly everyone, British or American, agreed that the first shot did not come from the ranks of Captain Parker's militia, or from the rank or file of the British infantry' (Hallahan, 2001, p. 32).

Moreover, Professor Fischer compared between both British and Minutemen testimonies. On the one hand, the militiamen testified that the first shots did not come from the British ranks, but from mounted officers. On the other hand, the British testified that the shots were fired from a stone wall. Maj- Gen. Pitcairn was convinced that four, or five shots were fired over a wall (Hallahan, 2001, p. 33).

Accordingly, Professor Fisher concluded that several shots were fired 'lose together– one by a mounted British officer, and another by an American spectator. Furthermore, he assumed that one of the shots might have been fired deliberately 'either from an emotion of the moment, or a cold- blooded intention to create the incident' (as cited in Tourtellot, 2000, p. 133), but who exactly? According to Professor Fisher, and other historians, the finger points to Samuel Adams. In this regard, Brendan Morrissey, a British military historian, asserted that 'The finger of suspicion points most strongly at someone acting on orders from Samuel Adams' (as cited in Hallahan, 2001, p. 37). Therefore, Samuel Adams wanted to provoke a violent situation for the British troops in Lexington to irritate them; therefore, they could not respond to the Minutemen. The behind these first shots are unknown; too. Explanations had been introduced to fully answer the reasons behind these first shots. Possibly a shot was fired as an additional alarm– a common practice during the times Indian raids. Alternatively, it was probably a shot fired by a British officer as an order to the Minutemen to lay down their arms; the order was given with a warning shot from his gun (Tourtellot, 2000, pp. 134- 5).

When the Lexington outbreak was over, Lt- Col. Francis Smith arrived and ordered the soldiers to ben in their correct formations. At last, the British counted a one dead soldier and one soldier wounded. On the other hand, the Minutemen had eight dead and nine wounded. After the Lexington Common Green, the British carried on their march to Concord. There, the British military expedition would fight the second battle of the American Revolutionary War (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 136).

2.2. The Battle of Concord North Bridge Fight (April 19, 1775):

The day of Lexington was not successful for the Minutemen; for they were outnumbered by the British soldiers. Additionally, the town of Lexington was not the target for the British military expedition. Therefore, the British troops had to carry on their march to Concord where another military engagement waited for the British soldiers. Unlike Lexington's Minutemen, the British soldiers would encounter another company of the Minutemen in the Concord North Bridge Fight.

2.2.1. The British Regulars at Concord:

After the Lexington Common Green, The British soldiers carried on the Concord march to. However, some of the officers were tired. They grew anxious of the circumstances which surrounded their mission, and the problems which they encountered in the expedition. They wanted to abandon the military expedition and return to Boston because of the county was being alarmed, and the militia were assembled there (Hallahan, 2001, p. 27).

Hackett (1994) cited that the Red coats were aware of the fact that the Concord Minutemen had been alarmed, and would be in high readiness. In addition, the weapons and the military stores were moved to other safe locations. On the other hand, Lt- Col. Francis Smith ordered his men to continue the march. The troops had passed beyond the hill, and continued their march through a curved route to reach Brook's Hill. They reached Concord at 08H00 a. m. (p. 129). On the other hand, it was Samuel Prescott, the third rider, succeeded to reach Concord at 02H00 a. m. to alarm the Concord Minutemen (Hallahan, 2001, p. 37). Immediately, as the Town House alerted, the Minutemen assembled. They decided to send several scouts to surveil the British (Galvin, 1996, p. 137).

According to Andrews (2002), the Reverend William Emerson urged the Concord Minutemen to get ready. Before the British arrived, the Minutemen had succeeded to move the bulk of arms to other towns. Now, Concord had received more reinforcements from Acton, Bedford, Carlisle, Westford, Littleton, Stow, Groton, and Chelmsford (p. 34).

It is worth to mention that Col. James Barrett held a war council. Strategically, he wanted to keep the militia out of easy reach of the British. In addition, he wanted his Minutemen to be in forceful positions with the advantage of observation and striking power. To better organize his militiamen, Galvin (1996) stated that Col. James Barrett set a militia company on a hill across the meetinghouse. The rest of the militia withdrew to the second bridge (pp. 129- 130).

Lt- Col. Francis Smith planned for the search. He organized his troops as follows: He kept the Grenadiers in the town on the east side of the Concord River. A second detachment of troops was sent to secure the South Bridge to block its entrance. In addition, Lt- Col. Francis Smith dispatched seven companies of the Light Infantry under Capt. Parsons' command of the North Bridge to destroy the military stores (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 153).

Galvin (1996) reported that as the British soldiers started searching, they found nothing (pp. 140- 1). However, Lt- Col. Francis Smith was informed that three cannons were secreted in Concord by Ephraim Jones, the innkeeper and the town jailer who informed about the location after he was captured (Hallahan, 2001, p. 38).

In addition to the cannons, Tourtellot (2000) reported that Lt- Col. Francis Smith found five hundred pounds of lead musket balls, a few wooden carriages, and a few barrels of wooden spoons and trenchers. He decided to burn the supplies. The Minutemen were two hundred yards from the British. Now, they saw the column of smoke which was rising from the town. In revenge to the fire which was lit, the Minutemen decided to fight (pp. 158- 61).

Galvin (1996) reported that while the British soldiers were putting fire in the supplies, the Minutemen held another war conference in which Joseph Homser, Lt. of Concord Minutemen, mobilized his militiamen to act (p. 150).

2.2.2. The Concord North Bridge Fight:

Before the fight began in Concord, Tourtellot (2000) cited that Col. James Barrett ordered his men to form a line to face the North Bridge. Maj.- Gen. John Buttrick led the column. In addition, James Barrett ordered his men not to fire until the British soldiers fired first (p. 161). Commanded by Capt. Isaac Davies, Acton Minutemen, led the way (Nolan, 1963, p. 118).

Capt. Laurie was undetermined. Being outnumbered, he decided to withdraw to the other side to defend the bridge. As he began his retreat, he planned to be in the right position to stop the Minutemen's advance (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 164).

Lt. Sutherland stated that the militiamen started to march in divisions in appropriate military way. Additionally, they moved in a regular manner. This proved that the British soldiers faced a well- organized Minutemen (Tourtellot, 2000, p. 180).

Nolan (1963) explained that Laurie tried to be in a defensive position. However, he was unable to use street- fighting technique because the troops had not been trained for, and the Concord area did not provide him with this possibility (p. 121).

When the Minutemen were advancing, shots were fired out. Capt. Laurie, who gave no order to fire, said 'I imagine myself that a man of my company... did first fire his piece' (Galvin, 1996, p. 151). Although Lt. Sutherland believed that it was the Minutemen who began the shooting first, it was probably that three, or four shots were fired from the British ranks, but fell into the river. These shots were followed by a volley fired towards the Minutemen, who were now close to the bridge (Galvin, 1996, p. 152).

Hallahan (2001) believed that the British soldiers marched back to Concord center and sat in a tavern where they ate, drunk, and helped the wounded. Although Lt- Col. Francis Smith reorganized his troops, he was unable to take the bridge because the Minutemen were increasing, and to run the fight. He found it difficult to resume fighting, and decided to start his retreat to Boston (p. 39).

In the Concord North Bridge Fight, Thompson (2004) reported that the British soldiers fought the Minutemen in their way back from Concord to Lexington. At Meriam's Corner, the British fought the Billerica and the Reading Militia. Fighting caused the British two dead and several wounded. At Hardy's Hill, the British fought the Framingham and Sudbury Minutemen. The British counted more than twenty casualties. Following their retreat, the British soldiers were caught by surprise by Maj. Baldwin and his Woburn militia at the Bloody Angle. They killed eight British officers (p. 20).

According to Tourtellot (2000), it was 02H00 a. m. when the British resumed their march back to Boston. Lt- Col. Francis Smith now reached Lexington, where he would encounter Capt. John Parker's Minutemen. In revenge, the Minutemen fought without discipline. As stated by one of the participants, each soldier, in his own position, placed himself to take advantage to attack from behind rocks, trees, fences, and buildings so as to annoy the British soldiers who were marching back. Unfortunately, the British soldiers were not in a forceful position. They were unable to return fire because they were run out of ammunition. Furthermore, they were tired, confused, and exhausted. They preferred to run away instead of facing the militia and fighting them (pp. 180- 1).

Despite their difficulties, the British troops were favored by the reinforcements sent by Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage to provide the Regulars' retreat to Boston safely. As he led the Grenadiers' companies, Earl Percy stated that that he successfully saved the British soldiers from a fatal destruction (Hallahan, 2001, p. 47).

According to Lt. Barker, the Concord military expedition was ill-planned and badly organized. Staying for three hours in Cambridge waiting for provisions and the interruption at Lexington because of the fact that the Minutemen had got intelligence and time to assemble, which delayed their arrival to Concord. Furthermore, the Grenadiers and the Light Infantry should have reached Concord before sunrise so that they would be able to destroy the stores of weapons and ammunition and provisions, and go back to Boston easily without being harassed. All in all, the military expedition to Concord was ill prepared and badly executed (Tourtellot, 2000, pp. 215-6)

In his report to the British Government, Galvin (1996) noted that Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage emphasized on the British intention not to cause troubles with the people, and stated that the militia fired the first shots to provoke fighting in both Lexington and Concord. He blamed the Minutemen for the failure of the military expedition; for they were ambushed and taken them by surprise. This; of course, the cause of their failure in the military expedition to Concord. As far as the British losses are concerned, he downplayed the number of casualties and reported that more than fifty were killed in the battles, and many were left wounded. Furthermore, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage emphasized that Lt- Col. Francis Smith had; firmly, executed his orders when he destroyed the military stores in Concord (p. 239).

In the battles of Lexington and Concord, the Americans not only succeeded to cause the British Redcoats to retreat from Lexington and Concord to Boston, but they would also obtain some other important achievements. Following the day of Lexington and Concord, American delegates to the Continental Congress decided to create the Continental Army to fight the British Army in the American Revolutionary War. Furthermore, fighting in the American Revolutionary War encouraged the Americans to declare their independence from Great Britain.

2.3. The Achievements of the Battles of Lexington Common Green and Concord North

Bridge Fight:

The news about the day of Lexington and Concord began immediately to spread, through newspapers, in Boston, Massachusetts' towns, and all over the colonies. The news about the battles of Lexington and Concord were reported in the Boston Gazette and the Massachusetts Spy in which Thomas Isaiah, the publisher, wrote and published his own version about what had happened; for he wanted his readers to understand that time had come to a new understanding and dealing with Great Britain (Fischer, 1902, p. 309). i. e. He wanted to inform the Americans that only the language of force should be used with Great Britain. For this reason, the Americans had to carry on their war until independence would be achieved.

Since the American Revolutionary War had already started, the Americans had to meet the war well- prepared. They needed to fight the British at the political and military levels, and two institutions were needed for this purpose. They were in need for a government. This role was successfully filled by the Continental Congress which became the Americans' spokesman, and acted on their behalf.

To seek foreign help, the Continental Congress negotiated with foreign countries for the sake of gaining help and support in the American Revolutionary War. Furthermore, the Americans had to create their own army and start enlistments in the American Revolutionary War. So, for this reason, the Americans would create two important institutions to direct the war; namely, the Continental Army and the Continental Congress.

2.3.1. The Creation of the Continental Army:

Although the battles of Lexington and Concord surprised every citizen; whether in Great Britain and the American colonies, they favored the Americans who set to work for planning

and organizing their war. After the battle of the Concord North Bridge Fight had ended, Dr. Joseph Warren wrote his own report in which he detailed what happened exactly in Lexington and Concord. He insisted on the need of forming an army to defend America. He addressed to the Continental Congress with the following letter:

Gentlemen,— The barbarous murders committed on our innocent brethren, on Wednesday, the 19th instant, have made it absolutely necessary that we immediately raise an army to defend our wives and our children from the butchering hands of an inhuman soldiery... . We beg you and entreat, as you will answer to God himself, that you will hasten and encourage by all possible means the enlistment of men to form the army, and send them to headquarters, at Cambridge, with that expedition which the vast importance and instant urgency of the affair demand. (Andrews, 2002, p. 53)

According to Galvin (1996), the above- mentioned letter intended to convince colonial populations that they should use force. Furthermore, what happened in Massachusetts today might take place in another colony. So, they had to get ready for unexpected situations (pp. 239-40).

Tourtellot (2000) reported that the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress created an army of 14,600 men for the sake of forming the largest core of New England's future army. The command of that army was left to Artemus Ward who; later, set up his headquarters at Cambridge and positioned his forces at Charlestown Neck, Roxbury, and Dorchester Heights. Militia companies which began to flow to Boston just after April 19, 1775 surrounded the Boston Peninsula and Gage's troops. They cut all possible land transportation, and kept surveilling the British. It was the Siege of Boston (p. 247).

To create an army was not the responsibility of Massachusetts; however, it was the Continental Congress' responsibility, which would adjourn in Philadelphia, later. This; in fact, would offer the Massachusetts' delegation a greater opportunity to make from the cause of Massachusetts the cause of the American thirteen colonies. It was a step, since the American Revolutionary War had begun, to get the colonies closely united in order to fight the British. Additionally, they intended to stop any conciliation, or negotiations with Great Britain, and to prepare for the American Revolutionary War by creating the Continental Army (Elson, 1904, p. 243).

Wright (1983) reported that colonial delegates when they met in the Continental Congress, they set into motion the need to get an army, since the War of Independence had already started. So, all the events which took place in Massachusetts, and Boston; in particular, from 1763 until the revolutionary outbreak had united the colonies both politically and militarily. Here, the Continental Congress worked hard to get the rest of the colonies tightly united (p. 19).

According to Tourtellot (2000), the Second Continental Congress adjourned in Philadelphia on May 10, 1775. All the colonies were represented, except Georgia. The Congress was presided over by John Hancock. Massachusetts was represented by Thomas Cushing, Robert Treat Paine, Samuel Adams, John Adams, and John Hancock (pp. 260- 1).

The core issue which assembled the colonial delegates was the creation of a Continental Army. Thus, on June 7, 1775, the Second Continental Congress approved Massachusetts' resolution and created the Continental Army and made Gen. George Washington its Commander- in- Chief. In addition, Congress appointed four Major- Generals to serve under Gen. George Washington. These were Artemus Ward, Charles Lee, Philip Schuyler, and Israel Putnam (Ketchum, 1999, p. 66).

It is worth mentioning that upon the creation of the Continental Army, Massachusetts' residents signed up in groups. Nearly forty- five per cent of the enlistees in the first year of the

American Revolutionary War were from Massachusetts- 16,449 out of 37,363 soldiers, including Native Americans and Black soldiers. According to O'Donnell (2021), many regiments and militias had been formed years ago in the Province of Massachusetts, amongst which the Marblehead Regiment was the best unit of the Continental Army, which had been assembled earlier in the mid-1760s before the American Revolutionary War broke out. This regiment fought at the war's first battles, in Lexington and Concord, as well as other key conflicts around Boston; such as, the Battle of Bunker Hill (1775), and that crossing of the Delaware (as cited in Phelan, 2021, para. 23- 4).

Though much of the fighting in the American Revolutionary War took place further down the eastern coast, Massachusetts played key roles throughout the American Revolutionary War. Two of Commander-in-Chief Washington's major-generals were from Massachusetts; namely, Artemas Ward and Israel Putnam. Henry Knox, who was the first Secretary of War during George Washington's Presidency, was eventually from Massachusetts. As a strategist, he played a key role throughout the American Revolutionary War (Phelan, 2021, para. 25).

When the American Revolutionary War commenced, the Americans succeeded to achieve two main objectives; namely, the formation of the Continental Congress, which acted as the government of the American colonies, and the creation of the Continental Army, which assumed the military role of fighting of the British Army. Moreover, the first battles of the American Revolutionary War made the colonists think about independence. There was a strong relationship between the military outbreak in Lexington and Concord and the rise of independence throughout the American colonies. Following the battles of Lexington and Concord of April 19, 1775, mass voices in the colonies rose, and were urging colonial delegates to issue a declaration of independence (Brogan, 1990, p. 187).

2.3.2. The Rise of the Independent Spirit and the Drafting the Declaration of Independence:

After creating the Continental Army, the Continental Congress; now, faced now the task to declare to the world why they had taken up arms to fight the British. It is worth to mention that correspondence between Philadelphia, the host town of the Continental Congress, and the Province of Massachusetts, the birthplace of the American Revolution and the Provincial Congress, was carried on. Now, the Continental Congress received another letter from Dr. Joseph Warren in which he insisted on the following strategy:

The necessity of establishing a civil government here ... such a government as shall be sufficient to control the military forces not only of this colony, but also as shall be sent to us from the other colonies. The continent must strengthen and support with all its weight the civil authority here; otherwise, our soldiers will lose the ideas of right and wrong, and will plunder, instead of protecting, the inhabitants. (Ford, 1905, pp. 177- 8)

In his letter, Dr. Joseph Warren was inspired by Locke's Social Contract Theory. He advocated to delegates in the Continental Congress the need to establish a government which, he believed, should be completely different from the British one. According to him, the government's role should be; primarily, to protect the citizens' natural rights and control the military forces of the Americans. Implicitly, Dr. Joseph Warren asked delegates to the Continental Congress to seek complete separation from Great Britain, declare independence, and form a new government different from Great Britain to serve the citizens. Truly, Dr. Joseph Warren advocated a government by the people, and for the people.

According to Tourtelot (2000), this letter was added to colonial voices which urged complete separation from Great Britain, and to establish another form of government which could provide every citizen with greater freedom and liberty to do what he pleased in accordance with preventing from harming others, or destroying their properties (p. 258). Moreover, Warren's letter which favored independence gave the Massachusetts' delegation, led by John Adams, in the Second Continental Congress another opportunity to convince colonial representatives to work for issuing a declaration of independence. Meanwhile, these delegates provided the following resolution:

That the proceedings of the American Continental Congress, held at Philadelphia ... reported by the honourable delegates from this colony, have ... considered by us; and the American bill of rights, therein contained, appears to be formed on the immutable laws of nature and reason, the principles of the English constitution, respective charters and constitutions of the colonies and to be worthy of their most vigorous support, as essentially necessary to liberty; ... which ... at present threatens destruction to America, appear to be clearly pointed out, and judicious plans adopted for defeating them. (Ford, 1905, p. 182)

This resolution proved that the Massachusetts' delegates had already determined not to seek any reconciliation with Great Britain, and decided to fight for their liberties and properties. Although they were totally in favor of independence, the Continental Congress sought reconciliation, at first, on the motion of some conservative representatives; such as, John Dickinson of Pennsylvania and Joseph Galloway of Philadelphia (Elson, 1904, p. 244).

On June 5, 1775, the Continental Congress issued the Olive Branch Petition, which was drafted by John Dickinson. It was an appeal directed personally to King George III in which

colonial delegates protested against the British policies and measures carried on in the American colonies. Moreover, King George III was asked to repeal the Coercive Acts, halt the war, and bring about reconciliation. Again, colonial delegates declared their loyalty to King George III, and emphasized on the strong relationships between the American colonies and the mother- country (Ford, 1905, p. 182).

Although the Olive Branch Petition was approved by most of the colonial representatives, it did not south the Massachusetts' delegates. They believed that the Continental Congress, which acted on behalf of the Americans, should take such further measures in order to recover and re-establish; totally, the American rights and liberties. This belief was emphasized by John Adams who said '... I and a number of us will break off from you in New England, and we will carry on the opposition ourselves in our own way' (Freidel and Drewry, 1970, p. 72). These members did not approve of reconciliation; for they had already knew that it would not work with the so-called tyranny and injustice of King George III and his Parliament who decided to use a particular legislation for the colonies so as to tighten colonial control, and take their liberties away from them (King et al., 1986, p. 95).

On that basis; again, the Continental Congress issued the Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking up Arms on July 6, 1775. Since Massachusetts' delegates did not agree with the Continental Congress about the Olive Branch Petition, John Adams threatened delegates of the Congress to withdraw from the Continental Congress and carry on the revolution by their own people and their own means. If this happened, the Continental Congress' efforts would go with the wind because it tried to unite the thirteen colonies, and make from Massachusetts the cause of the American thirteen colonies. So, along with New England's withdrawal, the Continental Congress would achieve nothing (Bailyn, 1968, p. 271).

Mainly stated, this declaration informed about the reasons which led the colonists to take up arms and fight in the American Revolutionary War. Colonial representatives held out the hope

of reconciliation with Great Britain, but; at the same time, approved their engagement in the war to protect their inherited rights. Additionally, colonial delegates insisted that the Americans would die free rather than to live as slaves. They also promised to lay down arms only when their liberties were secured. They indicated that they would obtain foreign aid against Great Britain (Fischer, 1902, p. 317).

The Olive Branch Petition and the Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking up Arms were carried to Great Britain by Richard Penn, and were presented to King George III as an ultimate chance to avoid the war. However, King George III, on October 26, 1775, stood up in front of his Parliament and declared the American colonies to be in a state of rebellion. They were no longer under his protection. Furthermore, he decided that he would suppress rebellion in the American colonies, even if meant to wage a war. King George III emphasized on the belief that the American colonies should be ruled by the Metropolis under whatever circumstances, since they made it part of the British Empire. As British subjects, they should accept the British Government's measures and decisions since they were for the public interest of the British Empire (Ford, 1905, pp. 185- 6).

On October 27, 1775, King George III made his speech in the British Parliament, in which he declared:

It is now become the part of wisdom, ... , to put a speedy end to these disorders For this purpose, I ... increased my naval establishment, and greatly augmented my land forces; but in such a manner as may be the least burthensome to my kingdoms. ('His Majesty's most gracious speech to both houses of Parliament', 1775, p. 2)

Moreover, King George III decided to hire foreign soldiers to supply the army with the needed troops. This statement was best expressed in his speech to Parliament when he said: 'I

have also the satisfaction to inform you, that I have received the most- friendly offers of foreign assistance; and if I shall make any treaties in consequence thereof, they shall be laid before you ('His Majesty's most gracious speech to both houses of Parliament', 1775, p. 2). These soldiers were Hessians, better- equipped soldiers from the State of Hesse- Cassel in Germany. By doing so, King George III was determined to go on fighting to slow down rebellion. On the other hand, the Continental Congress lost all its efforts of reconciliation with the mother- country (Ford, 1905, p. 700).

It is worth to mention that when the colonists started fighting, the idea of independence had been rising, too. It was no longer being expected that the use of arms would secure people's rights without asking for complete separation and independence from Great Britain (Kee, 1965, p. 48).

As the American Revolutionary War continued, hopes of reconciliation with Great Britain faded away, and most of the colonists suggested that independence would be a good chance for the Americans. Within this context, George Washington, Commander- in- Chief of the Continental Army, believed that if the Americans wanted to win their struggle over Great Britain, they would have to be independent. For, independence would identify the Americans with a new identity: A new people and a country which would be characterized with a particular culture and ideology. Moreover, this people would fight until independence was achieved, and; then, would establish a new form of government which best suits their political thinking and ideology. In the case of the American Revolutionary War, the Americans sought independence because they decided not to live under a corrupt monarchy of Great Britain, which was ruled by a corrupt monarch of George III, and his government, who did nothing to unite the Americans with their mother- country. Therefore, independence had already been the dream of Samuel Adams, John Adams, John Hancock, and other patriots (Bliven, 1958, pp. 51- 3).

The idea of independence was crystallized on January 10, 1776 when Thomas Paine, an American essayist, published his pamphlet *Common Sense*. In his pamphlet, Thomas Paine stated why independence might be good for the Americans rather than to be attached to a corrupted monarchy of Great Britain. Additionally, he argued that what happened recently in Lexington and Concord and the hostilities there had brought a new way of thinking to deal with American relationships with Great Britain. Thomas Paine proposed that the colonies should seek for independence rather than reconciliation with Great Britain. Furthermore, he believed that ‘... the injuries and disadvantages which we sustain by that connection ... because, any submission to, or dependence on Great Britain, tends directly to involve this Continent in European and wars quarrels’ (Dickinson, 1975, pp. 78- 80).

So; according to Thomas Paine, if the Americans lived under the British Crown, this would result in more hostilities and serious consequences. Thus, the best way was to seek independence, and make a new form of government where no monarch could rule over these citizens to destroy their rights and liberties. This belief was stated as follows ‘But the most powerful of all arguments is, that nothing but independence. i. e. a Continental form of government, can keep the peace and preserve it inviolate from civil wars’ (Lemay, 1993, p. 696).

According to Brogan (1990), as Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* was published and more than 100.000 copies were sold, it widely circulated in America. Accordingly, the revolutionary spirit swept in America and paved the way for John Adams and Samuel Adams to favor independence. Meanwhile, people in Massachusetts and Virginia; in particular, urged colonial delegates to work for issuing a declaration of independence (p. 178).

Dickinson (1975) reported that following the publication of *Common Sense* in America, the Continental Congress set to work. It took some important steps toward independence. In April, 1776, it announced that colonial ports were open to ships of all nations, except the ones of Great

Britain. Acting so, the Continental Congress defied the Coercive Acts which blockaded the Boston port since the summer of 1774. Moreover, in May, 1776, the Continental Congress took another revolutionary step: it recommended that colonies to form new governments; for the previous governments had collapsed, and most of the governors had fled when the American Revolutionary War began (p. 80).

To issue a declaration in favor of independence, another important step was taken by the Virginia House of Burgesses. The latter instructed its delegates to the Continental Congress to ask for a common declaration of independence. It seemed that circumstances at those remote times were in favor of the Americans, in their struggle, to declare their independence from Great Britain. The spirit of independence moved from one colony to another, and was favored by the writings of Thomas Paine, the recommendations of the Continental Congress, and the urges of some colonial assemblies. Accordingly, when the Second Continental Congress met in Philadelphia in the summer of 1776, the three issues of independence, confederation, and foreign alliance were the core talks of the sessions. As a primary issue, the notion of independence was made on June 7, 1776 by Richard Henry Lee and John Adams who had presented the following resolutions:

That these united colonies are, and of right to be, free and independent states, that they are absolved from all alliance to the British Crown, and that political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is, and ought to be, dissolved. (Bliven, 1958, p. 59)

As seen above, the Adams- Lee Resolutions; clearly, assumed (1) the total unity and independence of the American colonies, (2) these colonies should not swear allegiance to the monarchy of Great Britain, and (3) no political bonds connecting them together.

After three weeks of debate, the Continental Congress; finally, adopted the Lee- Adams Resolutions, and appointed a committee of five members to draw up the formal Declaration of Independence. It was presented to the Continental Congress on July 2 for vote, and was adopted on July 4. The task of writing the document fell into the hands of Thomas Jefferson (Latham, 1965, p. 2).

Conclusion:

The Massachusetts' colonists were successful in directing their political resistance which turned into armed confrontation against the British Regulars, in the colony, and who were determined to slow down colonial rebellion so as to tighten total colonial control over the rest of the colonies. In their efforts to fully prepare for war, the Massachusetts' colonists formed their local militia of the Minutemen to fight at any minute's notice. They had already collected arms and ammunition to fight the British troops in the colony. The first shots in Lexington and Concord confirmed the beginning of the American Revolutionary War between the British Army and the Massachusetts' militia.

The battles which were fought in Lexington Common Green and Concord North Bridge Fight convinced the colonists in the rest of the colonies to join Massachusetts because it symbolized the cause of all the colonies. Moreover, after the revolutionary outbreak, the colonists were convinced that to win the fight; they needed an official army and independence from the British Crown.

CHAPTER THREE

Analyzing the Historical Documents of the Suffolk

Resolves and the Declaration of Independence

Chapter Three: Analyzing the Historical Documents of the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence

Introduction	78
3.3.The Suffolk Resolves	79
3.3.1. Type of the Document	79
3.3.2. Author of the Suffolk Resolves	80
3.3.3. The Context of Creating the Suffolk Resolves	85
3.3.4. The Intended Audience of the Suffolk Resolves	87
3.3.5. The Purpose for Creating the Suffolk Resolves	88
3.3.6. Analysis of the Contents of the Suffolk Resolves	89
3.3.6.1.Statement of Purpose	90
3.3.6.2.Preamble	91
3.3.6.3.The Nineteen Grievances of the Suffolk Resolves	92
3.3.7. The Significance of the Suffolk Resolves	94
3.4.The Declaration of Independence	95
3.4.1. Type of the Document	96
3.4.2. Author of the Declaration of Independence	97
3.4.3. The Context of Creating the Declaration of Independence	102
3.4.4. The Intended Audience of the Declaration of Independence	106
3.4.5. The Purpose for Creating the Declaration of Independence	109
3.4.6. Analysis of the Contents of the Declaration of Independence	109
3.4.6.1.Preamble	110
3.4.6.2.Declaration of Natural Rights	111
3.4.6.3.List of Grievances	112
3.4.6.4.Resolution of Independence	114

3.4.7. The Significance of the Declaration of Independence	115
Conclusion	119

Introduction:

Throughout the events of the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts, it is notwithstanding to ignore the several tactics and strategies used by the colonists of Massachusetts in their political resistance and opposition against the British Parliamentary Acts. As the conflict escalated, the colonists defied the British acts, and political and ideological disagreements grew. In return, the British Government responded by enacting several punitive acts which paved the way to the rise of military struggle. It is worth mentioning that the American colonists in the Province of Massachusetts, or in other colonies, relied on drafting of several important documents- whether legal or political, which are regarded as official historical documents, as a means of providing legal and political grounds for justification of their resistance.

The present chapter attempts to analyze the official historical documents; namely, the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence. The analysis of the aforementioned documents takes into consideration the context of drafting both documents, their purpose, their significance, and how did they contribute to the stages of both the American Revolution and the American Revolutionary War in Massachusetts, both politically and militarily.

3.1. The Suffolk Resolves:

Although glimmers of revolutionary ideas existed in the American colonies before the revolutionary outbreak in Lexington and Concord, the Suffolk Resolves, which were written in September 9, 1774, crystallized these radical ideas into a consistent response to the British policies which affected colonial relationships with the American colonies. The Suffolk Resolves announced that the Americans, in spite of their loyalty to King George III, were determined to raise militia in order to protect their rights from the British Parliamentary Acts, which harmed the American interests.

It is worth to mention that the Stamp Act, the Boston Massacre, the Boston Tea Party, and the revolutionary outbreak in Lexington and Concord had been familiar components in the emergence of the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts. However, the Suffolk Resolves, constituted a traditional catalyst in the revolutionary movement. As they carried elements of resistance to British Parliamentary Acts, the Suffolk Resolves proved that resistance in the American colonies was rooted more deeply, as demonstrated by the fact that the rest of the colonies stood, with their support, behind the city of Boston in time of the Coercive Acts. The American colonists threatened to take up arms against Great Britain if colonial demands were not met. Moreover, they announced that fighting for protecting their rights and liberties not to be taken out of them would be regarded as a necessary obligation, and a must.

3.1.1. Type of the document:

Being considered as an important historical document and a forerunner of the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts, the Suffolk Resolves constitute a declaration of grievances against the recently enacted Intolerable Acts.

The Suffolk Resolves were written and published by Dr. Joseph Warren, President of the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress. They contain two thousand, one hundred and seventy- six words. The Suffolk Resolves are structured as follows:

- ✚ **Statement of purpose:** 'At a meeting of the delegates of every town and district in the county of Suffolk, ... , viz';
- ✚ **Preamble:** 'Whereas the power but not the justice, ... of eternity';
- ✚ **List of the resolves (Detailed acts):** 'Therefore we have resolved and do resolve.'

Essentially, the Suffolk Resolves were constitutional enforcement. They declared the fact that the British Parliament passed the Intolerable Acts, which were considered as violations of the natural rights and the British Constitution, an illegitimate assault on their colonial government's foundational document- the Massachusetts' Charter.

Furthermore, although they declared their loyalty to the British Monarch George III and stated their proudness of being British in the Suffolk Resolves, the citizens of Massachusetts announced how they would resist, in case their rights were violated and their local governments were subverted. They made it clear that they would not submit to be ruled by a Parliament, or a King that violated the natural rights, the British Constitution, or the basic colonial charter which guaranteed their rights and privileges. Moreover, the Suffolk Resolves provided the Massachusetts' colonists with a clear ideological justification for resistance, and laid out a plan of action to be adopted; later, by the Continental Congress.

3.1.2. Author of the Suffolk Resolves:

The American Revolution was not only famous of the events and battles and the revolutionary war which broke out of the several quarrels between the American colonies and

Great Britain. However, the American Revolution; also, gave birth to a list of heroes who fought the British and devoted their lives for the common cause: Saving America from a corrupted Monarchy of Great Britain.

Although Dr. Joseph Warren is barely mentioned in the history of the American Revolution, he is a true, Patriot Leader. Being a political writer and a famous speaker, Dr. Joseph Warren was famous for his speeches. His political career helped the American Revolution succeed; though he did not fight important battles during the American Revolutionary War.

An eldest son to Joseph and Marry Warren, Joseph Warren was born on June 11, 1741 in Roxbury, Massachusetts. Joseph's parents were farmers who developed a kind of apple, commonly known as 'Warren Pusset', one of the old varieties of apple in the US which dated back to 1649 (Di Spigna, 2018, p. 23).

Since Warren's parents determined to provide a better education to the future revolutionary man, Joseph attended the Roxbury Latin School in 1751 when he was ten years old; where he received a high level of scholastic instruction in Humanities and Religion. In mid- August 1755, Joseph Warren began to pursue his studies at Harvard College at the age of fourteen to earn his degree of Master of Arts. While studying at Harvard College, Joseph Warren was known as a man of 'superior talents, gentle manners, and a frank, independent, and fearless character' (Holland, Sabourin, Gandhi, Carmel, and Prestigiacomo, 2015, p. 2). These qualities were deeply rooted in the future young Patriot when his father told him 'I would rather a son of mine dead than a coward.' These words incited him into action to become a Patriot Hero and a leading revolutionary man when the American Revolution started (Di Spigna, 2018, p. 37).

After graduating from Harvard College, Joseph Warren did not start his medical career. He had the opportunity to pursue a career as a physician, and became an apprentice under a physician; namely, Dr. James Lloyd, an excellent, celebrated physician in London and Boston (Holland, Sabourin, Gandhi, Carmel, & Prestigiacomo, 2015, p. 2). After completing his

apprenticeship, Joseph Warren became a noticeable Doctor. During these times, an epidemic spread in Boston and Roxbury; many people became ill of smallpox. Living in the hospital for several months enabled Dr. Joseph Warren to work hard caring for smallpox patients. Finally, he was able to treat hundreds of patients. As a result of his efforts, Dr. Joseph Warren became very competent in medicine, surgery, and obstetrics. When he moved to Boston in 1769, Dr. Joseph Warren became a very successful doctor. Among the people whom Dr. Joseph Warren treated were William Dawes, who would; later, work under his command in the Boston Committee of Observers. Warren's other patients included John and Abigail Adams, John Hancock, and Governor Thomas Hutchinson (Griffin, 2018, pp. 4- 5).

Being a successful Doctor in Boston paved the way for Dr. Joseph Warren to start his political career because of his strong feelings about the several circumstances which the American colonies underwent. As colonial relationships escalated between Great Britain and the American colonies, Dr. Joseph Warren firmly believed in the independence of America. He wrote in the Boston Gazette that the American colonies must and will be free. In his letter to Samuel Adams on June 15, 1774, Dr. *Joseph Warren* admitted that the main cause for the Americans that they should fight for is liberty. Accordingly, the Americans should fight for their independence, or die if it were not obtained. He; strongly, advocated that. Furthermore, Dr. Joseph Warren was an enthusiast for liberty; he wanted the American colonies to have a government based on the will and power of the people. Dr. Joseph Warren believed that government should have adequate authority to protect the rights of citizens and their property (Holland, Sabourin, Gandhi, Carmel, & Prestigiacomo, 2015, p. 2).

When he was 26 years old, Dr. *Joseph Warren* became an important Patriot Leader. In his articles and letters, he described the British officials in America as foes to the Americans. In his attempts to convince his fellow readers, he argued that they should work to end Taxation

Without Representation. Dr. Joseph Warren worked with many political groups, and gained the respect of legendary leaders like Samuel Adams and Paul Revere (Griffin, 2018, p. 7).

Dr. Joseph Warren's engagement in political career enlisted him as a political activist during the troubled years between Great Britain and the American colonies. Having a radical mindset, Dr. Joseph Warren attempted to muster a spirit of American pride, bravery, and unity, while he rose opposition to the dangerous new encroachments upon the colonists' freedom. After the Boston Massacre, Dr. Joseph Warren was appointed to a committee, together with James Bowdoin and Samuel Pemberton, to prepare a narrative of the events. The committee produced *A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston*, a propaganda pamphlet which was meant to blame the British for the bloodshed in the Boston Massacre, exonerate Boston's inhabitants, and turn the victims into martyrs (Di Spigna, 2018, p. 104).

Being aware of the fact that Dr. Joseph Warren was an important patriot leader, the British worried that he might incite the colonists to become violent and oppose the British. In fact, the Boston Massacre made people think about the possibility of a revolution (Di Spigna, 2018, p. 103). Moreover, in his speech in a town meeting in Boston, celebrating the anniversary of the Boston Massacre, Dr. Joseph Warren listed the abuses that the Americans had suffered under the British Parliamentary Acts for taxing America, and raising a standing army at a time of peace. With a rising voice, he declared that the bloody Boston Massacre, which occurred on March 5, 1770, can never be forgotten. According to him, allegiance to Great Britain had to be maintained while, at the same time, insisting that a relationship between the colonies and the mother country was becoming impossible. His ultimate goal in his speech was to declare the ideology of the radicals that he represented overtly (Di Spigna, 2018, p. 107).

As a member of the Committee of Correspondence in Boston, Dr. Joseph Warren wrote letters to other towns in which he warned people of the colonial rights, in a pamphlet titled *The Votes and Proceedings of the Town of Boston*. Together with Paul Revere, he helped organize

Boston's craftsmen and workers into a political group; namely, the Loyal Nine (Di Spigna, 2018, p. 115).

When the British Parliament passed the Coercive Acts, just after the Boston Tea Party, Dr. *Joseph Warren*, as a member of the Boston Committee of Correspondence, worked hard to fight the British unjust laws, and to raise the anti-British feelings in Massachusetts. In 1775, Dr. *Joseph Warren* was both the chairman of the Committee of Safety and president of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress. He wrote and drafted the Suffolk Resolves, which were clear protests of the recently enacted Intolerable Acts. More importantly, Dr. *Joseph Warren* is mostly accredited, in the history of the American Revolution, of planning the famous Midnight Ride, in which he decided to send Patriot riders Paul Revere and William Dawes to Lexington and Concord to alert the Minutemen of the British military expedition. He gave Paul Revere a letter which informed the town leaders that Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage would likely reach Concord the following day. The letter; also, informed that the British expedition intended to arrest revolutionary leaders; namely, Samuel Adams and John Hancock. Actually, Warren's letter gave the colonists time to move military supplies out of Concord and into the surrounding communities (Holland, Sabourin, Gandhi, Carmel, & Prestigiacomo, 2015, pp. 2- 3).

As for his military career, Dr. *Joseph Warren* started exercising regularly after the revolutionary outbreak in Lexington and Concord on April 19, 1775. Soon, he earned the respect and admiration of his fellow soldiers and officers. Being the most active man in the field, officers and soldiers were delighted Dr. Warren's cool and collected bravery. He was; therefore, considered as a leader whose gallantry they were to admire, and in whose talents, they were to confide. Moreover, his successful medical practice helped him to become Surgeon General of the Army. He was offered the rank of Major General. Dr. *Joseph Warren* died while fighting in the Battle of Bunker Hill was fought on the Charlestown peninsula in Boston, Massachusetts, on June 17, 1775 (Holland, Sabourin, Gandhi, Carmel, & Prestigiacomo, 2015,

p. 3). In the fight, the Americans were run out of ammunition; they could not win against British bayonets. When they started their retreat, Warren was one of the last soldiers to leave. As he made his way down the back of the hill, Warren was shot and killed (Griffin, 2018, p. 19).

3.1.3. The Context of Creating the Suffolk Resolves:

Shortly after the Boston Tea Party, political turmoil reached its peak when the British Government reacted severely to the Boston Tea Party and passed the Intolerable Acts as a measure to restore the British control over their American colonies. In time of this crisis, Knox (2015) believed that there emerged two men in Boston whose relationships would pave the way for them to reorganize political resistance and protests; namely, Dr. Joseph Warren and Samuel Adams. The two men launched an unofficial communication network with leaders across the colonies, which helped publicize their political positions as well as gathered mass support for their cause in anticipation of Britain's response to the increasing colonial resistance (p. 17).

According to McFarland (1998), as tensions escalated in the Province of Massachusetts, the British Government replaced Thomas Hutchinson, Royal Governor of Massachusetts, with Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage who arrived in May 1774 with the Boston Port Bill, which effectively closed the Boston port on June 1, 1774. It is worth to mention that the Port Bill included the British demand that the East India Company be repaid for damages (p. 33).

With the port being closed, economic activities were restricted, and the city of Boston faced starvation. The task of remedying the economic fallout fell to the Committees of Correspondence. Dr. Joseph Warren took the responsibility of leading and framing the colonial response. When he met with the Boston Committee of Correspondence on May 12, 1774, he succeeded to pen a letter which declared that the Port Act violated the rights of Bostonians, and argued that it was against the international law. During this meeting; too, Dr. Joseph Warren

wrote a second letter to inform the rest of the colonies of the events which took place in Boston, and to request immediate help from the colonies. Paul Revere was the chosen member to deliver this news (Cary, 1961, p. 137). At the same time, the British Government significantly increased the number of British troops in Boston to help establish Gage's authority and comfort pro-British colonists (Breen, 2010, p. 73).

Throughout the colonies, Committees of Correspondence called for an intercolonial Congress to discuss the current circumstances which occurred in the Province of Massachusetts, and plan acts of resistance. Only an intercolonial Congress would make colonial leaders seek to (1) justify their resistance, and (2) define their status within the broader British Empire. In Boston, Dr. Joseph Warren, and other members, worked hard to solidify the economic alliances that came from the other colonies. Warren adopted the Solemn League and Covenant, which required all colonial merchants to boycott British goods until Parliament repealed the Port Bill (McFarland, 1998, p. 86).

Although the Solemn League and Covenant failed because the colonies were not yet prepared to support such an aggressive form of resistance to British economic constraints, the principles expressed in the Solemn League and Covenant; however, became important components of the future framework of American resistance. Moreover, it led to the foundation of the Continental Association, proposed by Dr. Joseph Warren in June 1774 and adopted; later, by the Continental Congress (Cary, 1961, p. 140). The pressures and calls for an intercolonial congress obliged all colonies, except Georgia, to appoint delegates to meet in the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia, which would adjourn on September 1, 1774, as the start date (Merrill, 1968, p. 467).

During the turmoil in Boston, Dr. *Joseph Warren*, and members of the Committee of Correspondence, worked hard to issue responses to the Intolerable Acts. Warren's growing influence grew from his role in directing resistance in the city of Boston, as well as support he

received from better known figures like the Adams' cousins; namely, John and Samuel, who represented the Province of Massachusetts in the Continental Congress. On the other hand, Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage, Royal Governor of Massachusetts, became afraid of the growing influence of radical elements; Dr. Joseph Warren; in particular. Governor Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage relied on the Massachusetts Government Act and prohibited unauthorized town, district, or precinct meetings (Forman, 2012, p. 201). However, in spite of the ban placed by Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage, Dr. Joseph Warren and other Massachusetts' leaders circumvented this ban by calling county conventions throughout the colony. In response, seven counties held conventions throughout the period between August and September (Merrill, 1968, p. 533).

The first county meetings took place in Berkshire County on July 6, 1774, and the last convention took place in Bristol County on September 28- 29, 1774. Every county worked to develop an official response to the latest acts of Parliament. Although each convention adopted separate resolutions, many similarities existed between the independent conventions' final results; particularly with regard to trade restrictions, opposition to standing armies, and concerns about the judicial system. Finally, Suffolk County towns' delegates met on September 9, 1774 in Milton, Massachusetts. They passed the Suffolk Resolves. Written and drafted by Dr. Joseph Warren, the Suffolk Resolves formed a coherent public relations' campaign and plan for resisting the British (Lincoln, 1838, pp. 604- 626).

3.1.4. The Intended Audience of the Suffolk Resolves:

After they had been drafted, the Suffolk Resolves were sent across all the towns and counties of Massachusetts to inform the citizens of the resolves made by the Suffolk Convention. The list of grievances mirrored the sentiments and feelings expressed by the citizens who suffered from the Intolerable Acts. In addition, the Suffolk Resolves were sent to the rest of the colonies

to inform the citizens there about the measures taken by the delegates of the Suffolk Convention, and to seek a common united front against the British enemy.

Later, the Suffolk Resolves were carried by Paul Revere to Philadelphia, which were debated by colonial delegates. After being brought to the floor of consideration in the First Continental Congress' session, the Suffolk Resolves became a decisive issue and a central matter of ideological divide. On the one hand, Radicals, like Christopher Gadsen, a South Carolina delegate and an extreme patriot, opted for a preemptive measure before Great Britain could reinforce its troops in America, Massachusetts; in particular. On the other hand, Joseph Galloway, a conservative delegate of Philadelphia, hoped for peaceful reconciliation. Finally, the Suffolk Resolves were adopted by the First Continental Congress on September 17, 1774 (Middlekauff, 2005, p. 252).

Later, the Suffolk Resolves reached London when Gen. Sir Thomas Gage sent his superiors in Great Britain a copy of the Resolves along with the Declaration of Rights and Grievances in late 1774 (Donoghue, 1964, p. 219). It is worth to mention that the November 1774 issue of London's Gentleman's Magazine published excerpts from the 'Debates in the House of Commons,' including a report entitled 'Account of the Proceedings of the American Colonies since the passing [of] the Boston Port Bill,' accompanied by a paraphrased version of the Suffolk Resolves ('Gentleman's Magazine', 1774).

3.1.5. The Purpose for Creating the Suffolk Resolves:

The Suffolk Convention, which was held in Melton, assembled delegates from nineteen towns across the Province of Massachusetts. The delegates who attended the Suffolk Convention were more than seventy; they were selected by town meetings (Cary, 1961, p. 153).

During the Suffolk Convention and before drafting the Suffolk Resolves, delegates debated a strategy of civil disobedience, and to stake out a radical position to combat the Intolerable Acts, which were recently passed by the British Parliament. At last, the Suffolk Resolves were; finally, approved by the delegates on September 9, 1774. The final, original draft contained a moderate tone, recommendations, and a direct commitment to a program of resistance, without excluding the other colonies (Ravoke, 1979, p. 46).

In retaliation to the Intolerable Acts of 1774, the Suffolk Resolves; effectively, declared the aforementioned acts of Parliament unconstitutional and void. The delegates responded to the British Parliament that colonial resistance would not only continue but intensify. They signaled to Parliament that further measures would be taken to protect the colonists' private properties. Moreover, they called on the people of Massachusetts, and all the thirteen colonies, to form new governmental institutions funded by the taxes that would otherwise be paid to British authorities. More rigorously, the Suffolk Resolves called for the arming of local militias, doing their utmost to learn and master the 'Art of War' to face the British troops, if necessary.

3.1.6. Analysis of the Contents of the Suffolk Resolves:

The Suffolk Resolves are structured to contain three main sections; namely, a statement of purpose, a preamble, and a list of nineteen grievances.

Inside the document of the Suffolk Resolves, the text reflects the sentiments of other county resolves, in addition to colonial tensions and frustrations towards the British Parliament, while renewing loyalty and respect to King George III. Throughout the Suffolk Resolves, an assertiveness in the mindset of the citizens of Massachusetts, being the rightful, true leaders of the colony, is expressed and illustrated. Because their contract with Great Britain is dissolved

by the latest Acts of Parliament; they are no more obedient servants of either the British Crown, or Parliament.

Moreover, the Suffolk Resolves show an escalation towards war that began to surface in the colonial American mindset after the Cambridge Powder Alarm. The issues that defined the American Revolution; such as, Taxation without Representation, trade regulation, and right to a fair trial, are extensively highlighted within the Suffolk Resolves. More clearly, the document defined contentious issues which crystallized the growing distance between Britain and her American colonies.

3.1.6.1. Statement of Purpose:

To deal with, the statement of purpose introduces the purpose of the Suffolk Convention, and who were the delegates that were chosen to run the Convention. In addition, it announces the intention of the delegates for organizing this meeting. Written by Dr. Joseph Warren, this part of the Suffolk Resolves informed about the meeting. The delegates of every county and district of Massachusetts were concerned by the Suffolk Convention because of the latest circumstances which occurred in Massachusetts. The delegates met to voice out their sentiments and feelings in the light of the Intolerable Acts which passed by the British Parliament after the Boston Tea Party. Moreover, they met in defiance of the British authorities in Massachusetts which abandoned town meetings. They met in September 6 and adjourned till the ninth of the same month at Mr. Richard Woodward's house. The votes of the Suffolk Resolves took place at Mr. Daniel Vose's house. In this statement of purpose, it is indicated the names of persons who run the Suffolk Convention: Joseph Palmer, esq. a moderator of the convention, and William Thompson, esq. as a clerk. After the debates, a committee was set up to bring the report of the convention. Finally, the resolves were read in public, and were unanimously voted.

3.1.6.2. Preamble:

The opening preamble of the Suffolk Resolves demonstrates the high value of the Massachusetts' charter, which is held by the citizens of the province. Massachusetts' Charter is highly regarded by the colonists. It is a symbol of self- government which had been practiced since the colony's establishment. In the preamble, Lincoln (1838) believed that Dr. Joseph Warren, author of the Suffolk Resolves, used the following hostile terms of powerful, vengeful, arbitrary, licentious, and parricide so as to describe the British colonial administrators as 'military executioners.' He accused the British authorities of their attempts to take the colonists' rights and properties out of them. Being described as 'unparalleled usurpation[s] of unconstitutional power,' Dr. Joseph Warren accused the British colonial authorities of economic exploitation. He; further, juxtaposed the violent, unjust, strident, and exaggerated characterization of the British colonial administrators against the colonists by depicting the latter as guiltless children who practice their labor in order to protect their inheritance, or private properties, which had been built on the valor and blood of colonial ancestors. In addition, Dr. Joseph Warren attacked those who 'tamely submit to live, move, and have their being at the arbitrary will of a licentious minister.' He described their position as similar to voluntary slavery. These words and expressions sparked emotional connections between the colonists to build a strong unity between them. Therefore, he aimed at forging common bonds against the British. In fact, Dr. Joseph Warren knew that in order to stand and exert an impact on the British Parliament, the colonists would have to put aside their differences and show a united front (p. 602).

3.1.6.3. The Nineteen Grievances of the Suffolk Resolves:

As for the body of the Suffolk Resolves, it contains nineteen resolves, or grievances.

The first resolve made a pro forma declaration of loyalty to King George III, which; according to Dr. Joseph Warren, should be maintained because it is based on the Lockean concept of the Social Contract. In the resolve, the citizens of the Province of Massachusetts expressed their loyalty to King George III. It is stated that King George III is acknowledged as ‘our rightful sovereign.’ Allegiance is assured; in fact, while understanding that the compact with the original colonists forms the “covenant [which] is the tenure and claim on which are founded our allegiance and submission.” This total adherence to the rule of the monarchy which is mentioned in the Suffolk Resolves proves that the colonists had not given up completely on all aspects of their mother country, but they acknowledged the disintegration of colonial relationships which had already begun. The expression of loyalty masks deeper discontent highlighted in the second point, or the second resolve, which stressed the natural right to defend their civil and religious rights and liberties (Lincoln, 1838, p. 602).

The second resolve insisted on the importance of the natural right to defend civil, religious, and liberties. The words ‘indispensable duty’ ‘to God’, ‘our country’, ‘ourselves and posterity’ indicate that the citizens had a strong covenant with God, country, their selves, their rights, and prosperity would allow them to use all necessary means available to them in order protect their rights, whether religious or civil, and liberties. Those rights and liberties were regarded as sacred since they were practiced earlier by their ancestors, and were passed to them from one generation to another (Lincoln, 1838, p. 602).

The third and fourth resolves announced colonial grievances against the British Parliament which enacted the Intolerable Acts. The Suffolk Resolves rejected the Intolerable Acts. In his analysis of the Suffolk Resolves, Lincoln (1838) agreed to the fact that many colonists were most upset with Parliament in 1774 when it passed the Intolerable Acts which put limitations

on personal and economic freedoms. Because of these limitations, the third and fourth resolves contained grievances which; specifically, targeted the British Parliament. The Suffolk Resolves criticized severely the British Parliament ‘for blocking up the harbor of Boston, for altering the established form of government in this colony, and for screening the most flagitious violators of the laws of the province from a legal trial,’ which the delegates deemed as entitlements ‘by the laws of nature, the British constitution, and the charter of the province.’ Particularly, this complaint; also, provides a perfect example of the disconnect between Great Britain and its American colonists. Great Britain was willing to sacrifice revenue to bring the troublesome Bostonians in order and obedience, which the colonists saw as a sign of tyranny. However, in their minds, ‘the attempts of [a] wicked administration to enslave America’ freed them from obligations of obedience (pp. 602- 3).

The fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth resolves contained grievances about court and legal issues. Colonial grievances against the court system established by the Intolerable Acts were mentioned in this part of the resolves. In the colonists’ minds, the court systems and justices all over the colonies had forfeited their legitimacy and authority. However, the delegates to the Suffolk Convention considered the justices as unconstitutional officers who operated under undue influence, since they were illegitimately appointed by the Crown, and not through colonial consent. This; in fact, indicates the developing radicalism inherent in the Suffolk Resolves (Lincoln, 1838, p. 603).

In addition, the aforementioned resolves suggested aggressive actions to be taken by the citizens in Massachusetts, in terms of boycotting British trade and calling for certain individuals to resign their public offices, even issuing an ultimatum that those refusing to do so by September 20th would be considered as ‘obstinate and incorrigible enemies to this country.’ Furthermore, this step was taken by the colonists took in the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and through twelfth resolves by recommending the removal of commissions of militia members and

advocating that the inhabitants of the colony should prepare to defend themselves, if it became necessary. These protests came in reaction to the increased military presence throughout Massachusetts and the newfound threat towards Protestantism following the protection of the Roman- Catholic religion in Canada. The colonies maintained a defensive position towards military relations with Great Britain out of 'affection to his majesty' and as long as 'such conduct may be vindicated by reason and the principles of self-preservation.' This stance; further, illustrates the transitional nature the Suffolk Resolves held in regards to movement towards revolution (Lincoln, 1838, p. 604).

The thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and the nineteenth resolves proposed an outline of specific measures to create independent government to combat the 'present tyrannical and unconstitutional government' of the British authorities' in the Province of Massachusetts. The Suffolk Resolves threatened the British authorities in case colonial resistance leaders were arrested, colonists would take royal officials' hostage until those captured by the British were released. The next step in the Resolves' plan consisted a call for Anglo-American trade cessation and the development of American art and manufacturing to offset this boycott of British goods. The sixteenth and seventeenth resolves called upon other towns and counties to provide support and encouragements to the Massachusetts Provincial Congress, which would adjourn later in October. Finally, to counteract the growing movements of mobs' activities and riots and to allow the colonial elites to reassert their leadership of the resistance, the Suffolk Resolves called for civil order, particularly the protection of private property (Lincoln, 1838, p. 604).

3.1.7. The Significance of the Suffolk Resolves:

More importantly, the Suffolk Resolves were thoroughly developed, and rationally argued than those of other counties' resolves. They offered the most detailed and articulate statement

of colonial grievances. While being debated in the First Continental Congress, the Suffolk Resolves provided a compromise, preventing the possibility of a situation in which radicals like Gadsden would support a military attack before the British could call in reinforcements (Middlekauff, 2005, p. 252). The delegates hoped to prevent further disruption in New England, while sending a message to the British government that punitive actions to attempt to regain control of the situation would not be tolerated (Rakove, 1979, p. 47).

Because of their importance, the First Continental Congress, opted to break with the previous secrecy policy by ordering the Suffolk Resolves to be printed in local newspapers. The Suffolk Resolves made page one news as seen in a special September 15, 1774 Supplement to the Massachusetts Gazette, the Essex Gazette of September 20, 1774, and the New Hampshire Gazette of September 23, 1774 (Knox, 2015, p. 39).

It is worth to mention that when the Suffolk Resolves reached the Continental Congress for debate, John Adams wrote: 'This was one of the happiest days of my life... . This day convinced me that America will support Massachusetts or perish with her' (Webster & Morris, 1973, p. iii). For him, John Adams believed that when the Suffolk Resolves reached the Continental Congress for debate, unity is achieved between the thirteen American colonies. The colonies would support the cause of Massachusetts, which is; in return, the cause of America.

3.2. The Declaration of Independence:

During the American Revolution, there emerged patriot leaders who were successful in influencing the mass population in colonial America with their ideas which were deeply rooted in the colonists' minds. Ideologically, men like Dr. Joseph Warren and Thomas Jefferson were highly successful all over the thirteen American colonies with their writings which clarified the nature of the conflict between Great Britain and the American colonies. By doing so, they

succeeded to mobilize citizens, radicals, and revolutionaries towards the common cause of saving America from a corrupt monarchy of Great Britain.

After drafting the Suffolk Resolves, which were debated and approved by the First Continental Congress, the year 1776 witnessed the drafting of an important historical document which gave birth to the United States of America. Like the aforementioned document of the Suffolk Resolves, which were a detailed list of grievances against the British Intolerable Acts, the Declaration of Independence; too, detailed the British unjust measures and policies which were carried on the American colonies. Moreover, it stated the factors and the reasons which impelled the colonies to cut the breach with Great Britain and declare their independence.

3.2.1. Type of the Document:

With the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War on April 17, 1775, the British colonists in America had announced their revolt against George III, the British Monarch, whom they insisted that he violated their natural rights. These rights and the King's violations were described in their famous document; namely, the Declaration of Independence.

The United States of America, as they were officially named in the Declaration of Independence, defined liberty, freedom, and the natural rights, as they viewed them. They wanted total economic and political autonomy from Great Britain and the British King. They were determined not to be ruled by a corrupt Monarch, his government, and his Parliament.

Written by Thomas Jefferson, a Virginian lawyer, the Declaration of Independence today serves as the US most treasured historical document. As an important document in the history of the US, the Declaration of Independence is an official act of the original thirteen colonies by which they declared their independence from the British Crown on July 4, 1776.

The Declaration of Independence announced to the world the reasons and the causes which drove the thirteen American colonies to the separation from Great Britain. The causes can be summarized to (1) taxing the colonists against their own consent, (2) keeping an army in time of peace, (3) subverting colonial rights and liberties, and (4) the British Monarch broke his contract with his subjects in colonial America.

In fact, the Declaration of Independence did more than announce to the world the decision of the thirteen American colonies to separate from Great Britain. Primarily, it articulates the fundamental principles that form the foundation of America's political ideology. The document became a significant landmark in the history of democracy when the formal statement asserted the people's right to choose their own government. The document; also, summarizes the fundamental principles of American self- government. The principles of natural rights philosophy, unalienable rights, consent of the governed, liberty, freedom, equality, right to revolution, and legitimate government are notified in the Declaration of Independence.

3.2.2. Author of the Declaration of Independence:

Being amongst the Founding Fathers of the United States of America, Thomas Jefferson had remarkably filled several public offices to which he was chosen: The President of the US, Vice-President of the US, Secretary of State, Diplomatic Minister, and Congressman. His actions and ideas helped create the new nation and gave it direction. Along the course of his life, Thomas Jefferson was instrumental in (1) encouraging the United States to declare independence, (2) helping the new nation to gain recognition at the international scene, (3) giving shape to the American political system, and (4) helping promote American Democracy.

Thomas Jefferson was born on April 13, 1743 in his father's plantation at Shadwell, Albemarle, Co., in Virginia. His father Peter Jefferson was a successful planter and surveyor.

His mother Jane Randolph was a member of one of Virginia's most distinguished families (Randall, 2014, p. 15).

When he was five years' old Thomas Jefferson started his education at the English School, and; then, at the Latin School at the age of nine. When he was fourteen years' old, Thomas Jefferson lost his father who died in 1757. He carried on his education at Murray School, and in 1760, he entered William and Mary College. After his graduation in 1762, he entered the office of Law of George Wythe at Williamsburg. His apprenticeship enabled Thomas Jefferson to be elected at the House of Burgesses in 1769 (Jefferson, 1914, pp. 5- 6- 7).

Upon his apprenticeship in law, Thomas Jefferson became a noticeable lawyer in Virginia. Amongst the qualities he possessed that helped him to be a successful lawyer were his keen observation, quick perceptions, and inquisitive nature. Having a defining method, learning, skill in handling books, instinct research, the habit of noting everything on a paper, a ready sympathy with client's mind, and the audacity of stating a case with clearness and brevity led him to be what he wanted. As his clients included the first families of Virginia; such as, the Carters, Carringtons, Dinwiddies, Clairbornes, Blandes, Lees, and Pages, the young attorney gained confidence in the community. Jefferson's greatest mission was to revise the laws of Virginia. Based on ballot's votes, Thomas Jefferson was elected to the committee with other members. After taking the greater part of the job, Jefferson produced his revision of the laws of Virginia (Curtis, 1901, p. 74).

Serving in the Virginia House of Burgesses during the troubled years between Great Britain and the American colonies, Thomas Jefferson played an active role in the Virginia Committee of Correspondence. As colonial resentment against Great Britain was increasing, the Committees of Correspondence included political agitators who worked to oppose the British presence in America. Jefferson's Summary View of the Rights of British America, which was published in 1774, drove him in the larger spotlight. As a result, he became to be known as a

man of immense abilities in articulating the colonial position for independence. Together with Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson represented the leading Radicals and argued that the British Parliament had no authority to make laws for the colonies (Bernstein, 2004, p. 34).

In his review of Jefferson's Summary View, Bernstein (2004) pointed out to Jefferson's beliefs that were stated in the published document. According to him, Jefferson argued that the colonists were entitled to the rights of British subjects. With their ancestors, they chose to settle in America, founded and built the colonies without the help of the mother country. Thus, he insisted, both the colonists and their descendants had all the rights of freeborn Englishmen. As for taxation and law-making, Jefferson argued that all Englishmen had the right to be taxed only by their own consent through their elected legislatures in which they were represented directly. In contrast, the British Parliament could only make laws for and levy taxes on Great Britain. Because each colony had its own legislature that could make laws and levy taxes, Parliament had no right to legislate for the American colonies. Thomas Jefferson concluded, the only thing that Americans had in common with those residing in Britain was loyalty to King George III (p. 37).

In the US history, Thomas Jefferson is; mostly, accredited as the author of the Declaration of Independence. Both are inseparable. When the American Revolutionary War broke out after the battles of Lexington and Concord on April 19, 1775, the First Continental Congress met in 1775 and approved the creation of the Continental Army to fight in the war. In order to debate the issue of separation from Great Britain, the Second Continental Congress met; again, in Philadelphia in June, 1776 to issue the Declaration of Independence. Thomas Jefferson was appointed, with four other delegates, in the committee which main task was to write a declaration of independence. The five delegates included in the committee were Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, and Robert R. Livingston. Based on the fact that he was the most influential politician in Virginia and his powerful writing style,

Thomas Jefferson was selected in the aforementioned committee. Thomas Jefferson wrote the draft and defended it before the committee as a piece designed to present in plain and firm terms the 'common sense' of independence (Randall, 2014, pp. 355- 6).

In regard to the document's structure, the Declaration of Independence comprised (1) a preamble, (2) a statement of principles, (3) a list of grievances, and (4) a conclusion. After debating the written document for three days, the Second Continental Congress approved the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. Since the Declaration of Independence asserted the fundamental human rights, it provided a compact statement of government upon which the new republic was built. Theoretically, Thomas Jefferson argued that the Declaration of Independence would provide the foundation for the creation of a truly representative and egalitarian American society.

After Thomas Jefferson left Congress in 1776, he returned to Virginia and served in the legislature. As a member of the new House of Delegates of Virginia, he worked closely with James Madison to end the religious establishment in Virginia. Their first collaboration resulted in the passage of Jefferson's Statute for Religious Freedom in 1786. Elected governor from 1779 to 1781, Thomas Jefferson suffered from the British invasion of Virginia which wreaked £2 million pounds' worth of damage (Randall, 2014, pp. 415- 6).

When the American Revolutionary War ended, Thomas Jefferson was appointed a peace commissioner to Europe on November 12, 1782. On June 6, 1783, he was elected delegate to Congress. Shortly, he drafted the constitution of Virginia. On March 10, 1785, Jefferson was elected by Congress a Minister to France where he succeeded to sign a treaty with Prussia, and prepared a project treaty with Great Britain in 1786 (Jefferson, 1914, p. 27).

Thomas Jefferson criticized the Articles of Confederation, and expressed the need of a more powerful central government. Jefferson expressed his frustration about the new Constitution. While ratifying the US Constitution, Jefferson objected some key parts of it. According to him, the new Constitution lacked the Bill of Rights, and failed to establish the limits of Federal Government's power. In 1788, the framers of the US Constitution included the Bill of Rights upon Jefferson's argument 'a list of rights would help give the judiciary the power to ensure that the branches of government would not infringe on citizens' civil liberties' (Randall, 2014, pp. 633- 5).

When the new US Republic began under the new Constitution, Thomas Jefferson served as Secretary of State under George Washington's presidency. However, he resigned from the Cabinet of George Washington on February 28, 1792 when the Federalists formed their first political organization in the country, represented by George Washington, John Adams, and Alexander Hamilton. Together with his adherents, Thomas Jefferson formed the Anti-Federalist party, and coined the term Democratic- Republicans: Advocates and defenders of Democracy, and supporting a government of the people (Curtis, 1901, p. 274).

When the US presidential elections were held in 1796, Thomas Jefferson was elected as a US Vice- President; John Adams was elected as second President of the US. On February, 17, 1801, Thomas Jefferson was elected as the third US President. While in office, Thomas Jefferson made several noticeable achievements. He moved the US Capital City from New York to Washington D. C. after his inauguration. On May 3, 1803, the Louisiana Purchase was concluded treaty with France. Jefferson was re- elected on November 4, 1804. He addressed to Congress to end the slave trade in 1807. He died on July, 4, 1826 (Randall, 2014, pp. 783- 4)

3.2.3. The Context of Creating the Declaration of Independence:

Being the ablest politician that the US had, Thomas Jefferson had written the best known; namely, the Declaration of Independence. Although written in the summer of 1776, events and circumstances occurred before, which contributed to the drafting of the aforementioned document.

The Intolerable acts shocked the Massachusetts' citizens; many people realized what happened in Massachusetts could happen elsewhere. This; in fact, led patriot leaders to develop a strategy of resistance against the British measures. The first move came from Massachusetts where delegates of its counties drafted the Suffolk Resolves, under the direct of Dr. Joseph Warren, which called for (1) raising militia to defend the counties of Massachusetts and the citizens' properties whenever they were threatened, and (2) develop new governments to replace the British authorities in colonial America.

Jefferson's Summary View accused the British Monarch George III of his attempts to limit the colonists' liberties and rights. These attempts, as Thomas Jefferson viewed them, were tyrannical and unjust. Furthermore, Thomas Jefferson called King George III to execute his constitutional responsibilities in the following passage:

[Americans] know, and will therefore say, that kings are the servants, not the proprietors of the people. Open your breast, sire, to liberal and expanded thought. Let not the name of George the third be a blot in the page of history. You are surrounded by British counsellors, but remember that they are parties. You have no ministers for American affairs, because you have none taken from among us It behoves you, therefore, to think and to act for yourself and your people. The great principles of right and wrong are legible to every reader; to pursue them requires not the aid of many counsellors. The whole art of government consists

in the art of being honest. Only aim to do your duty, and mankind will give you credit where you fail. (Bernstein, 2004, p. 38)

In the fall of 1774, the First Continental Congress adopted a set of resolutions which restated American rights against the British King who attempted to subvert them. Planning to meet in the Second Continental Congress in May, 1775, events; however, went so far than planned before. The battles of Lexington and Concord, which were fought on April 19, 1775, between American militia and the British soldiers, made it clear that the conflict between the American colonies and Great Britain moved into a military bloodshed. Following that military outbreak in Massachusetts, the Second Continental Congress met in Philadelphia. It created the Continental Army and made George Washington its Commander- in- Chief.

Bernstein (2004) argued that the question of independence was the issue of debate in the Second Continental Congress during which two main divergent views emerged among colonial delegates. Mainly, New England and Virginia delegates; namely, John Adams Samuel Adams, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and Richard Henry Lee insisted that the British use of force against the British subjects had worsened colonial relationships. Therefore, Americans should embrace independence and fight for it. On the other hand, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas' delegates insisted that the Continental Army's role should fight only to defend the colonists' rights and liberties. Accordingly, the resistance would defeat the Parliament's arrogance, and persuade the King to mediate so as to resolve the conflict. According to them, any attempt to win independence, the consequences would be serious for both America and Great Britain (p. 39).

As a matter of fact, the issue of independence was controversial in the Continental Congress' sessions. Since 1765, the British subjects in America, in their repeated grievances, proved their

loyalty to King George III and were asking for protection of their liberties and liberties as Englishmen. They did not declare independence because it was a treason, and it carried death penalty. They wished that King George III would intervene to solve the dispute between the British Parliament and the American colonies. In this regard, the Second Continental Congress sent, on July 5, 1775, the Olive Branch Petition to King George III, begging him to resolve the dispute between the British Parliament and the American colonies. However, King George III refused to take the American rights into consideration. Moreover, in his proclamation, he denounced the Olive Branch Petition and considered it as an act of treason. He ordered the British authorities in the colonies, both civil and military, and loyal subjects to use all accessible means available to them to suppress rebellion; and bring to the law the rebels who lead rebellion against the King, Parliament, and the Government of the Crown so as to punish them. Thus, the king's words and deeds made him the focus of American resentment and pushed Americans towards independence (Bernstein, 2004, pp. 40- 1).

In January 1776, Americans were persuaded that independence was legitimate and desirable. Thomas Paine's pamphlet *Common Sense* supplied that argument by presenting a powerful case for independence. Attacking both King George III and the British Monarchy, Thomas Paine insisted that monarchy was illegitimate and corrupt, and that no monarch could have any claim of loyalty, or allegiance of a free people. This argument helped to cut the last tie binding many Americans to Britain. Furthermore, he argued that America had the right to embrace independence; since the means and resources are available to make it real. Doing so, Thomas Paine cleared out all the fears which the Americans still had about the risks of declaring independence (Hayes, 2008, pp. 175- 6).

In the spring of 1776, when the Revolutionary War was still going on, royal officials, who represented the British authorities in America, fled. Self- appointed provincial congresses and conventions took over the tasks of government and adopted resolutions rejecting British

authority and demanding independence. At the same time, these bodies appealed to the Second Continental Congress for instructions and guidance. On May 15, 1776, the Continental Congress adopted a resolution, written by John Adams of Massachusetts, which called the colonies to frame new forms of government. Furthermore, the Continental Congress began to keep pace with the current events of public opinion. It became; therefore, clear that it was only a matter of time to debate the issue of independence directly (Bernstein, 2004, p. 43).

When the Second Continental Congress adjourned, the issue of independence dominated its agenda. Based on the Virginia convention, Richard Henry Lee proposed the following resolutions on June 7, 1776:

- ✚ The first proclaimed ‘that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; that they are absolved from allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved’;
- ✚ The second resolution called for ‘articles of confederation and perpetual union’ among the thirteen colonies;
- ✚ The third resolution urged the Continental Congress to send envoys to France and other European powers to find allies against Britain. (Bernstein, 2004, pp. 44- 5).

While debating independence, the Continental Congress named three committees to consider Lee's resolutions: The first was to prepare draft articles of confederation, the second was to plan American diplomatic efforts to win European allies, and the third was to draft a declaration of independence. In selecting the declaration committee, the Continental Congress named Thomas Jefferson in Henry’s place. In addition, he was selected based on what John Adams believed about Jefferson's ‘happy talent for composition and singular felicity of expression’ (Bernstein, 2004, p. 45).

When Thomas Jefferson started writing the Declaration of Independence, he closeted himself in a house owned by bricklayer Jacob Graff, Jr. for seventeen days until he finished drafting the Declaration of Independence. Then, he showed his draft to the other members of the committee. After adding the committee's suggestions, the final draft of the Declaration of Independence was presented to the Continental Congress on June 28, 1776. The Continental Congress; then, voted for independence on July 2, and on July 4, 1776 independence was proclaimed (Bernstein, 2004, p. 46).

3.2.4. The Intended Audience of the Declaration of Independence:

When the American Revolutionary War commenced, few people in the American colonies wanted independence from Great Britain. However, when the war continued, most of the colonists were convinced that only independence would save America. After drafting the Declaration of Independence, it played three pivotal roles; namely, (1) directing the American Revolutionary War, (2) uniting the thirteen colonies, and (3) announcing, to the world, the birth of the United States of America.

In fact, the Declaration of Independence changed the character of the American Revolutionary War. The people who waged the war against the King of Great Britain were trying to seek reconciliation, since they proclaimed their loyalty to the British monarch. However, after independence was declared, these people, at heart and hand, could move together; for they had a common cause to fight for.

As an important document which announced the separation of the former British thirteen colonies from Great Britain, one major question is raised about the Declaration of Independence: To whom the Declaration of Independence was written? Or, to whom the Declaration of Independence addressed?

As a starting point, the Declaration of Independence made broad claims about the intended audience. According to Armitage (2007), the phrases Opinions of Mankind and a Candid World remind that the Declaration of Independence addressed to concentric audiences. Opinions of Mankind refers to the public opinion of the world that is able to reason and judge the case of the Americans appropriately. Candid World means an unprejudiced world (p. 30). Furthermore, he added that the leading Patriots in America, whom the British Government viewed as rebels, needed international support; an international neutrality because they engaged in a struggle for their national liberation (Armitage, 2007, p. 36). Moreover, Jefferson's use of the phrase is a call from American elites to emulate the 'United Colonies' as 'Free Independent States.' i. e. To treat them as independent states which have the same functions as other states in the world; being able to declare wars, make peace treaties, and establish foreign diplomatic relations. Therefore, appealing to candid world, Thomas Jefferson announced the birth of new nation; namely, the United States of America, which is different from the Kingdom of Great Britain in politics, ideology and Government's structure (Konotrovich, as cited in Tushnet, 2010, p. 812).

Since it possessed the three elements of language, form, and intent, the Declaration of Independence it seen as a general manifesto which was published to all the world. By issuing the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson informed the candid world about the Continental Congress, being a representative body; such as, Parliament. The Continental Congress, which is composed of colonial delegates, implied that it possessed the same sort of power to issue such documents, as did the British Parliament (Armitage, 2007, pp. 30- 1).

The Declaration of Independence marked a decisive turning point in the struggle between Britain and its American colonies. In this case, it addressed the whole world, and informed that the colonists had moved to formal armed conflict with the reassurance that they have not raised armies and decided to fight just for the sake of separating from the Kingdom of Great Britain, but to establish independent states. The candid world; too, means that the Declaration of

Independence addressed to particular communities within the British Empire by enacting the central claim: The United Colonies had ceased to be members of the British Empire and now stood alongside ‘the Powers of the Earth’: A state which has full powers like other European states (Armitage, 2007, p. 33).

Since Congress dispatched the document across the Atlantic to be printed in London newspapers, the Declaration of Independence; also, addressed to the British public opinion. In the passage ‘Nor have we been wanting in our attentions to our British brethren’, Jefferson referred to the British people, living in Great Britain, as their brothers because of the shared heritage between both peoples of the British Empire. He wanted to inform them that the British Parliament was amongst the causes that led the American colonies to proceed with separation and declaration of independence. Accordingly, that institution is accused of its attempts to extend ‘an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us.’ Although the colonists appealed, repeatedly, to that institution to correct the errors, and avoid that unwanted legislation; for it would lead to break connections between Great Britain and the British subjects in America, but, in vain. Therefore, the British would be treated as enemies in war, and friends in peace (Armitage, 2007, pp. 32- 3).

Another addressee in the Declaration of Independence is George III, the King of Great Britain. In fact, Thomas Jefferson has reserved a whole section in the document which detailed the king’s intention to establish a despotic rule over the colonies. It is made clear, in the Declaration of Independence, that ‘The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.’ The list of grievances which followed, details the King’s abuse of power which led to breaking contract with his subjects in America. Therefore, they no longer owe allegiance, or declare loyalty to him.

3.2.5. The Purpose for Creating the Declaration of Independence:

In addition to its ideological importance, the Declaration of Independence; also, played another important role in negotiations and diplomatic efforts which were carried out by the Second Continental Congress. Thus, it is regarded as an important step during the American Revolutionary War (1775- 1783). The document was issued as a means to win the French help to fight against the British. Therefore, helping the Americans in their Revolutionary War against Great Britain was viewed by the French government as a golden opportunity to revenge from Great Britain because of losing the vast territory of Canada, and other forts and settlements, in North America after the end of the French and Indian War. So, based on that fact, the French king provided that the Americans would declare themselves independent from Great Britain, or the British Government would officially accuse the French government of inciting and supporting the American colonies in their rebellion.

Accordingly, after the Americans won a decisive victory in the Battle of Saratoga on October 7, 1777, the French were convinced that the Americans would definitely succeed in their struggle against the British. Therefore, they signed the Treaty of Alliance on February 6, 1778, creating a military alliance between the United States of America and France against Great Britain. Moreover, the Declaration of Independence gave birth to the birth of the United States as a new country with a republican system, and described the emergence of a new people with a new identity and a new culture. This newly- born American identity was strengthened in the course of the American Revolution's events in Massachusetts, and spread throughout the rest of the American colonies (Mousnier, Labrousse, and Bouloiseau, 1986, p. 368).

3.2.6. Analysis of the Contents of the Declaration of Independence:

When we read the Declaration of Independence, it is helpful to review its structure in order to analyze its contents and main ideas, and what did it declare. The Declaration of Independence

comprises four main parts: (1) Preamble, (2) Declaration of Natural Rights, (3) a detailed list of grievances, and (4) a resolution of independence.

As a matter of fact, the writers of the Declaration of Independence, including the celebrated Thomas Jefferson, were well aware of the consequences of the issuance of the Declaration of Independence would be. Meanwhile, the Continental Congress knew that the world was watching the conflict between the United States of America- as they were named officially in the document, and Great Britain, and the attention desired from writing the Declaration of Independence. Using the phrase ‘let facts be submitted to a candid world’ in the Declaration of Independence makes it as clear as evidence of the awareness of international attention would bring to the United States. Therefore, the Declaration of Independence can be defined as a document which was publicly and internationally issued to announce the crimes of King George III, and assert the sovereignty of the United States (Brannigan, 2014, p. 5).

3.2.6.1. Preamble:

Being a well- known passage and easy to quote, the opening paragraph makes the preamble of the Declaration of Independence. In the Declaration’s preamble, Thomas Jefferson outlined the general beliefs of government that justifies a rebellion. This section begins with one of the most popular phrases of the document:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among those are Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness. (‘The Declaration of Independence.’ See Appendix B)

These words define the political beliefs of the Declaration's writer. Government is established by the people, and for the people. When the government becomes too destructive to the peoples' rights, the people have the right to abolish it and establish a new government, taking into account respecting peoples' rights and liberties. Despite the fact that the decision to end a corrupt government is not easy, there should be clear reasons why. However, when there is an abuse of power, it is the peoples' right and duty to essentially alter the government.

In the declaration's preamble, Thomas Jefferson talked in general and situated it into the history of mankind. The phrases 'political bonds' and 'Laws of Nature and Nature's God' make the opening paragraph significant. Thomas Jefferson argued that political relationships between governors and the governed are based on respecting and protecting of natural rights entitled by God to humans. Whenever these rights are subverted and no longer protected, people should break away from another. Moreover, they should declare the reasons to do so.

3.2.6.2. Declaration of Natural Rights:

The second part of the document contains a declaration of the natural rights, stated by Thomas Jefferson. Arguably, 'Life', 'Liberty', and the 'Pursuit of Happiness' are the 'unalienable rights' which are entitled to humans by their 'Creator.' These rights are; therefore, nontransferable from one to another.

Moreover, Thomas Jefferson believed that God had guaranteed men with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. King George III was not above the power of the Creator and the gifts he ordained on his men. The rights of men are natural, but the three rights included in the Declaration of Independence are the only essential ones for men's life. Therefore, claiming that the rights mentioned were natural implies that King George III's and his policies and acts towards his subjects in America were unnatural, claiming the rights and

wrongs and pitting the American colonists against the British Crown. This; in fact, implies that monarchy; itself, was not natural, but an abomination of sorts, and unnecessary (Brannigan, 2014, p. 6).

Significantly, Thomas Jefferson used these rights to convince Americans to put their lives for the cause. In fact, Thomas Jefferson intended to claim that only separation from Great Britain would help Americans strengthen their sense of security, economic stability, and identity.

In this part; too, Thomas Jefferson stated the purpose and function of establishing governments. They are established to protect and secure the ‘unalienable rights’ of people. When any government fails to secure these natural, unalienable rights, it is; then, the right of the people to engage in a revolution so as to establish a new form of government to protect the people’s rights.

3.2.6.3. List of Grievances:

In the third and longest part of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson listed twenty- seven of grievances against King George III. These grievances are; mainly, considered a list of complaints, the first of which announced that the British monarch, King George III had ‘refused his Assent to Laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.’ In addition, other grievances emphasized specific complaints; such as, the quartering of British troops in colonists’ homes, and the denial of trial by jury. In fact, the grievances were written in a way that would appeal to everyday colonists. Acting so, Thomas Jefferson wanted to convey the complaints that everyday people in the colonies had as a way to build support and feedback for the revolutionary act that the Declaration of Independence represented. The grievances fall into three categories:

- ✚ Grievances 1–12: Grievances on abuse of power by King George III;
- ✚ Grievances 13– 22: Actions by the king and Parliament that violated the British Constitution;
- ✚ Grievances 23–27: Charges against the king for making war on the colonists.

In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson stated that King George III paid no attention to the rights and wishes of his subjects in America, but rather made decisions in order to further his desires and interests; thus, committing the crime which John Locke cited as the reason why people should rebel against the established form of government, and; therefore, form new governments so as to protect themselves from ‘confusion and disorder.’ As a matter of fact, Thomas Jefferson listed the King’s transgressions of specific acts and list of allegations of King George III for the purpose of applying them to other situations, and mobilize other British colonies to revolt against their tyrannical mother- country because they would read the crimes and recognize the faults in their own governments (Armitage, 2007, p. 54).

King George III was charged with several crimes and his refusal to:

assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good... for taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments... abdicat [ing] government here, by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us...[for] plunder[ing] our seas, ravag[ing] our Coasts, burn[ing] our towns, and destroy[ing] the lives of our people. (Nardo, 1999, p. 58)

The accusations did not stop at the King, the Declaration also references those they considered their ‘British brethren’ and finds them guilty of being ‘deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity’ (Nardo, 1999, p. 58).

In the Declaration of Independence, there was no use of the term compromise. The phrase ‘dissolve the political bands’ is used to demonstrate the nature of the political relationship between the ruler and the ruled. In fact, all governments are merely bonds between the ruler and those being ruled. Therefore, once the political affiliation exists in society in which the governed feel oppressed, it is; thus, the right of the governed to rebel, and form a new government to protect their rights (Brannigan, 2014, p. 11).

3.2.6.4. Resolution of Independence:

The last part of the Declaration of Independence contains the resolution of independence. In this part, the document concludes that ‘these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States.’ Clearly, Thomas Jefferson affirmed, in the Declaration’s closing paragraph, the entrance of new actors; namely, the thirteen ‘Free and Independent States’ onto the world stage. It symbolizes the birth of the United States of America into world stages as equal as other states in the world (Armitage, 2007, p. 28).

The declaration’s concluding paragraph enumerated the rights possessed by those states that had successfully achieved their independence and equality:

[T]hese United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States... and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. (‘The Declaration of Independence.’ See Appendix B)

Thus, Jefferson makes separation from Great Britain justified both logically and historically. Accordingly, it is affirmed in the conclusion that the representatives assembled in the Continental Congress resolved to ‘pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor’ to make that decision of separation. For the sake of the people’s lives, fortunes, and sacred honor, the delegates to the Continental Congress made the best decision which changed history: independence to save the future of America. With that precise but flexible declaration of rights, the representatives of the United States announced that they had left the transnational community of the British Empire to join instead an international community of independent sovereign states (Hayes, 2008, p. 186).

3.2.7. The Significance of the Declaration of Independence:

As the new ideas of the Age of Enlightenment shaped politics and political attitudes, they challenged the older order and gave rise to a new way of thinking to bring well- educated citizens. Considered as a major product of Enlightenment, the Declaration of Independence has had global influence since its drafting on July 4, 1776.

Militarily, the Declaration of Independence raised the spirit of the Americans and encouraged them to join the Continental Army (Maier, 1997, p. 156). Using the Declaration of Independence as a recruitment tool for the Continental Army was another significant factor for this historical document. The Continental Congress responded to Gen. George Washington, Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army, who encountered troubling circumstances with worsening military situations on September 16, 1776, one month after the final celebrations of the Declaration were held. As a matter of fact, Gen. George Washington believed that (1) an effective army would result only if its members were recruited for periods that extended well beyond the current one- year term of enlistment and, (2) enlistment bonuses were essential to achieve the desired numbers of recruits (Martin and Lender, 2006, pp. 75- 6).

Based on Washington's recommendations, Congress approved the following:

That eighty-eight battalions be enlisted as soon as possible, to serve during the present war, and that each state furnish their respective quotas in the following proportions:

Delaware 1 battalion, Rhode Island 2 battalions . . . Virginia and Massachusetts bay 15

battalions each [and] that twenty dollars be given as bounty to each non-commissioned

officer and private soldier, who shall enlist to serve during the present war, unless sooner

discharged by Congress. (Journals of the Continental Congress, 1907, p. 762)

To further encourage enlistments, Congress; also, approved an additional bonus that consisted of granting land. It was addressed to:

... the officers and soldiers who shall so engage in the service, and continue therein to the close of the war, or until discharged by Congress and to the representatives of such officers and soldiers as shall be slain by the enemy.' The grants ranged in size from 100 acres for non-commissioned officers and soldiers to 500 acres for a colonel. (Journals of the Continental Congress, 1907, p. 763)

While fighting in the battles, the Declaration of Independence boosted the Continental Army troops' morale in the battles of Trenton and Princeton on December 26, 1776. Few months after its drafting, George Washington, Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army, ordered the Declaration of Independence to be read by his officers and soldiers. According to him, the hearing the declaration's words would motivate every officer and soldier to act with great fidelity and courage. The declaration would make them know that independence, future, and

safety of their country now depends on the success of their arms, and their conduct in the war. Being now in the service of the United States, it possessed sufficient power to reward their merits, and advance them to the honors of a free Country (Beeman, 2013, p. 418).

Being aware that foreign assistance and recognition from other European countries would help the United States fight and achieve additional victories in the War of Independence, the Declaration of Independence convinced, in a large scale, the French government to engage in the American Revolutionary War by providing loans, arms, troops, and commanders. The most important of these French commanders was The Marquis de Lafayette, whose generalship at the Battle of Yorktown in Virginia, in October 1781, helped draw the British commander, Lord Charles Cornwallis, into a trap that led to Cornwallis's surrender, which effectively ended the war (Marcovitz, 2015, pp. 68- 9).

The structure and wording of the declaration helped convince the French that the American cause was worth supporting. In August 1776, American emissaries in France published both the Declaration of Independence and Common Sense in Affaires de l'Angleterre et de l'Amérique, a French periodical. Moreover, Benjamin Franklin arrived in France in December 1776; He was charged with the task of enlisting French aid, using his negotiating skills and magnetic personality to charm French officials. Outraged by the French defeat in French and Indian War, King Louis XVI sought revenge for his country. The French Monarch believed the ouster of the British from the American colonies would weaken Great Britain economically, he; therefore, wanted to exploit that option. On February 6, 1778, France signed the Treaty of Alliance, which formally recognized the American independence, and pledged financial and military assistance for the United States (Marcovitz, 2015, p. 70).

Following the Battle of Yorktown, The Marquis De La Lafayette returned to France and found the concepts of liberty, freedom, and democracy had gained attraction and appreciation among the French people who called for establishing of democracy like the American style.

While still in the United States, Lafayette had been close friend to many of the delegates to the Continental Congress, including Jefferson by whom he was greatly influenced. In 1789, the French Revolution broke out; The king was forced to make many concessions to the rising democratic movement. He ordered the creation of a National Assembly composed of the common people. On August 27, 1789, the National Assembly adopted the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (*Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen*) (Brannigan, 2014, p. 13).

Written in part by the Marquis De La Lafayette, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen included many points that are drawn directly from the Declaration of Independence. The French document declares, 'Men are born and remain free and equal in rights,' and that all men are entitled to 'liberty, property, security, and resistance of oppression' (Durant and Durant, 1975, p. 23).

The American Revolution War was the first outbreak which transmitted the ideas of sovereignty, freedom, liberty, and human rights across the world in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this context, Armitage (2007), assumed that the ideas which appeared in the Declaration of Independence became mostly used in political discourses in modern times. Its influence spread first to the countries of the Caribbean and; then, to Spanish America. When revolutions broke out in Latin American countries, the revolutionaries drafted their declarations of independence which marked the aspirations of freedom, liberty, and human rights. These declarations stated a desire for independence as a *fait accompli*. Like the US Declaration of Independence, nationalist groups in Latin American stated grievances to justify their desire to independence (p. 104).

It is worth recalling that the American Revolutionary War presented a good example which impacted Latin American countries; in particular, to revolt against the Spanish colonizers. After the United States got its independence, Chanaud (1949) reported that commercial relationships

existed between the United States and Latin American colonies. In the period from 1788 to 1796, it was reported that twenty- six Bostonian ships harbored into the ports of Chili. From 1797 to 1809, the number increased to two hundred and twenty- six ships. In 1805, twenty- two US ships reached Montevideo (pp. 63- 4).

In 1795, commercial relationships between the United States and Latin America counted for \$1.389.219 for exportation, and \$1.739.138 for importation. In 1801, exportation rate rose to \$8.434.659. Through the development of commercial relationships, revolutionary ideals about the American Revolutionary War and the Declaration of Independence were transmitted in the Southern American countries, which were subjected to Spanish rule. Therefore, the revolutionaries in Latin America stood and declared their independence because of the Spanish oppressive measures which were carried on them (Chanaud, 1949, p. 65). To achieve complete independence, revolutionary leaders; such as, Simon Bolivar (1783- 1830) and José de San Martin (1778- 1850) led revolutionary movements and waged revolutions in Venezuela and Argentina, which brought independence to both countries in 1818- for Argentina, and 1819- for Venezuela (Chanaud, 1949, pp. 78- 9).

Conclusion:

The historical documents of the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence played a pivotal role in the formation of a solid, unified resistance against the British policy. In addition, they served as a precursor of the American Revolutionary War. Drafted after the Intolerable Acts, the Suffolk Resolves reflected the growing discontent of American colonists who felt threatened by Parliamentary attempts. The colonists were afraid that the British Parliament, while exerting control over them, would take their liberties and properties out of them. Furthermore, the Suffolk Resolves deepened the divide between Great Britain and the American colonies.

On the other hand, the Declaration of Independence announced the total separation between Great Britain and its American colonies, becoming a new republic of the United States of America. Listing colonial grievances, the writers of the Declaration of Independence announced to the world their ultimate objective: To seek independence for saving America from a corrupt Monarchy of Great Britain.

Moreover, both of the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence are similar in the following elements:

- ✚ Many of the important grievances listed in the Suffolk Resolves were echoed in the Declaration of Independence;
- ✚ Both documents raised and shared concerns of the issues of (1) taxation without representation, (2) the establishment of standing armies, and (3) due process of law;
- ✚ The call of taking up arms to defend colonial rights and properties was raised in the Suffolk Resolves, fully declared in the Declaration of Independence, and manifested when the American Revolutionary War commenced.

General Conclusion

The present research analyzed the emergence of the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts in the period. Being labelled the 'Spirit of America,' the city of Massachusetts has been associated with the history of the American Revolution. As a matter of fact, resistance to the British government's imperial policies had already started from the Province of Massachusetts. It emerged in political form, and; then, escalated into armed revolution. Additionally, the major events which characterized the American Revolution; such as, the Stamp Act Crisis, the Boston Massacre, and the Boston Tea Party, had occurred in Massachusetts. Therefore, through studying the American Revolution in the Province of Massachusetts, the researchers explored the origins of the American Revolution in Massachusetts. Moreover, the researchers' aim was to find out how Massachusetts' colonists succeeded to direct the revolution against the British Government and its imperial policies which were implemented shortly after 1763. The researchers; also, analyzed the different measures and tactics used by Massachusetts' colonists in their revolution.

In the present study, the research hypotheses were confirmed. During the revolutionary era, the Province of Massachusetts had played a major role in directing the American Revolution, promoting the revolution throughout the American colonies, and making from the cause of Massachusetts the cause of America. Thus, Massachusetts convinced the rest of the colonies that fighting Great Britain is saving America from a corrupt British Monarchy.

As stated in the research above, the American Revolution had emerged in the aforementioned province because of some historical, political, ideological, and economic reasons. Historically, it is worth noting that since Massachusetts had been the third oldest colony which had been established in North America, the Puritans succeeded to develop an independent spirit. In the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the Puritans became being self-reliant on

their own government in managing colonial affairs. They depended on their own established legislature to enact taxes. This principal of self- government reflected the political freedom which existed in the colony since its establishment. As a matter of fact, the aforementioned historical factor contributed to the rise of the American Revolution in Massachusetts, which led the revolutionary movement.

Ideologically, the central conflict was; however, over principles of government between Great Britain and its American thirteen colonies: the issue of sovereignty over North America. This; in fact, was mainly manifested in practical politics in conflicts over taxation and representation, revenue and regulation, freedom and subordination. Therefore, the core debate of the was American Revolution centered over the issue whether the American thirteen colonies should, or should not be subjected to the British Parliamentary Acts. Political resistance which emerged during the American Revolution crystallized the British attempts to rule the American colonies, from one hand, and; from the other hand, the American colonists' determination to preserve their inherited rights of freedom and self- rule.

During the revolutionary period, Massachusetts' colonists resisted and opposed the British Government Acts and policies so as to preserve their inherited political tradition of self- government. Their struggle emphasized Massachusetts colonists' denial of submission to the British Crown, Government, and Parliament which relied on taxes to raise money and revenue because of the French and Indian War's expenses.

Another factor which sparked the American Revolution from Massachusetts was the fact that Massachusetts' colonists were largely influenced by the ideas of Enlightenment, especially those related to politics and government. Thus, using these ideas, they succeeded to formulate legal and political grounds for their revolution. From Massachusetts, there emerged patriots and radicals who led revolution against the British Government's policies. Men like Samuel Adams,

John Hancock, and John Adams succeeded to promote their ideology and their revolutionary ideas among the colonists so as to make them join their opposition to the British policies.

Furthermore, these patriots were intelligent and clever in practical matters. Accordingly, they achieved successes in their organization and direction of the American Revolution in the following steps:

- ✚ The emergence of random and unexpected riots and resistance activities. This; in fact, is best illustrated in violent activities which followed colonial reaction toward the Stamp Act (1765). Fierce riots rose in Boston. This resistance which was led by the *Sons of Liberty* compelled stamp collectors to resign or flee, and even threatened colonial governors like Thomas Hutchinson;
- ✚ The implementation of non- importation agreements and commercial boycotts by Bostonian traders. In fact, these measures arose as a reaction to the *Townshend Acts* (1767), and were advocated by the Boston Town Meeting. After being firstly adopted in Boston in March 1768, non- importation agreements and boycotts extended to the rest of the American. These measures were used by Bostonians as a means to force the British Parliament to repeal the Townshend Acts (1767), and other revenue taxes;
- ✚ The creation of the Committees of Correspondence for the purpose of exchanging communication and strategies and measures with towns and the colonies. Established by Samuel Adams in Boston, the main purpose was to fully organize and plan resistance to the British Parliamentary taxes with the other colonies. The role and importance of the Committee of Correspondence during the *American Revolution* (1763- 1775) was described to be as ‘... the source of the rebellion. I saw the small seed when it was planted. It was as a grain of mustard. I have watched the plant until it has become as a great tree’ (Nevis & Commager, 1945, p. 72);

✚ The creation of the Massachusetts' Provincial Congress; namely, the Revolutionary Legislature. The latter was responsible for preparing for the revolutionary outbreak in Lexington and Concord through (1) calling militiamen to start military drills so as to be ready at any minute's notice, (2) setting up the Committee of Safety to direct the Minutemen, and (3) establishing the Committee of Supplies with the duty of providing the Minutemen with the necessary logistics and military equipment and arms.

It is worth to mention that the American Revolution did not occur randomly. However, it was well- organized and better planned. Drafting the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence meant that the leading patriots in Massachusetts used these tools as revolutionary means to promote their ideology. The above- mentioned documents crystallized the American struggle for protecting individual rights, liberties, and freedom which were threatened by the British Government's policies. Moreover, these documents insisted on measures and steps which the Americans would take to preserve their inherited tradition of self- government. Therefore, drafting the Suffolk Resolves and the Declaration of Independence made Massachusetts unite colonial populations throughout the thirteen colonies as one front against Great Britain. Clearly, American unity was best seen in the creation of the Continental Congress which acted as the government of the American colonies, and the Continental Army which fought in the American Revolutionary War.

As a conclusion, the American Revolution, which emerged in the Province of Massachusetts, transformed Massachusetts from an old British colony to an American State. This transition is reflected in the period from 1763 to 1775 during which the revolutionary era took place.

References

- Adams, J. T. (1923). *Revolutionary New England, 1691- 1775*. Boston, MA: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Alden, J. R. (1944, April). 'Why the march to Concord?' *American Historical Review*, 49(3), 446– 454. Retrived from <https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr/49.3.446>
- Allison, R. (2011). *The American Revolution: A Concise History*. Oxford, NY: OUP.
- Ammerman, D. (1974). *In the Common cause: American response to the Coercive Acts of 1774*. NY: Norton.
- Andrews, C. M. (1938). *The colonial period of the American History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Andrews, J. L. Jr. M. D. & Contributors. (2002). *Revolutionary Boston, Lexington, and Concord, The Shots Heard' Round the World*. (3rd Ed.). Boston, MA: Commonwealth Editions.
- Archer, R. (2010). *As If an enemy's Country: The British Occupation of Boston and the Origins of Revolution*. NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Armitage, D. (2007). *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Axelrod, A. (1998). *Invitation to a Tea Party: Complete Idiot's Guide to American History*. NY: Simon & Schuster McMillan Company.
- Bailyn, B. (1967). *The ideological origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bailyn, B. (1968). *The origins of independence*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Bailyn, B. (Jan. 1992). 'Political experience and Enlightenment ideas in Eighteenth Century America'. *The American Historical Review*, 67(2), 339- 351. DOI:10.2307/1843427

- Barrow, T. C. (1965, January). 'Background to the Grenville Program, 1757-1763.' *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 22(1). pp. 93- 104. Williamsburg, VA: Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture.
- Beach, S. (1965). *Samuel Adams: The Fateful Years 1764- 1776*. NY: Dodd, Mead & Company.
- Beeman, R. R. (2013). *Our Lives, Our Fortunes and Our Sacred Honor: The Forging of American Independence, 1774-1776*. (1st Ed.). NY: Basic Books.
- Bërdufi, N. & Desara Dushi. (2015, November). 'Social Contract and the Governments Legitimacy'. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. MCSER Publishing, 6(6), 392- 8. DOI: 10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s1p392
- Bliven, B. Jr. (1958). *The American Revolution 1760- 1783*. NY: Random House.
- Bonwick, C. (1977). *English radicals and the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Bowen, G. (2009). 'Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method.' *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27- 40. DOI:10.3316/QRJ0902027
- Branson, S. (2007). *From Daughters of Liberty to Women in the Republic: American Women in the Era of the American Revolution*. New Brunswick, Canada: Rutgers University Press.
- Brannigan, G. (2014). *An Analysis of the Declaration of Independence*. (Unpublished master dissertation, Suny Brockport University, NY). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/Honors/90>
- Bernstein, R. B. (2004). *Thomas Jefferson: The Revolution of Ideas*. NY: OUP.
- Breen, T. H. (2010). *American Insurgents, American Patriots: The Revolution of the People*. NY: Hill and Wang.

- Broadwater, J. (2006). *George Mason: Forgotten Founder*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Brogan, H. (1990). *The penguin history of the United States*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bullion, J. L. (1982). *A great and necessary measure: George Grenville and the genesis of the Stamp Act, 1763- 1765*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Butterfield, L. H. (Ed.). (1961). *The Adams Papers, Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*. (Vol. II, 1771–1781). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cary, J. (1961). *Joseph Warren: Physician, Politician, Patriot*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Chanaud, P. (1949). *Histoire de l'Amérique Latine*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Chidsey, D. B. (1965). *The great separation: The story of the Boston Tea Party and the beginning of the American Revolution*. NY: Crown Publishers. Inc.
- Colin, J. R. (1984). *The American past*. NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Countryman, E. (1985). *The American Revolution*. London: Penguin Books.
- Cranston, M. (1985). *John Locke: A biography*. Oxford, NY: OUP.
- Cushing, A. (Ed.). (1904). *The writings of John Adams*. NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Curti, M. (1964). *The growth of the American thought*. (3rd Ed.) NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Curtis, W. E. (1901). *The True Thomas Jefferson*. PA: J. B. Lippincott Company.
- Dallek, R. Jesus Garcia, Donna M. Ogle, & C. Frederick Risinger. (2008). *American History*. IL: McDougal Littell, a division of Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Dickinson, A. (1975). *The Massachusetts Colony*. NY: Franklin Watts.

- Di Spigna, C. (2018). *Founding Martyr: The life and death of Dr. Joseph Warren, the American Revolution's lost hero*. NY: Crown Publishing Group.
- Donoghue, B. (1964). *British Politics and the American Revolution: The Path to War, 1773- 75*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.
- Durant, W. & Ariel Durant. (1975). *The Age of Napoleon*. NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Edmund, M. S. & Helen M. Morgan. (1959). *The Stamp Act crisis: Prologue to the revolution, 1764- 1766*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Elson, H. W. (1904). *History of the United States of America*. NY: Mac Millan Company.
- Ellis, G. E. (1888). *The Puritan age and rule in the colony of Massachusetts Bay 1629- 1685*. NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Ferguson, R. A. (1957). *The American Enlightenment 1750- 1820*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fischer, S. G. (1902). *The struggle for American Revolution*. (Vol. I). Free Port, NY: Books for Libraries Press.
- Ford, W. C. (1905). *Journals of the Continental Congress 1774- 1779*. (Vol. II). Washington. D. C.: Government Printing Office:
- Freidel F. & Henry N., Drewry. (1970). *America, A Modern History of the United States*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Company.
- Galvin, J. R. (1996). *The Minutemen, The first fight: Myths and realities of the American Revolution*. Dulles, VA: Brassey's. Inc.
- Gentleman's Magazine*. (1774, November). Retrieved from <http://www.rarenewspapers.com/view/559395?imagelist=1>.
- Griffin, S. (2018). *Joseph Warren: An American Hero*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Hacker, L. M. (1985, September). 'The first American Revolution'. *Columbia University Quarterly*, XXXVII(3), Part I, 72- 8.

Hackett, D. F. (1994). *Paul Revere's Ride*. NY: OUP.

Hallahan, W. H. (2001). *The day of the American Revolution began, 19 April 1775*. NY: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

Harlow, R. V. (1975). *Samuel Adams Promoter of the American Revolution: A Study in Psychology and Politics*. NY: Octagon Books.

Hart, A. B. (1927). *Commonwealth history of Massachusetts; Colony, Province, and State*. NY: The State History.

Hayes, K. J. (2008). *The road to Monticello: the life and mind of Thomas Jefferson*. NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

'His Majesty's most gracious speech to both houses of Parliament, October 27, 1775 [New York? 1775]'. *Library of the Congress*. Retrieved from <https://tile.loc.gov/storage-services/service/rbc/rbpe10/rbpe108/10803800/10803800.pdf>

Holland, R. Victor M. Sabourin, Chirag D. Gandhi, Peter W. Carmel, & Charles J. Prestigiacomo. (2015). 'Joseph Warren: a discussion of his life and analysis of his death'. *Neurosurgical Focus*, 39(1): E13. Retrieved from <http://thejns.org/doi/abs/10.3171/2015.3.FOCUS1564>

Hoskins, A. (Ed.). (2014). *The Founding of the United States*. (Vol. I). Richmond Hill, WV: Imagine Publishing Ltd.

Howard, G. E. (1905). *Preliminaries of the Revolution, 1763- 1775*. NY: AMS.

Jamestown Yorktown Foundation. (2014). *Road to Revolution 1760- 1775*. Retrieved from <https://www.historyisfun.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/03/RoadtoRevolution.pdf>

- Jefferson, T. (1914). *Autobiography of Thomas Jefferson 1743- 1790. Together with A Summary of the Chief Events in Jefferson s Life*. Introd. Paul Leicester Ford. Foreword, George Haven Putnam. NY: G. P. Putnam & Sons.
- Journals of the Continental Congress 1774- 1789*. (1907). Edited from the original records in the Library of Congress by Worthington Chauncey Ford, Chief, Division of manuscripts. (Vol.) IX. (October 3- December 31, 1777). Washington D. C.: Washington Government Printing Office.
- Kachun, M. (2017). *First Martyr of Liberty: Crispus Attucks in American Memory*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kee, S. Mc. (1965). *American history to 1865*. NJ: Little Field, Adams & Co.
- Ketchum, R. M. (1999). *Decisive day, The Battle for Bunker Hill*. NY: OWL Books, Henry Holt and Company.
- King, D. C. Mariah Marvin, David Weitzman, & Toni Dwiggin. (1986). *United States History*. Boston, MA: Addison- Wesley Publishing Company. Inc.
- Knox, D. M. (2015). *The Suffolk Resolves: A neglected catalyst of the American Revolution*. (Unpublished BA Thesis, Angelo State University). Retrieved from <https://asu-ir.tdl.org/asu-ir/bitstream/handle/2346.1/30410/Knox.Honors%20Thesis.Final.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y>.
- Labaree, B. W. (1964). *The Boston Tea Party*. NY: OUP.
- Laslett, P. (1975). *Locke's Two Treaties of Civil Government*. Cambridge, MA: CUP.
- Latham, E. (1956). *The Declaration of Independence*. Boston, MA: D. C. Heath & Company.
- Lemay, J. A., L. (1993). *An early American reader*. Washington. D. C.: United States Information Agency.

- Lincoln, W. (Ed.). (1838). *The Journals of each Provincial Congress of Massachusetts in 1774 and 1775: and of the Committee of Safety, with an appendix, containing the Proceedings of the County Conventions Narratives of the Events of the Nineteenth of April, 1775- Paper relating to Ticonderoga and Crown Point, and other documents.* Boston, Dutton and Wentworth: Printers to the State.
- Locke, J. (1823). *Two Treatises of Government.* London: Thomas Tegg.
- Maier, P. (1972). *Colonial radicals and the development of American opposition to Britain, 1765- 1776.* NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Maier, P. (1972). *From Resistance to Revolution Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition to Britain, 1765-1776.* NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Marcovitz, H. (2015). *The Declaration of Independence.* CA: Reference Point Press, Inc.
- Martin, J. K & Mark E. Lender. (2006). *A Respectable Army: The Military Origins of the Republic, 1763-1789.* Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson.
- Marx, K. (2010). 'The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850.' In Cohen, Maurice Cornforth, Maurice Dobb, E. J. Hobsbawm, James Klugmann, and Margaret Mynatt. (Eds.). *Marx & Engels Collected Works, 10,* 45- 145. London: Lawrence & Wishart Electric Book.
- Marx, R. (1967). *Histoire du Royaume- Uni.* Paris: Librairie Armand Colin.
- McFarland, P. (1998). *The Brave Bostonians: Hutchinson, Quincy, Franklin, and the Coming of the American Revolution.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Merrill, J. (1968). *The Founding of a Nation: A History of the American Revolution.* NY: OUP.
- Michael, G. Mc., Crews, F., Levenson J. C., Marx L., & Smith, D. E. (1985). *A concise anthology of American Literature.* NY: Mc Millan Publishing Company, Inc.
- Middlekauff, R. (2005). *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution 1763- 1789.* Revised and Expanded Edition. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Miller, J. C. (1943). *The origins of the American Revolution*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.

Morris, R. B. (1963). *The New World*. NY: Time- Life Books.

Mousnier, R. Ernest Labrousse, & Marc Bouloiseau. (1986). *Le XVIII siècle, l'époque de lumières (1715- 1815)*. Trans. Youssef A. Dagher & Farid M. Dagher. Beyrouth: Editions Oueidat.

Nardo, D. (1999). *The Declaration of Independence: A Model for Individual Rights*. San Diego, CA: Lucent Books.

Nevis, A. & Henry Steele Commager. (1945). *A pocket history of the United States of America*. NY: Random House, Inc.

Nixon, R. R. L. K. & James B. Rhoads. (1970). *The formation of the Union*. Washington D. C.: The National Archives of the US.

Nolan, J., C. (1963). *The shot heard round the world: The story of Lexington and Concord*. NY: Julian Messenger.

Phelan, C. (2021, May). 'Boston and Beyond: Massachusetts in the Revolutionary War'. *Explorethearchive.com*. Retrieved from <https://explorethearchive.com/massachusetts-Boston-revolutionary-war>

Puls, M. (2006). *Samuel Adams Father of the American Revolution*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rakove, J. (1979). *The Beginning of National Politics: An Interpretive History of the Continental Congress*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Randall, W. S. (2014). *Thomas Jefferson: A Life*. (2014). (1st Ed.). NY: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.

Rice University. (2014). *US History*. Houston, TX: OpenStax College.

- Rogers, G. A. J. (2021, January 13). 'John Locke'. *Encyclopedia Britannica. com*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Locke>
- 'Sarah Bradlee Fulton' (2017). *Boston Tea Party Ships and Museum*. Retrieved from <https://www.bostontepartyship.com/sarah-bradlee-fulton>
- Schmidt, L. E. (2001). *Religion, Illusion, and the American Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stanlis, P. J. (1976). 'British views of the American Revolution: A conflict over right and sovereignty'. *Early American Literature*, 2(11), 179- 205.
- Sullivan, R. (1966, April). 'Early on an April Morning'. *Yankee*, 60(4), 68- 87.
- 'The American Revolution'. (1997). *World Book Encyclopaedia*. Chicago, IL: World Book Inc., pp. 270- 3.
- Thomas, P. D. G. (1985, February). 'George III and the American Revolution.' *History*, 70 (228), 16- 31.
- Tourtellot, A. B. (2000). *Lexington and Concord: The beginning of the war of the American Revolution*. NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Trevelyan, G. M. (1987). *A shortened history of England*. London: Penguin Books.
- Tushnet, M. V. (2010). '*A Decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind*': Referring to Foreign Law to Express American Nationhood. Retrieved from <https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/231/>
- Webster, M. P. & Charles R. Morris. (1973). *The Story of the Suffolk Resolves*. Milton, MA.: Massachusetts Historical Commission.
- Wright, R. K., Jr. (1983). *The continental army*. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- Young, R. (1996). *The real patriots of the American Revolution*. Dillon, NJ: Parsippany.

Appendices

Appendix A: The Suffolk Resolves

Joseph Warren, 1774

At a meeting of the delegates of every town & district in the county of Suffolk, on Tuesday the 6th of September, at the house of Mr. Richard Woodward, of Deadham, & by adjournment, at the house of Mr. [Daniel] Vose, of Milton, on Friday the 9th instant, Joseph Palmer, esq. being chosen moderator, and William Thompson, esq. clerk, a committee was chosen to bring in a report to the convention, and the following being several times read, and put paragraph by paragraph, was unanimously voted, viz.

Whereas the power but not the justice, the vengeance but not the wisdom of Great Britain, which of old persecuted, scourged, and exiled our fugitive parents from their native shores, now pursues us, their guiltless children, with unrelenting severity: And whereas, this, then savage and uncultivated desart, was purchased by the toil and treasure, or acquired by the blood and valor of those our venerable progenitors; to us they bequeathed the dearbought inheritance, to our care and protection they consigned it, and the most sacred obligations are upon us to transmit the glorious purchase, unfettered by power, unclogged with shackles, to our innocent and beloved offspring. On the fortitude, on the wisdom and on the exertions of this important day, is suspended the fate of this new world, and of unborn millions. If a boundless extent of continent, swarming with millions, will tamely submit to live, move and have their being at the arbitrary will of a licentious minister, they basely yield to voluntary slavery, and future generations shall load their memories with incessant execrations.--On the other hand, if we arrest the hand which would ransack our pockets, if we disarm the parricide which points the

dagger to our bosoms, if we nobly defeat that fatal edict which proclaims a power to frame laws for us in all cases whatsoever, thereby entailing the endless and numberless curses of slavery upon us, our heirs and their heirs forever; if we successfully resist that unparalleled usurpation of unconstitutional power, whereby our capital is robbed of the means of life; whereby the streets of Boston are thronged with military executioners; whereby our coasts are lined and harbours crowded with ships of war; whereby the charter of the colony, that sacred barrier against the encroachments of tyranny, is mutilated and, in effect, annihilated; whereby a murderous law is framed to shelter villains from the hands of justice; whereby the unalienable and inestimable inheritance, which we derived from nature, the constitution of Britain, and the privileges warranted to us in the charter of the province, is totally wrecked, annulled, and vacated, posterity will acknowledge that virtue which preserved them free and happy; and while we enjoy the rewards and blessings of the faithful, the torrent of panegyrists will roll our reputations to that latest period, when the streams of time shall be absorbed in the abyss of eternity.--Therefore, we have resolved, and do resolve,

1. That whereas his majesty, George the Third, is the rightful successor to the throne of Great-Britain, and justly entitled to the allegiance of the British realm, and agreeable to compact, of the English colonies in America--therefore, we, the heirs and successors of the first planters of this colony, do cheerfully acknowledge the said George the Third to be our rightful sovereign, and that said covenant is the tenure and claim on which are founded our allegiance and submission.
2. That it is an indispensable duty which we owe to God, our country, ourselves and posterity, by all lawful ways and means in our power to maintain, defend and preserve those civil and religious rights and liberties, for which many of our fathers fought, bled and died, and to hand them down entire to future generations.

3. That the late acts of the British parliament for blocking up the harbour of Boston, for altering the established form of government in this colony, and for screening the most flagitious violators of the laws of the province from a legal trial, are gross infractions of those rights to which we are justly entitled by the laws of nature, the British constitution, and the charter of the province.
4. That no obedience is due from this province to either or any part of the acts abovementioned, but that they be rejected as the attempts of a wicked administration to enslave America.
5. That so long as the justices of our superior court of judicature, court of assize, & c. and inferior court of common pleas in this county are appointed, or hold their places, by any other tenure than that which the charter and the laws of the province direct, they must be considered as under undue influence, and are therefore unconstitutional officers, and, as such, no regard ought to be paid to them by the people of this county.
6. That if the justices of the superior court of judicature, assize, &c. justices of the court of common pleas, or of the general sessions of the peace, shall sit and act during their present disqualified state, this county will support, and bear harmless, all sheriffs and their deputies, constables, jurors and other officers who shall refuse to carry into execution the orders of said courts; and, as far as possible, to prevent the many inconveniencies which must be occasioned by a suspension of the courts of justice, we do most earnestly recommend it to all creditors, that they shew all reasonable and even generous forbearance to their debtors; and to all debtors, to pay their just debts with all possible speed, and if any disputes relative to debts or trespasses shall arise, which cannot be settled by the parties, we recommend it to them to submit all such causes to arbitration; and it is our opinion that the contending parties or either of them, who shall refuse so to do, ought to be considered as co-operating with the enemies of this country.

7. That it be recommended to the collectors of taxes, constables and all other officers, who have public monies in their hands, to retain the same, and not to make any payment thereof to the provincial county treasurer until the civil government of the province is placed upon a constitutional foundation, or until it shall otherwise be ordered by the proposed provincial Congress.
8. That the persons who have accepted seats at the council board, by virtue of a mandamus from the King, in conformity to the late act of the British parliament, entitled, an act for the regulating the government of the Massachusetts- Bay, have acted in direct violation of the duty they owe to their country, and have thereby given great and just offence to this people; therefore, resolved, that this county do recommend it to all persons, who have so highly offended by accepting said departments, and have not already publicly resigned their seats at the council board, to make public resignations of their places at said board, on or before the 20th day of this instant, September; and that all persons refusing so to do, shall, from and after said day, be considered by this county as obstinate and incorrigible enemies to this country.
9. That the fortifications begun and now carrying on upon Boston Neck, are justly alarming to this county, and gives us reason to apprehend some hostile intention against that town, more especially as the commander in chief has, in a very extraordinary manner, removed the powder from the magazine at Charlestown, and has also forbidden the keeper of the magazine at Boston, to deliver out to the owners, the powder, which they had lodged in said magazine.
10. That the late act of parliament for establishing the Roman Catholic religion and the French laws in that extensive country, now called Canada, is dangerous in an extreme degree to the Protestant religion and to the civil rights and liberties of all America; and,

therefore, as men and Protestant Christians, we are indispensably obliged to take all proper measures for our security.

- 11.** That whereas our enemies have flattered themselves that they shall make an easy prey of this numerous, brave and hardy people, from an apprehension that they are unacquainted with military discipline; we, therefore, for the honour, defence and security of this county and province, advise, as it has been recommended to take away all commissions from the officers of the militia, that those who now hold commissions, or such other persons, be elected in each town as officers in the militia, as shall be judged of sufficient capacity for that purpose, and who have evidenced themselves the inflexible friends to the rights of the people; and that the inhabitants of those towns and districts, who are qualified, do use their utmost diligence to acquaint themselves with the art of war as soon as possible, and do, for that purpose, appear under arms at least once every week.
- 12.** That during the present hostile appearances on the part of Great-Britain, notwithstanding the many insults and oppressions which we most sensibly resent, yet, nevertheless, from our affection to his majesty, which we have at all times evidenced, we are determined to act merely upon the defensive, so long as such conduct may be vindicated by reason and the principles of self-preservation, but no longer.
- 13.** That, as we understand it has been in contemplation to apprehend sundry persons of this county, who have rendered themselves conspicuous in contending for the violated rights and liberties of their countrymen; we do recommend, should such an audacious measure be put in practice, to seize and keep in safe custody, every servant of the present tyrannical and unconstitutional government throughout the county and province, until the persons so apprehended be liberated from the bands of our adversaries, and restored safe and uninjured to their respective friends and families.

- 14.** That until our rights are fully restored to us, we will, to the utmost of our power, and we recommend the same to the other counties, to withhold all commercial intercourse with Great- Britain, Ireland, and the West-Indies, and abstain from the consumption of British merchandise and manufactures, and especially of East-Indies, and piece goods, with such additions, alterations, and exceptions only, as the General Congress of the colonies may agree to.
- 15.** That under our present circumstances, it is incumbent on us to encourage arts and manufactures amongst us, by all means in our power, and that be and are hereby appointed a committee, to consider of the best ways and means to promote and establish the same, and to report to this convention as soon as may be.
- 16.** That the exigencies of our public affairs, demand that a provincial Congress be called to consult such measures as may be adopted, and vigorously executed by the whole people; and we do recommend it to the several towns in this county, to chuse members for such a provincial Congress, to be holden at Concord, on the second Tuesday of October, next ensuing.
- 17.** That this county, confiding in the wisdom and integrity of the continental Congress, now sitting at Philadelphia, pay all due respect and submission to such measures as may be recommended by them to the colonies, for the restoration and establishment of our just rights, civil and religious, and for renewing that harmony and union between Great Britain and the colonies, so earnestly wished for by all good men.
- 18.** That whereas the universal uneasiness which prevails among all orders of men, arising from the wicked and oppressive measures of the present administration, may influence some unthinking persons to commit outrage upon private property; we would heartily recommend to all persons of this community, not to engage in any routs, riots, or licentious attacks upon the properties of any person whatsoever, as being subversive of

all order and government; but, by a steady, manly, uniform, and persevering opposition, to convince our enemies, that in a contest so important, in a cause so solemn, our conduct shall be such as to merit the approbation of the wise, and the admiration of the brave and free of every age and of every country.

- 19.** That should our enemies, by any sudden manoeuvres, render it necessary to ask the aid and assistance of our brethren in the country, some one of the committee of correspondence, or a select man of such town, or the town adjoining, where such hostilities shall commence, or shall be expected to commence, shall despatch couriers with written messages to the select men, or committees of correspondence, of the several towns in the vicinity, with a written account of such matter, who shall despatch others to committees more remote, until proper and sufficient assistance be obtained, and that the expense of said couriers be defrayed by the county, until proper and sufficient assistance be obtained, and that the expense of said couriers be defrayed by the county, until it shall be otherwise ordered by the provincial Congress.

Appendix B: The Declaration of Independence

IN CONGRESS, JULY 4, 1776

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen United States of America

WHEN in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,— That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the

necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their acts of pretended Legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, Establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our

connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

WE, THEREFORE, the Representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Signed by ORDER and in BEHALF of the CONGRESS, JOHN HANCOCK, President.

Attest. CHARLES THOMSON, Secretary

الملخص

تعتبر الثورة الأمريكية أبرز حدث ميز القرن الثامن عشر، فقد جاءت نتيجة لعصر التنوير، والذي يعتبر بدوره نقطة تحول رئيسية في تاريخ أوروبا والحضارة الغربية. لقد تمخض عن الثورة الأمريكية مبادئ جديدة تتعلق بالحوكمة، وعلاقة الحاكم بالمحكومين، والضرائب والتمثيل النيابي، والحرية، الحقوق، والحريات الفردية. على الرغم من أن الثورة الأمريكية أدت إلى انفصال المستعمرات البريطانية في أمريكا عن التاج البريطاني، إلا أن هذا الانفصال لم يكن وليد الصدفة، بل كان نتيجة لسلسلة من الأحداث التي بدأت وتصاعدت منذ سنة 1763. تاريخياً، لا يمكن دراسة الثورة الأمريكية بمعزل عن مستعمرة ماساتشوستس. فجميع الأحداث والوقائع التي ميزت الثورة الأمريكية وقعت في هذه المستعمرة. الشيء الذي يجعلنا نعتقد اعتقاداً جازماً أن هذه المستعمرة لعبت دوراً رئيسياً في إطلاق شرارة الثورة الأمريكية، كما أنها نجحت في توحيد باقي المستعمرات ضد الحكومة البريطانية وأقنعتها بخوض حرب الاستقلال وإعلان وثيقة الاستقلال والانفصال عن التاج البريطاني.

تناقش هذه المذكرة ظهور الثورة الأمريكية في مستعمرة ماساتشوستس، وذلك من خلال تسليط الضوء على الأسباب والذوابع التي جعلت من هذه المستعمرة تقود الثورة الأمريكية والوسائل والأليات التي استخدمها قادة النضال في هذه المستعمرة لقيادة وتوجيه الثورة الأمريكية.

اعتمد الباحثان على المنهج التاريخي في دراسة وتحليل أحداث الثورة الأمريكية في مستعمرة ماساتشوستس. إضافة إلى ذلك، استخدم الباحثان تحليل مضمون الوثائق التاريخية كأداة تكميلية لتحليل مضمون وثيقة قرارات سوفلك ووثيقة الاستقلال التاريخية وكيف ساهمتا في أحداث الثورة الأمريكية التي اندلعت من مستعمرة ماساتشوستس. خلصت الدراسة إلى أن أحداث الثورة الأمريكية في مستعمرة ماساتشوستس ساعدت على رسم مستقبل الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. فقد كان الدافع الأساسي للنضال هو الاستقلال والانفصال من أجل تشكيل حكومة تحمي الأفراد، الحقوق، الممتلكات، والحريات الفردية.

الكلمات الرئيسية: الثورة الأمريكية، بريطانيا العظمى، ليكسينغتون وكونكورد، مستعمرة ماساتشوستس.