American Colonial Committees of Correspondence: Encountering Oppression, Exploring Unity, and Exchanging Visions of the Future

Ben Warford-Johnston
Gentry Junior High, Baytown, Texas
Junior Division Historical Paper, National History Day 2016 Competition

The complete accomplishment of it in so short a time and by such simple means was perhaps a singular example in the history of mankind. Thirteen clocks were made to strike together: a perfection of mechanism, which no artist had ever before effected.

- John Adams

For a century and a half, the relationship between Great Britain and the American colonies was a quiet one. While the mother country had long asserted the right to regulate her imperial child, few impositions were made, which enabled the colonies to experiment with self-rule. This period of exploration abruptly ceased at the conclusion of the French and Indian War when King George III attempted to reassert dominion. As revenue-generating taxes and measures to control colonial governments thundered from across the Atlantic, his decrees conflicted with the notions of liberty and autonomy that had become integral to the American ethos. Rather than suffering in silence, colonists began denouncing perceived oppression, and in doing so, they recognized that they were not alone. Individual frustrations accumulated into community calls for change. Grievances amassed, momentum spread, and protests reverberated throughout the colonies. Between the pivotal years of 1772 and 1774, hundreds of committees of correspondence formed to facilitate communication and amplify demands. They networked the provinces, which ultimately resulted in the Continental Congress where representatives began speaking against Great Britain with one resounding voice. Indeed, through the colonial committees of correspondence, our Founders encountered British oppression, explored American unity, and exchanged visions of the future that would become the foundation of our nation.
Encountering Oppression: Collective Action Bolsters Early Resistance Against Taxation

From 1607 to 1763, Great Britain’s policy of salutary neglect enabled self-government to prevail throughout the American colonies.² Domestic affairs were largely left to provincial legislatures, and laws imposed by Parliament were often evaded.³ As a result, colonists acquiesced to imperial policies, regardless if they disagreed in principle. Acceptance diminished in the 1760s, however, when Britain passed seven acts deemed subversive of American rights.⁴ These were designed to offset the military expenditures incurred in the French and Indian War and included the 1764 Sugar Act, an indirect tax on sugar-related products with strict enforcement mechanisms, and the 1765 Stamp Act, a direct tax that required embossed revenue stamps on every printed paper.⁵

The colonial response to these newly encountered measures would set the precedent for future rebellion. A growing subset began to argue that taxation without colonial representation in Parliament was tyranny and mobilized active resistance.⁶ To address the Sugar Act, colonies assembled temporary committees of correspondence to consolidate opposition and organize protests.⁷ Undeterred, Parliament passed the Stamp Act the subsequent year. This was the first direct tax on America that did not involve trade agreements, and violence against British officials erupted in many cities. In response, Massachusetts exchanged communications with other committees to increase awareness about Parliament’s encroachment on liberty, but the effort was taken one step further: it asked each province to participate in the Stamp Act Congress.⁸ The meeting convened in New York City during October 1765, and nine of the colonies united to sign a non-importation agreement.⁹ The committees’ collective action was enough to convince Britain to repeal the Stamp Act.¹⁰ Success notwithstanding, this cycle of organization would have to be repeated two years later.

In 1767, Britain passed the Townshend Acts that imposed new duties on glass, lead, paints, paper, and tea, as well as stricter methods of enforcement.¹¹ Recalling the strength of numbers when encountering oppression, committees of correspondence reformed, protests resumed, and additional non-importation agreements were signed against Britain.¹² By 1770, these organized efforts prevailed, and the acts were almost completely rescinded.¹³ Early resistance, although temporary in nature, demonstrated the power of the committees of correspondence and collective organization to address encountered oppression; accordingly, these committees would be called on again when discord returned.
Exploring Intra-Colonial Unity:  
The *Boston Pamphlet* Inspires Massachusetts Committees

The repeal of the Stamp Act and most of the Townshend Acts provided temporary respite from turmoil, but passions reignited in the fall of 1772. Governor Thomas Hutchinson announced that high officials in Massachusetts would be paid by the Crown, rather than by appropriations from the colonial House of Representatives. Samuel Adams published an article in the *Boston Gazette* condemning this action, which made the most powerful government positions independent of the electorate and raised questions about whether colonists would receive fair trials. Following a meeting on the issue, Boston requested policy clarification and then submitted an appeal to the General Court. Hutchinson denied both requests, so the town passed a resolution affirming the right to petition and established a 21-member committee of correspondence to exchange ideas about recourse.

On November 2, 1772, the Boston Committee of Correspondence was convened and tasked with writing the *Votes and Proceedings of the Freeholders and Other Inhabitants of the Town of Boston*. Petitions were constitutional in origin and adhered to a traditionally accepted format: they invoked rights, presented grievances, and sought relief by appealing to the Crown, Parliament, or governor. Accordingly, the first two sections of the *Votes and Proceedings* followed this familiar design. The statement of rights echoed earlier sentiments from the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Rights while the enumerated grievances became an exhaustive list of infringements and violations critiquing encountered oppression. The remarkable aspect of the *Votes and Proceedings* was the third section of the pamphlet that made a very significant alteration to the norm. The Boston Committee of Correspondence did not address the appeal to a higher British authority; after all, Hutchinson had twice refused to hear the request. Instead, they made this historic plea to their colonial brethren. They addressed the pamphlet to the other towns of Massachusetts and called upon each for “a free communication of your sentiments” on the current political emergency.

Approximately 600 copies of the *Votes and Proceedings* were distributed throughout the 290 towns in Massachusetts. It proclaimed that Britain’s actions “if accomplish’d, would complete our slavery” and asserted that colonists had a moral obligation to repudiate tyranny. At this very early stage in the resistance, Boston had thrown down a metaphorical gauntlet by holding an extra-constitutional meeting and calling for an exchange with the municipalities of the colony. Only support from other communities
could validate its actions. The *Votes and Proceedings* was colloquially termed the *Boston Pamphlet* and created an unprecedented vehicle of mobilization that garnered the full energy of communities. Colonists assembled in halls and thoughtfully considered the state of the relationship with their imperial sovereign and the oppression they encountered. The process opened “the eyes of many who [had] not the opportunity of informing themselves concerning these important matters” and gave them an occasion to voice distress in an open forum. By January 1773, 56 towns had responded to Boston; by April, 119 letters were received; by September, 144 of the towns in the colony had replied through a standing committee of correspondence. The *Boston Pamphlet* initiated exchange throughout Massachusetts that explored unifying principles and served as a model for systemic organization. After the *Gaspee* Affair, this foundation would be extended throughout the colonies.

**Exploring Inter-Colonial Unity: Gaspee Sparks Standing Provincial Committees**

As the exchange between the committees of correspondence strengthened in Massachusetts, Rhode Island encountered new British oppression. Following the Sugar Act of 1764, Great Britain authorized customs agents to search and seize vessels. Enforcement threatened New England’s profitable rum industry and became a source of unchecked power that allowed officials to steal and imprison with impunity. The two-masted schooner, *Gaspee*, and its infamous Lieutenant William Dudingston became a symbol of this detested law and instigated an act of rebellion that would unite the colonies.

On June 9, 1772, Dudingston’s *Gaspee* attempted to stop and search the *Hannah*, a packet under the command of Captain Benjamin Lindsey. Rather than submitting to the ill-reputed Dudingston, Lindsey led the *Gaspee* through Narragansett Bay and caused it to run aground near Namquid Point. After a town-hall meeting at Sabin’s Tavern in Providence, colonists resolved to confront the British crew. Eight boats carrying sixty-five volunteers pushed away from shore. They boarded at night, wounded Dudingston, and burned the ship to the waterline.

King George III proclaimed the burning of the *Gaspee* an act of high treason and stationed a commission in Newport for further investigation of the incident. The Crown selected five judges to head the inquiry. When news of the Newport Commission spread, it resuscitated the same fears of king-appointed courts that had generated the *Boston Pamphlet* and prompted a response from Virginia. The House of Burgesses proposed the formation of standing committees of correspondence in each of the colonies.
to “quiet the minds of the people” and maintain colonial vigilance.\textsuperscript{28} Just as Boston had cried out to each of the towns in Massachusetts, Virginia called out to each of its sister colonies to explore unity. Rhode Island was the first to action and created a standing committee of correspondence and inquiry, which became the first link in this monumental inter-colonial exchange.\textsuperscript{29} Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts quickly answered and elected committees by the end of the month.\textsuperscript{30} By spring of 1773, twelve of the original colonies had mobilized and joined the network of correspondence.\textsuperscript{31}

The committees of correspondence were instruments of communication by design, but the sum of their responsibilities transcended that limited function. They provided an early foundation that explored colonial unity and promoted exchange by raising constitutional questions, disseminating arguments, and creating a common front against Great Britain. As asserted by Mercy Warren Otis, “Perhaps no single step contributed so much to cement the union of the colonies, and the final acquisition of independence, as the establishment of committees of correspondence.”\textsuperscript{32} It was with this infrastructure in place that they encountered the next political crisis: the Boston Tea Party.

**Exchanging Visions of the Future:**  
**The Boston Tea Party Directs Committee Action**

The Boston Tea Party served as a tipping point that inextricably linked the fate of the colonies and focused the exchanges of the committees of correspondence on visions of the future. The East India Company, a British joint-stock venture, arranged to unload surplus inventory in the colonies at a discount. While this plan seemed innocuous, a duty on tea remained in effect from the 1767 Townshend Acts, and the new 1773 Tea Act made smuggling imports more difficult.\textsuperscript{33} The first two shipments of tea arrived in Philadelphia and New York, but in acts of defiance, both colonies refused the cargo and began protesting.\textsuperscript{34} American resistance grew and solidified: Britain had renewed its attempt to tax the colonies without representation in Parliament; nevertheless, the shipments continued as planned.\textsuperscript{35}

In November, the *Dartmouth*, *Eleanor*, and *Beaver* arrived in Boston Harbor. Colonists prevented unloading, and customs officials prepared to seize the goods if duties were not paid within twenty days. Tensions mounted as the date approached, and committee resolutions began pouring in to show support.\textsuperscript{36} On the eve of the deadline, approximately 6,000 Bostonians convened at the Old South Meeting House to decide what would be done.\textsuperscript{37} Francis Rotch, the owner of the ship, reported that he had twice been denied return to Britain without paying duties. In frustration, a mob
of 116 men dressed as Mohawks proceeded to Griffin’s Wharf. Over the course of three hours, they dumped 342 chests containing over 90,000 pounds of tea into Boston Harbor.38

Following the Boston Tea Party, Parliament responded with the Intolerable Acts.39 The entire city was punished without due process by closing Boston Harbor until the East India Company was fully compensated, and Great Britain imposed severe restrictions on colonial participation in government. With the committee of correspondence network in place throughout the provinces, the Intolerable Acts unleashed a wave of exchange.40 In a letter to Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Adams wrote on behalf of the Boston committee, “Colony communicates freely with colony...The whole continent is now become united in sentiment and in measures of opposition to tyranny.”41 Committees across America began exchanging views on how to respond.42

As the committees of correspondence sought ways to address the newfound political crisis, two currents of recommended action emerged in their written exchanges. The first thread of letters considered a non-importation agreement that banned trade with Britain.43 Towards this end, Virginia passed the Fairfax Resolves, a boycott drafted at Mount Vernon by George Washington and George Mason.44 Similarly, Massachusetts issued the Suffolk Resolves, a non-importation agreement written by the committees of correspondence of that province.45 The second thread of letters moved for a meeting of all the colonies to discuss the future.46 The Maryland Committee of Correspondence asserted the “absolute necessity of a general and firm union of sister colonies to preserve common liberties” and called for a congress of the colonies at Philadelphia.47

By the end of summer, twelve colonies had selected delegates for the First Continental Congress. This prestigious assembly of patriots included the first five Presidents of the United States and became a natural evolution of the committees of correspondence; in fact, over half of the representatives had previously served on a committee at some level.48 This not only imbued the new body with legitimacy, it also directed its actions. Accordingly, the convention passed the Articles of Association, a boycott of British goods based on the Fairfax and Suffolk Resolves.49 It also inaugurated our Founders who began exchanging visions of the future that would become our nation’s foundation. After convocation, they debated whether each colony would receive a single or weighted vote just as they would at the Constitutional Convention twelve years later.50 When penning the Declaration and Resolves, they deliberated on how best to secure American rights just as they would when drafting the amendments of our Bill of Rights before ratification.51 After two months, the First Continental Congress finalized a petition to King George
III repudiating the Intolerable Acts and demanding the reinstatement of colonial liberties. The accomplishments of the Congress demonstrate the ability of committees of correspondence to unite the colonies into a single voice against Britain and begin fundamental exchanges about America that would continue through our independence and inception.

**Conclusion**

When our Founders left their seats at the First Continental Congress, the future was uncertain. Many representatives wanted reconciliation with the mother country while a small, but growing minority thought independence necessary. Despite these disparate views, one aspect was clear: the colonies would no longer struggle in isolation. What was done could not be undone: the declarations shared in town hall meetings about what it meant to be American could not be unheard; the pamphlets passed from hand to hand citing the natural rights of men could not be unseen; the letters sent from colony to colony promising allegiance to one another could not be unwritten. These were the contributions of the American colonial committees of correspondence: they forged a network of solidarity that encountered British oppression, explored unity, and exchanged visions of the future that would become the foundation of our nation.
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**Primary Sources**


This letter provided the introductory quote to the paper. In this correspondence, John Adams asserted that the “radical change in the principles, opinions, sentiments, and affections of the people, was the real American Revolution.” He maintained that it was truly remarkable how quickly this occurred given the great differences between colonies.


Before serving as President, John Adams played a central role in colonial resistance. He participated in the Boston Committee of Correspondence as well as the First and Second Continental Congresses. In addition to providing valuable background information, this source presented his perspective on the influence of the committees of correspondence.


In this selection, Adams argued with another anonymous contributor named “Chronus” about whether British duties on trade for the express purpose of raising revenue was “repugnant to or subversive of our constitution.” It showed me the increasing discord created by Britain’s taxation policies.


This article praised the *Votes and Proceedings* and the formation of committees of correspondence as progress that “thwarted the designs of our enemies.” This article is one of many that showed the close relationship between the committees of correspondence and colonial publications.


In this article, Samuel Adams addressed individuals who were attempting to frustrate the colonial agreement on non-importation and argued for the need for a general congress. This source demonstrated how the different colonial committees of correspondence began moving toward coordinated action.
Samuel Adams anonymously published this condemnation when Britain declared that high officials in Massachusetts would be paid by the Crown, rather than by appropriations from the colonial House of Representatives. He urged Bostonians to discuss the matter at a town meeting.

This letter was written in the days following the Boston Tea Party and described the events leading up to the crisis beginning with the arrival of the ship and concluding with the early aftermath of the event.

Samuel Adams wrote this letter on behalf of the Massachusetts Committee of Correspondence. In it, he discussed the situation in Boston following the Intolerable Acts and expressed how freely the colonies communicate with one another.

In this letter, Samuel Adams explains the importance of spreading committees of correspondence. He writes, “As there is no measure which tends more to disconcert the Designs of the enemies of the public liberty, than the raising Committees of Correspondence.”

The Boston Committee of Correspondence generated these instructions to the representatives of Boston following the passage of the Sugar Act. It advises the legislators to defend the rights of the people and protect against Parliament’s laws where “Trade & Business is unreasonably impeded or embarrass’d thereby.”

Boston penned this letter approximately one month after the formation of the Cambridge Committee of Correspondence as “Evidence of their virtuous Attachment to the Cause of Liberty.”

Boston indicated that it had received communications from the committees of correspondence in Portsmouth, Hartford, Newport, and Providence. These
expressed outrage over the situation in Boston following the Port Act. They committed to imposing restrictions on British trade.

———. Letter to Other Committees of Correspondence. 21 Oct. 1773. Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784. Vol. 3. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 230. MS.

This letter originated with a subcommittee designed to write to the Connecticut Committee of Correspondence, but it was determined to be of such importance that it was made a circular letter. It stated that the design of committees of correspondence was such that “Colonies should be united in their Sentiments… and [each] should have the united Efforts of all for its Support.”

———. Letter to Other Committees of Correspondence. 17 Dec. 1773. Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784. Vol. 6. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 468-469. MS.

In this circular letter, the Boston Committee of Correspondence conveyed the events of the Boston Tea Party. It explained that the tea had been destroyed without injury to other property and that this was after “every step was taken, that was practicable for returning the Teas.”

———. Letter to Philadelphia Committee of Correspondence. 13 May 1774. Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784. Vol. 9. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 757. MS.

This letter was copied to many of the committees of correspondence throughout the colonies, including New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Portsmouth. It described the state of Boston after the Port Act and asked for others to assist with a non-importation agreement against Britain.

———. Letter to Worcester Committee of Correspondence. 11 Sept. 1773. Miscellaneous Correspondence and Proceedings of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1783. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 11-14. MS.

Boston reported on the success of the committees of correspondence network in Massachusetts. It noted the “Advantage that Each has of communicating any Matter of common Concern & Importance to a chosen Number of Men zealous for the publick Liberty.”

———. Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784. 12 vols. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. MS.

These are the official minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence in bound manuscript form. The 12 volumes span the years between 1772-1784. They contain information about the organization’s proceedings and include many of the letters written by the committees. These were an invaluable resource in the creation of this paper.
———. Miscellaneous Correspondence and Proceedings of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1783. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. MS.

This archive houses the unbound letters exchanged between the committees of correspondence. Many of these have not been written into the Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784 and provided many supplementary primary sources.

———. Report to Boston Town Meeting. 20 Nov. 1772. Miscellaneous Letters and Documents of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1782. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 1-42. MS.

These minutes include the text of the Votes and Proceedings of the Freeholders and Other Inhabitants of the Town of Boston. This petition deviated from traditional formats by appealing to other towns in Massachusetts for relief rather than seeking the aid of Great Britain. It mobilized the colony by asking communities to form standing committees of correspondence to communicate with Boston.


This source provided the records of Boston’s town meetings between 1758-1769, which included the letters of the temporary committee of correspondence that was formed to address the Sugar Act, Currency Act, and Townshend Acts of the 1760s.

———. Solemn League and Covenant. 2 June 1774. Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784. Vol. 9. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 764. MS.

This entry was written following the Boston Tea Party and the passage of the Intolerable Acts. It created a subcommittee tasked with writing a circular letter to ask other committees to join a non-importation agreement against Great Britain.

———. Vote Appointing Committee of Correspondence. 2 Nov. 1772. Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784. Vol. 1. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 1-2. MS.

This meeting appointed the Boston Committee of Correspondence and tasked them with writing the document that would become the Boston Pamphlet or the Votes and Proceedings of the Freeholders and Other Inhabitants of the Town of Boston.

Boston Port Act, 1774, 14 Geo. 3, c. 19.

Parliament enacted this legislation following the Boston Tea Party. It blocked the port of the city for all but fuel and food until such time that the British East India Company was compensated for its lost cargo. It became known as one of the Intolerable Acts and prompted a surge of colonial response from committees of correspondence.

Although born in Ireland, Burke did much to further the colonial cause. In his speech, “On American Taxation,” he argued that Britain should be satisfied with taxes on trade and refrain from external taxes like the Stamp Act. His sentiments were echoed in America.


In this speech to Parliament, Burke coined the phrase “salutary neglect” to describe Great Britain’s policy toward the American colonies between 1607-1763. He argued that the American colonies were valuable and that concessions should be made to keep them. Force would not achieve submission.


In this letter, the town of Cambridge unanimously appointed a standing committee of correspondence to communicate with Boston. It reported that the meeting was “as full as it has been” and that “the people discovered a glorious spirit, like men determined to be free.”


This volume contains the public records dating from October 1772 to April 1775. Entries reflected that the Connecticut House of Representatives appointed a standing committee of correspondence on May 21, 1773, and that committee elected members to the Continental Congress on July 13, 1774.


This volume contains records from May 1775 to June 1776 and the Journal of the Council of Safety from June 7, 1775, until October 2, 1776. The entries showed the evolution of the relationship between the legislature and the committees designed to support the American Revolution.


In this letter, Connecticut sent notice that a committee of correspondence had been formed. It echoed the language of Virginia’s initial call for communication by indicating that the intent of the committee was to “remove the Uneasiness and quiet the Minds of the People.”

Following the Boston Port Act, Connecticut wrote to the Virginia Committee of Correspondence to assent to participation in a general congress. It advocated “holding as early as conveniently might be, a general congress of the committee or delegates... appointed to take into consideration, the present melancholy and alarming situation of America.”


These records were used in the last section of the paper that described how delegates at the First Continental Congress exchanged visions of the future that would extend into the Constitutional Convention. Excerpts were used to show that both bodies considered what weight the votes of each colony or state should carry. They also examined how to best secure and articulate American rights.


In this volume of records from the Federal Convention of 1787, the delegates considered how states would be represented in the legislative branch of government. Both the pages of Edmund Randolph’s original Virginia Plan, and the pages of the revised plan that was accepted by the delegates are cited in my paper.


Volume 3 included discussions that occurred between the delegates about how American rights would be written into the constitutional framework. They spent a considerable effort debating ways to best secure individual rights and whether they needed to be enumerated.


The Articles of Association was a non-importation agreement signed by the First Continental Congress. It demonstrated the degree to which it was directed by the committees of correspondence. The previously penned Fairfax Resolves from Virginia and the Suffolk Resolves from Massachusetts served as its foundation.


The Declarations and Resolves of the First Continental Congress cataloged grievances against Great Britain beginning with seven acts during the 1760s designed to tax the colonies for the purpose of generating revenue. These were deemed subversive of American rights. The list continued through 1774.


This volume includes the records of the First Continental Congress. In addition to providing the Suffolk Resolves and Declarations and Resolves of the First Continental Congress, it also listed the credentials of each of the delegates to Congress and included other documents generated by the body.
In these minutes, the delegates to the First Continental Congress debated whether each colony would have an equal or weighted vote in the legislative body. The discussion paralleled the one that would be held later at the Constitutional Convention about how states would be represented.

The First Continental Congress’s petition to King George III served as the culminating document produced by this legislative body. The colonies united to repudiate the Intolerable Acts and demand the reinstatement of American liberties.

This piece of Parliamentary legislation sparked the first temporary committees of correspondence. It attempted to control colonial monies and protect British merchants, which created discord in America.

This volume includes the Votes and Proceedings from October 20, 1773. It documented correspondence that Delaware received from Virginia, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. In response, they formed a standing committee of correspondence.

This letter confirmed Delaware’s creation of a standing committee of correspondence. It included the resolution of the House of Representatives accepting Virginia’s original communication asking for the same.

Dickinson was a part of the early movement for collective action in the colonies. He served in the Stamp Act Congress of 1765 and wrote this treaty in protest of the duties required by the Townshend Acts. This publication circulated widely in the 1760s and became a well-known critique of British taxation.

This letter argued for the severe punishment of those involved in the burning of the Gaspee because of the pre-mediation involved in the act. He contends that
colonists harbored great animosity towards Dudingston and had been planning action against him for months.


Thirty colonies in Virginia passed the Fairfax Resolves following the Intolerable Acts. It denounced British actions in Massachusetts, proposed a non-importation agreement, and asked for a general congress of the colonies to convene on the issue. The original text was primarily composed by George Washington and George Mason at Mount Vernon.


Franklin acted as an ambassador in London during the early years of the resistance. He corresponded with many colonial leaders during this time, which provided an important source of documentation. Franklin returned to serve in the Second Continental Congress only to be sent back to Europe to seek France’s aid during the Revolutionary War.


Joseph Galloway was a colonial politician who was elected to the First Continental Congress. When the momentum changed and the colonies no longer sought reconciliation with Great Britain, he became a Loyalist and published in support of these views. This book provided a counterpoint to the pro-independence leanings of other colonists.


The unsigned article was published months before the Gaspee Affair and illustrated the ill-repute of Lieutenant Dudingston. The Gaspee was described as a “piratical schooner… employed in robbing some of the poorest subjects.”


This volume contains the Journal of the Upper House of Assembly from January 17, 1763, to March 12, 1774. Many of the later entries were condemnations of the actions of the lower house, which had begun acting independently of the rest of the government and appointed a committee of correspondence.


Georgia addressed this letter to the Massachusetts following the passage of the Townshend Acts. It stated that it would “join earnestly with the other colonies’ agents in soliciting a repeal of those acts, and in remonstrating against any acts of
the like nature for the future.” This provided an early example of inter-colonial exchanges.


This letter indicated that the Georgia Commons House of Assembly created a standing committee of correspondence. It included the resolution establishing its legitimacy through the legislature.

Gloucester Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 19 May 1774. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 10. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 802-803. MS.

Gloucester wrote this letter following the Port Act. It called the action “tyrannical” and pledged support to Boston. It also agreed to join a non-importation agreement against Britain in an attempt to force repeal.


Hamilton had yet to rise to fame at the beginning of the resistance; however, he quickly became a key figure in the Revolutionary War by acting as George Washington’s aide-de-camp. Included in these volumes were his early writings while associated with the New York Sons of Liberty.


Thomas Hutchinson was a longstanding member of the provincial government in Massachusetts, ultimately becoming governor in 1771. His actions in support of the Crown made him one of the most detested figures in the colonies. This resource showcased his thinking during this tumultuous time period.


This message included in the records of the Massachusetts House of Representatives announced that high officials would thereafter be paid by the British Crown. Concern over the lack of governmental independence prompted the formation of Boston Committee of Correspondence and the *Boston Pamphlet* that gave rise to sister committees.


John Jay served New York as a member of the Committee of Sixty and as a representative at the First and Second Continental Congresses. His correspondences and writings highlight his influence in the revolutionary cause and uniting the colonies.

Thomas Jefferson was an active participant in Virginia politics and was elected to the House of Burgesses in 1769. His autobiography and voluminous correspondence provide valuable insight into the momentum of the colonial resistance.


*Massachusetts* was a series of 17 letters written by Daniel Leonard asserting that many of the grievances against Great Britain were without foundation. These were published in a Loyalist paper in Massachusetts under a pseudonym. John Adams, also writing under a pseudonym, published a response. This source provided an argument against viewing British acts as oppressive.

Lynn Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 9 Feb. 1773. Miscellaneous Correspondence and Proceedings of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1783. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 4-6. MS.

This letter acknowledged the formation of the Lynn Committee of Correspondence. It stated, “We heartily joyn with you in wishing the glorious spirit of Liberty which now animates the Inhabitants of this Province shall be diffused through the Colonies, & happily Effect the restoration of their Rights, which are cruelly ravishd from them.”


Although James Madison rose to prominence during the building of our national government, his writings begin with the pre-Revolutionary period. In 1774, he joined the Committee of Safety, and in 1776, he participated in the Virginia state legislature.

Marblehead Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence and Marblehead Resolves. 12 Dec. 1774. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 1. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 9-14. MS.

Marblehead responded to the *Boston Pamphlet* by writing this letter and enclosing a copy of the Marblehead Resolves in which the town listed the right of its citizens, cited grievances against Britain, and created a standing committee of correspondence.


This volume spans the period beginning October 1773 to April 1774. It includes the proceeding on April 11, 1774, at which a standing committee of correspondence was appointed to maintain an open line of communication with other colonies in light of the perceived offenses of Britain.
Maryland Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Massachusetts Bay Committee of Correspondence. 26 June 1774. Miscellaneous Correspondence and Proceedings of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1783. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. I-6. MS.

This letter from the Maryland Committee of Correspondence to the Massachusetts Bay Committee of Correspondence expressed the “absolute necessity of a general and firm union of sister colonies to preserve common liberties” It called for a congress of the colonies to convene in Philadelphia during September 1774.


In this letter, Maryland indicated the establishment of the a standing committee of correspondence. It included the resolution of the House of Assembly to “accept the Invitation to a mutual Correspondence and Intercourse with our Sister Colonies.”


This journal contains the records between 1765-1766. The House of Representatives stringently argued against the passage of the Stamp Act as being an abuse of Parliamentary power. It proposed the Stamp Act Congress and appointed a committee of correspondence to communicate with the other colonies.


This journal contains the records from the years between 1768-1769. Many letters were sent to the colonies regarding resistance to the Townshend Acts in which they consent to a non-importation agreement against Great Britain.


This journal contains the records between 1772-1773. In it, Governor Thomas Hutchinson’s announced that judges would be paid by the Crown as opposed to the House of Representatives. It also documented the colony’s organization of colonial resistance that followed.


This volume includes the records of the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts in 1774 and 1775. It begins with a spirited letter from Governor Thomas Gage that denounced the Congress as unsanctioned because the legislature had been officially disbanded. Nevertheless, Massachusetts resistance continued.

Gouverneur Morris was a colonial leader who acted as a member of the New York Provincial Congress and was later elected as a delegate to the Continental Congress. He became a spokesperson for the Continental Army and signed the Articles of Confederation. His writings reflected the political climate of the New York colony.


This volume contains the documents from 1764 to 1776. It includes Council records, House journals, Provincial Congress journals, and early Revolutionary War records concerning the Battle of Bunker Hill and several others, which provided me a historical understanding of the New Hampshire colony.


New Hampshire wrote this letter following the passage of the Townshend Acts. It praised Massachusetts for the leadership it displayed in coordinating efforts and stated that “your example will be a powerful motive to show provinces and colonies which may not be so sensible of their danger to exert themselves in pursuit of the same measures.”


In this letter to the Virginia Committee of Correspondence, it is reported that the New Hampshire House of Representatives appointed a committee of correspondence. It included a copy of the resolution that described its purpose as obtaining intelligence on Parliament and communicating with sister colonies.


This volume contains the Journal of the Provincial Council from 1769 to 1775. It reflected little discord until March 11, 1773. At this time, the General Assembly was adjourned for over 10 months. When it returned, Governor William Franklin gave a stirring speech about the crossroads at which the colony found itself.


This volume begins on February 8, 1774, which is the date that New Jersey appointed a standing committee of correspondence and inquiry for the purpose of communicating with other assemblies. It contains extracts from many of the communications to and from the committee and documents the evolution of the resistance through 1775.
New Jersey Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 31 May 1774. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 8. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 709-710. MS.

This letter was written by the New Jersey Committee of Correspondence following the Boston Port Act. It expressed an interest in forming a “Congress from the several Assemblies” to discuss a non-importation/non-exportation agreement against Great Britain.

Newport Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 13 Jan. 1774. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 6. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 541-543. MS.

The Newport Committee of Correspondence passed resolves expressing solidarity with Boston and condemning the passage of the Intolerable Acts. It stated that the townspeople voted to “afford them all the assistance in their power.”


This volume begins in December 1743 and ends in April 1775. After March 8, 1773, Governor William Tryon prorogued the General Assembly until January 11, 1774. When it reconvened, he announced that he would be returning to London. Despite this, the legislature remained in Loyalists control until after the included dates.

New York Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 23 May 1773. Miscellaneous Letters and Documents of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1782. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 23-26. MS.

The New York Committee of Correspondence penned this letter following the Boston Port Act. It called for “a virtuous and spirited union” and sought a congress of the colonies to decide upon joint action against Great Britain.

———. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 13 Dec. 1773. Miscellaneous Letters and Documents of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1782. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 1-4. MS.

In this letter, the New York Committee of Correspondence counseled Boston on what action to take in the days before the Boston Tea Party. It indicated that the “worst that can happen here is the landing of the tea in the port.” New York had turned away the tea that arrived.


This volume contains the records dating from 1770 to 1775. The proceeding on December 8, 1773, acknowledged a letter from the Virginia House of Burgesses and appointed a standing committee of correspondence.

North Carolina answered Virginia’s call for communication and established a standing committee of correspondence to “preserve the just Rights and Liberties of the American Colonies, which appear of late to be so systematically invaded.”


Otis rose to fame during the Writs of Assistance case in which he defended a group of merchants who denied Britain the ability to search their ships. His notoriety continued during the early 1770s as he continued to write political pamphlets about British abuses.


James Otis was one of the first to assert that Parliament lacked the authority to tax the American colonies because they were not represented in that legislative body. His pamphlet became one of the most widely dispersed in the colonies.


Paine became a key figure in the movement for independence. He is renowned for writing *Common Sense*, in which he denounced British corruption and championed the colonial preservation of liberty. Over 100,000 copies of this pamphlet were distributed throughout the colonies in the months following its publication in 1776.


This volume contains Provincial Council records from October 1, 1771, to September 27, 1775, as well as the Minutes of the Council of Safety from June 30, 1775, to November 12, 1776. It includes an interesting string of correspondence between Governor Penn and the Assembly that documented the escalating tensions between Britain and the colonies.

Philadelphia Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 6 Dec. 1773. Miscellaneous Letters and Documents of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1782. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 1-4. MS.

In this letter, Philadelphia discussed its response to the arrival of British tea in port—that is, the ships were met with protest and the cargo was sent away. The message was sent to provide advice to the town before the Boston Tea Party.


The Philadelphia Committee of Correspondence expressed sympathy for Boston. The letter indicated that the Boston Tea Party was “Justified by a strong
Necessity” because of the actions of “inveterate Enemies,” which was a strong assertion against Great Britain at this time.


The Philadelphia Committee of Correspondence wrote this letter to the Virginia Committee of Correspondence following the Boston Port Act. It stated, “Our united efforts are now necessary to ward off the impending blow leveled at our lives, liberty, and property.” It recommended a “speedy meeting,” or general congress to address the issue.

Plymouth Committee of Correspondence. Letter to the Boston Committee of Correspondence and the Votes and Proceedings of the Town of Plymouth. 1 Dec. 1772. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 1. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 6-8. MS.

The Plymouth Committee of Correspondence penned this letter and copy of proceedings in response to the *Boston Pamphlet*. It created a standing committee to “correspond with the town of Boston and any other town on the subject of our present difficulties and of the measures proper to be taken on the occasion.”

Portsmouth Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 16 Dec. 1773. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 7. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 546-549. MS.

Portsmouth passed resolves rejecting Great Britain’s duties on tea. They asserted that Parliament had violated the natural rights of colonists by imposing such a tax without the consent of the colonies.


Richard Price, a Welsh philosopher, wrote a series of pamphlets in support of the American Revolution. He became famous after penning *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*, which criticized the Declaratory Act of 1776. 60,000 copies of this pamphlet were sold in the first year of publication.


This letter was written after the Boston Port Act. The Providence Committee of Correspondence declared itself “greatly interested in the present alarming conduct of the British Parliament.” Providence indicated that it would join a non-importation agreement against Great Britain until Boston was restored.
David Ramsay was a doctor and public official from South Carolina who became one of the first historians of the American Revolution. His account of the war celebrated those whose dedication worked to improve societal conditions. As a member of the Continental Congress, Ramsay’s viewpoint was an interesting contribution to this project.

The Repeal Act, 1770, 10 Geo. 3 c. 17.

The Repeal Act of 1770 was issued by Parliament in response to the colonial organization against the Townshend Acts. Committees of correspondence initiated communication. Both boycotts and civil unrest ensued before the repeal.


This volume contains the records beginning in 1770 and ending in September 1776. It included a great deal of information on Governor Wanton, Lieutenant Dudingston, and Gaspee incident.


In this letter, it is reported that the Rhode Island House of Deputies appointed a committee of correspondence in response to Virginia’s call for each colony to create one. It included a copy of the resolution from the Lower House of Assembly.


Following the Boston Port Act, Rhode Island advocated for a general congress to address the situation. It wrote that their committee would “consult and advise with representatives of the other colonies who shall meet in such congress upon a loyal and dutiful petition and remonstrance… setting forth the grievances they labor under.”

Salem Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 17 May 1774. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 803-804. MS.

Salem reported on a meeting conducted by the town following the Port Act. It offered support to Boston and unanimously agreed to join a non-importation, non-exportation agreement against Great Britain.


In this letter, South Carolina reported that it would unite with the other colonies to obtain the “repeal of the several acts of Parliament, which have lately been passed
laying duties in America, and to endeavor to prevent the clause for billeting soldiers in America.” This served as an early example of inter-colonial coordination after the Townshend Acts.


South Carolina informed Virginia that a committee had been formed to “correspond with the Committee appointed by the said House of Burgesses, and Committees appointed or to be appointed in or Sister Colonies respecting the same.”


The Suffolk Resolves were originally written by a select group of Massachusetts committees of correspondence for the purpose of rejecting the Massachusetts Government Act and instituting a boycott of British goods until the Intolerable Acts were repealed. These were endorsed by the First Continental Congress and appear in its journal.


The Stamp Act Congress was the first successful experiment of the colonies with committees of correspondence and collective organization. Nine of the colonies sent delegates to this congregation in New York, and the remaining agreed to abide by the decisions made there.

Sugar Act, 1764, 4 Geo. 3, c. 15.

The Sugar Act of 1764 updated the 1733 Molasses Act. While the act lowered the amount of tax to be collected on sugar products, the Molasses Act was rarely enforced. Because stricter collection methods were imposed, it created colonial backlash like that seen in the Gaspee incident.

Tea Act, 1773, 13 Geo. 3, c. 44.

The Tea Act of 1773 allowed the British East India Company to send its cargo directly to the colonies in an attempt to remedy its surplus. Because the Townshend duties on tea remained in effect, the colonies resisted and viewed the act as a renewed British attempt to tax America without its consent.

Townshend Revenue Act, 1767, 7 Geo. 3., c. 46.

The Townshend Revenue Act was one of the several pieces of legislation designed to generate funds to offset the expense of the North American campaign during the French and Indian War. The colonies formed committees of correspondence, organized protests, and signed a non-importation agreement in order to have most of it repealed.


Trenchard and Gordon wrote a series of 144 essays that criticized British politics and were published in the London Journal. In them, they expressed concern about
the harms of standing armies. This became seminal during the early American revolutionary movement.


Josiah Tucker was a Welsh political commentator who wrote about the British relationship with the colonies. As early as 1766, he believed American independence was likely and maintained that it was in his country’s best interest to allow it. This source provided interesting insight into the inevitability of conflict with Britain.


This volume of documents from 1773-1776 includes the records of the Virginia Committee of Correspondence. This was an invaluable resource because it contained the minutes, as well as the letters sent and received by the committee.


This source contains the records of the temporary committee of correspondence formed in Virginia near the conclusion of the French and Indian War. It includes the letters written in response to the Sugar Act, Currency Act, and Townshend Acts, which provided a model for later mobilization.


This letter to the Earl of Hillsborough presented an account of information ascertained by the governor concerning the destruction of the *Gaspee*. It detailed the raid by an anonymous crew and the injury of Lieutenant Dudingston.


Warren was a political writer during the American Revolution. She wrote one of the first historical accounts of the time period in which she credited the committees of correspondence with unifying the colonies and enabling a successful bid for independence.


This letter was one in a series with Bryan Fairfax that illustrated the degree to which the Intolerable Acts caused Washington to commit to the American cause. He writes to the more passive Fairfax, “I would heartily join you in … a humble and dutiful petition to the throne, provided there was the most distant hope of success. But have we not tried this already?” His impassioned plea argued that the time had come for action.

George Washington and George Mason drafted the Fairfax Resolves at Mount Vernon. In this letter, he explains why he believed this non-importation agreement necessary. He wrote, “This I am convinc’d, as much as I am of my Existence, that there is no relief for us but in their distress; & I think, at least I hope, that there is publick Virtue enough left among us to deny ourselves everything but the bare necessaries of Life to accomplish this end.”


This letter was written after Washington drafted the Fairfax Resolves. He explained to Fairfax why he felt compelled to take action against Great Britain. He stated, “The Crisis is arriv’d when we must assert our Rights, or Submit to every Imposition that can be heap’d upon us.”


In this letter, George Washington asserted that Great Britain should be protecting the colonies against skirmishes with Native Americans. Instead, they had engaged in the taxation of America without consent and closed Boston Harbor. This letter provided the quote in the introduction to the paper. It stated that Great Britain was “endeavoring by every piece of art and despotism to fix the shackles of slavery upon us.”


*The Papers of George Washington* included many letters that were not found elsewhere. The colonial series covered the years 1748-1755. They demonstrated Washington’s growing frustration with Great Britain and showed how profoundly this period affected his thoughts and deeds.


George Washington’s role in the American Revolution onwards is well-known, but his efforts in early colonial resistance against Great Britain were notable, as well. He opposed the 1765 Stamp Act and took a leadership role in protests of the Townshend Acts. In July 1774, he chaired the Fairfax Resolves, which was received by the First Continental Congress.

Westerly Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 19 May 1774. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 10. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 800-802. MS.
Westerly communicated with Boston following the Port Act. It made a historical analogy likening the situation to that faced by Carthage when Rome attempted to destroy it. Westerly offered support to Boston and indicated that it would participate in a non-importation agreement against Great Britain.

Westford Committee of Correspondence. Letter to Boston Committee of Correspondence. 12 Jan. 1773. *Minutes of the Boston Committee of Correspondence 1772-1784*. Vol. 1. Boston Committee of Correspondence Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. 88-90. MS.

This letter from Westford to Boston expressed the degree to which the new committees of correspondence in Massachusetts were heightening the level of awareness and communication in the colony.


James Wilson was a member of the Continental Congress and signatory of the Declaration of Independence. In 1774, he wrote “Considerations on the Nature and Extent of the Legislative Authority of the British Parliament,” which argued that Parliament lacked the ability to pass laws related to the colonies because they were not represented in that legislative body.

**Secondary Sources**


Ammerman discussed the colonial response to the Intolerable Acts. His argument underscored that committees of correspondence provided the infrastructure that supported the rebellion. It also provided me with a great deal of information on the formation and politics of the Continental Congress.


Anderson’s book analyzed the global significance of the Seven Years’ War. It looked specifically at how the North American component, the French and Indian War, altered British policies in the colonies. This source helped explain why the colonists found later British actions to be so objectionable.


Bailyn created portraits of important Revolutionary figures including Thomas Hutchinson, John Adams, Thomas Paine, and Harbottle Door. Implicit in his presentation was the idea that these influential leaders enabled the revolt. Bailyn used these vignettes to present Revolutionary themes, which helped me to better understand the different colonial perspectives on the war.

In this Pulitzer Prize-winning account, Bailyn synthesized the many political and social theories that inspired the Revolution. It provided a wide-ranging foundational study of the period. This book is considered one of the seminal works on the American Revolution. I read and reviewed its contents many times while preparing this paper.


This National Book Award winner studied Thomas Hutchinson, one of the most infamous figures during the period of the Revolution. It attempted to dispel many of the reasons he was reviled. It provided insight into the man so inextricably linked to the Massachusetts Committees of Correspondence.


This text compiled three of Bailyn’s lectures from the 1960s. He discussed the ideological origins of the revolution, the structure of politics in the colonies, and the events in the mid-eighteenth century that made revolution likely. I consulted this text because of Bailyn’s preeminence in Revolutionary studies. His discussion of the structure of politics was a valuable extension to what I had already read by him.


This is a compilation of pamphlets during the American Revolution. This mode of communication became incredibly popular during this period because of the ease of publication and distribution. Pamphlets significantly impacted the colonial momentum towards rebellion, and this book helped explained how they were used by key figures in the Revolutionary movement.


Bailyn interwove images and text in this study of the Founding Fathers. In five essays, he posited that it was the creativity and enterprise of individuals like Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams that propelled them into the spotlight, but that their legacies are not without inconsistency and contradiction. This source provided interesting insight into how the Founders put the idealism of the American Revolution into practice.


This Pulitzer Prize-winning book focused on Europeans migration into the colonies in the 18th century. Bailyn considered the impact of the movement of people in the generation before independence. This source offered an interesting perspective on immigration as one of the possible causes of the revolution.


Becker described two warring factions in colonial New York. He traced the evolution of these parties through the Stamp Act, Tea Act, and American Revolution.
He also described the role of the New York Sons of Liberty. This source provided a detailed look at politics in New York during the period before the war.


This article described the process by which delegates from New York were selected for the First Continental Congress. Specifically, it detailed the battle for delegates between three factions: conservatives, radicals, and Loyalists. It helped explain the politics behind the meeting.


Historians assembled this book in contemplation of the 200th birthday of the U.S. Constitution. It includes an examination of early American culture as a foundation for national identity and helped me to understand the role that a clearer American identity played in the American Revolution.


Bell described trade with West India. He explained that most exchanged goods in loose partnerships and through coastal connections. Bell also posited that British taxation policies united Whigs in England, America, and Jamaica who suffered financially. This source provided information on the impact of the Tea Act on the colonies.


Brewer provided a view of the British government at the time of George III’s ascent and carried through the first decade of his reign. It covered the political instability that plagued this period and discussed how new parties were forming there. This source interested me because it included the argument that American politics traveled across the Atlantic and helped frame political discontent within Great Britain.


This account explained how Britain was able to become the most powerful country in Europe during the 18th century; specifically, it credited the fiscal-military state’s ability to maintain high taxes with minimal corruption. It helped me by explaining the evolving view of the King and Parliament toward the American colonies and how high taxes were also an expectation in Great Britain, not just an imposition placed on America.

Brown’s study analyzed the impact that newspapers between the years of 1700-1865. It examined how newspapers and pamphlets were a driving force in the debate over independence. This book showed me the degree to which the press was used to influence colonial perspectives about British control and American rights.


Brown looked at the Boston Pamphlet as revolutionary propaganda that had profound implications in Massachusetts. He analyzed the contents of the document and evaluated the historical response of neighboring towns. This source provided information for the section of my paper regarding intra-colonial unity in Massachusetts.


This work reconstructed the minute books and letters of the Boston Committee of Correspondence. It discussed the structure and ideology of the committee as well as described how Boston served as a revolutionary leader by recruiting other cities and directing collective actions.


This volume contains the letters of members of the Continental Congress between August 19, 1774, and July 4, 1776. It underscored the debates and compromises made between the factions of the Continental Congress. The letters presented a first-hand account of how the leadership’s position changed from one of reconciliation to independence.


Butler described how an “American” people emerged even before the nation’s independence was won. He characterized the colonists of the eighteenth century as a blend of immigrants and a culture distinct from England. This book presented a social framework for understanding the American Revolution.


This text includes letters between Thomas Gage and governmental secretaries. This source provided me with an interesting perspective on the developing crisis in America during the years between the French and Indian War and the American Revolution.

A British and an American historian wrote this book together and presented differing viewpoints on the Revolution. It is well-grounded in primary resources and includes an in-depth perspective on British policy-making during this time. This account offered an interesting juxtaposition of viewpoints about growing tensions in the colonies.


Cohen researched the works of Revolutionary historians including David Ramsay and Mercy Otis Warren. He posited that they told history through a self-conscious valence while documenting the birth of a democracy and analyzed how they justified colonial resistance. This book was interesting in that it examined, and in some instances challenged, assumptions made by these authors.


Colbourn discussed the ideology of the American Revolution, paying particular attention to historical events and sources that influenced the movement. He went so far as to catalog the books available in colonial libraries at the time and argued that a shared cultural literacy contributed to Revolution. This source helped identify cultural elements behind the colonial resistance.


Colley described Great Britain in the decades between 1707 and 1837 and argued that a new national identity was forged during this time. She provided detailed information about the reign of King George III and maintained that a major motivator behind Great Britain’s reinvention was the loss of the war in America. This source highlighted the impact of the American Revolution on Great Britain.


Collins’s work remains one of the few comprehensive studies of the committees of correspondence. It detailed the development of the committees, the role they played in the organizing the revolution, and the eventual evolution of them into other standing bodies.


This is a collection of articles that outlines the ways the revolution affected specific groups in the colonial South. It includes essays on military strategy, but it most helped me understand the regional political culture of the South before the American Revolution and how that affected the way resistance developed there.


The 1760s were tumultuous for Great Britain. It saw the coronation of a new king in 1763 and the appointment of a new prime minister in 1770. This collection
demonstrated George III’s heavy reliance on Lord North and showed North’s hesitation on remaining in office once the war with the colonies appeared imminent. It helped detail the degree of political instability in Britain leading up to the war.


Ellis chronicled Jefferson’s life. He detailed not only the most widely known periods in Virginia or during his presidency, but also his time in Philadelphia during the 1770s, Paris during the 1780s, and alongside George Washington during his first administration. It provided me with biographical information about Jefferson during the pre-Revolutionary period.


This book attempted to separate man from myth while looking at the life of George Washington. Ellis tried to reveal the complexities of the icon including his views on slavery and expansion. This source included information relevant to Washington’s role in colonial resistance.


Ellis painted another portrait of a Founding Father with this account of John Adams’s life. He portrayed him as a great and often misunderstood man. This source attempted to synthesize Adams’s correspondence and reconcile the positions he maintained throughout his lifetime. Most notable to this paper, however, were Ellis’s reflections on Adams before and during the Revolution.


Although Paul Revere is most well known for his April 18th ride ahead of Lexington and Concord, Fischer also detailed Revere’s role in the early revolutionary movement. He played an important role in Boston, which included the delivery of the Suffolk Resolves to the First Continental Congress.


Fisher contended that historical smoothing has distorted many realities of the American Revolution. He stated that Loyalists positions have been underrepresented because they hid during this period and patriots were extremely divided on how to form a country. This article explained how the colonists divided support for independence.


Foner explained Thomas Paine’s transformation from recent immigrant to the author of one of the most influential pamphlets in history. He explored the political and social ideas that influenced his writings. This source reinforced why Common Sense resonated with so many colonists and described Paine’s contributions to the Revolutionary effort.

Friedenwald used the records of the Continental Congress and some of the additional ancillary materials written by its members to discuss how the legislative body conducted business. He compared and contrasted this body with later, more familiar congressional models. This article offered an overview of the Continental Congress.


Gipson’s book on the American Revolution provided a good foundation on the subject. He described 1763 as a turning point in American history that set the colonies looking for a new world order. The book presented information on many of the historical events in my paper including the Stamp Act, Townshend Acts, and Intolerable Acts.


Greene posited that culture in the American colonies was similar to that of Great Britain, but this abruptly changed with the revolution. This text offered a different perspective to other historians who contend that the culture and political problems with Britain had been developing for a long time.


This is a very detailed reference work on the American Revolution. It began with 75 articles examining the causes of the revolution and is followed by biographical and chronological sections. Of particular help to me were the works on the different types of propaganda used on both sides of the Atlantic.


This collection includes essays on political, social-cultural, and economic issues during the colonial era. This source provided information about different the colonial identities and the dynamics between them. Each essay also offered extensive lists of additional readings that furthered my course of research.


This compilation of articles on the American Revolution provided a thorough background on issues related to the period. Over 90 articles are included on topics ranging from aspects of daily life to the global impact of the war. This source provided general information on events and people relevant to the American Revolution.

Gould explained that British culture at the time of the American Revolution supported the expectation that the colonies pay taxes; in fact, most believed they should pay more than just trade taxes. This source assisted by juxtapositioning the British and American views on taxes after the French and Indian War.


Henderson argued that parties were emerging in the United States as early as the formation of the Continental Congress. He analyzed voting patterns and determined that many of them were based on internal factions and geographical divisions. This source helped me understand that while the Continental Congress unified the colonies, divisions remained.


In this study, Hinderaker and Mancall argued that Britain never effectively exercised control over the American backcountry, which caused the area to develop independent systems to control the territory. It suggested that this conflict played a key role in the American Revolution. This interesting account explained what was going on in a little-focused-on area in the colonies during the time period.


Hofstadter provided a portrait of the American colonies in the middle of the 18th century. It discussed the population explosion at the time, as well as prevailing social norms. This book provided me with background information for the section of the paper on early resistance.


Hyneman and Lutz compiled an assortment of primary resources related to the American Revolution. This text contains 76 wide-ranging pamphlets that reveal the social and political thoughts of the time. The editors contextualized each of the documents, which offered a great deal of information in the early stages of my research.


This Pulitzer Prize-winning book described the religious and political confrontations that changed Virginia during the years between 1740 and 1790. The author argued that many of the institutions that bolstered the landed elite were dislodged. This text assisted by demonstrating how the revolution altered life in the area.


This book was based on a series of lectures that Jameson gave at Princeton University. He maintained that the American Revolution was caused by and resulted
in profound social changes. By creating a republic, the Founders moved away from the aristocratic values of Great Britain. This book helped by presenting one of the many social arguments for the Revolution.


This is a quantitative study of the colonial economy on the eve of the Revolution. Jones described the distribution of wealth therein and argued that economic considerations played a very real motivation for the revolt. Statistical analysis was used to conclude that wealth in the colonies had increased in the years before the war and that colonists were committed to the protection of this wealth. This provided a possible economic cause of the Revolution.


Kammen’s study provided an account of agents whose role was to maintain an open line of communication between London and the colonies. These agents were instrumental in providing information before and during the Revolution. For me, this book highlighted the degree of political instability in America caused by shifting power in Great Britain and the degree to which Parliament was uninformed about the colonies.


This volume is the product of a 1971 symposium in which leading scholars reflected on the ideas of the Revolution. It consists of 8 essays that discuss the causes and effects of the war. Of particular help to me were the essays on the significance of the movement, the actions of the Continental Congress, and the social effects of the war.


Labaree described the Boston Tea Party as a threshold moment in history. The event is described as a climax to a long series of frustrations beginning with the Townshend Acts of 1767. He also underscored how Americans viewed East India Company’s monopoly on tea as another threat to liberty. This book informed the section of my paper on how the committees of correspondence responded to the Tea Act.


Lecky sought to create an unbiased history of England. To do so, he referenced countless source materials. Portions of volume III and volume IV are devoted to the American Revolution in which he provided an in-depth discussion of England’s perception of the colonies. Lecky’s text provided me with the British perspective on the growing discord in the colonies.

Locke’s social contract influenced colonial ideas about natural rights. He asserted that while man voluntarily leaves the state of nature and gives up certain liberties in exchange for governmental protection, he retains certain natural rights. I read portions of this book when referenced as an impetus for colonial resistance.


Lutz compiled a set of primary source documents that show the colonial origins of the American Constitution. He argued that the local self-governments in the colonies created a democratic foundation. This text assisted me with understanding how the colonies functioned with relative independence from Great Britain from early stages in development.


Maier invested considerable energy into analyzing primary source documents related to the creation of the Declaration of Independence. This book cited many of the events and grievances in my paper as motivations. It also discussed the Suffolk Resolves as the first Revolutionary document promoting non-compliance with Great Britain, which informed the latter part of my paper.


In this text, Maier thoroughly analyzed primary source documents to create a chronological survey that detailed the growing resistance against Great Britain. She provided an in-depth account on the evolution of colonial backlash. This book helped chronicle how the arguments against British taxes and involvement in the colonies gained momentum.


The included information painted a broad picture of the British empire during the 18th century and provided foundational support for the era. I used this book to understand more about the British perspective on the American Revolution. This source acknowledged it as a setback for imperialism, but it describes it only as a small “rupture” in the empire.


Lender and Martin began this interesting book about Revolutionary War military history with the conclusion of the French and Indian War. They described the development of the Continental Army and as a type of evolution from there and credited the lower classes with much of its success. This book was most
assistive in its attempt to place the formation and function of the military in a larger historical context.

McCullough has woven a narrative that tells about the American Revolution from both sides of the Atlantic. Letters, maps, and portraits are used to frame the analysis that details the year of the Declaration of Independence. Although this book is entitled 1776, it discussed the complex issues leading up to the Revolution. I read this early in my research when narrowing down my topic.

This biography chronicled the life of John Adams as he is thrust into the world of politics and rises to be a Revolutionary leader. It discussed his relationships with the other Founding Fathers, including his complex relationship with Thomas Jefferson. After reading 1776, I selected this book. The beginning sections of this work helped explain Adams’s involvement in the colonial resistance.

This book was a finalist for the Pulitzer Prize. This very detailed account of the American Revolution began with the French and Indian War and carried through the election of George Washington as first President. It provided me with a great deal of information on the Stamp Act and the Boston Tea Party.

Miller explained that the original Virginia Committee of Correspondence (1759-1770) was designed to facilitate communication with Great Britain. It was only after this was dissolved and then reassembled in March of 1773 that it evolved into an institution intended to correspond with other colonies about imperial frustration.

Miller provided a good overview of the developments that led up to the Revolutionary War. His chapters detailed many of the aspects of my paper and attempted to describe different nuances of the movement, e.g., when colonial resistance was ebbing and waning, different factions of support within the movement, elements of the ideological conflict on both sides of the Atlantic, etc.

Morgan synthesized Benjamin Franklin’s papers to show his multifaceted abilities as a scientist, ambassador, printer, and postmaster general. Much of the book was spent discussing his role leading up to and during the American Revolution. This was one of the several books that helped explain Franklin’s involvement in the early years of the resistance.

Morgan asserted that Prime Minister Grenville delayed passing the Stamp Act because he knew that it was burdensome. It also indicated that Britain provided the colonies with an opportunity to respond and provide alternative taxes. This article provided me with British context surrounding the passage of the Stamp Act.


Morgan argued that “Puritan ethic” created a divide between British subjects in the mother country and the colonies long before the American Revolution began. He explained that religion was divisive because it caused many to leave Great Britain and influenced social values in America. Morgan provided yet another view for me to consider regarding the impetus of the Revolution.


Morgan reflected on the significance of the Stamp Act Crisis and the foundation that it played in the later push for independence. He emphasized that this instance prompted colonists to consider and fight for their rights. This book informed the section of my paper on early resistance.


Nash unearthed lesser-known stories from the American Revolution. He showed that war efforts involved all classes and could be found in a variety of places—both on and off of traditional battlefields. This book argued against traditional notions that the Revolution was an elitist movement and that participation was limited to that cross-section of the population.


Nash focused on the port cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia and explored how the urbanization of these areas created a revolutionary impetus. These seaports experienced socioeconomic fluctuations after the French and Indian War, which caused them considerable frustration with Great Britain.


This source provided an economic perspective on the American Revolution. Newell chronicled the economic development of New England and posited that it was this advancement that allowed it demonstrate leadership during the American Revolution. Most books focus on the political or social reasons for colonial resistance, and this book provided me with another view.


Osgood analyzed the timing of the American Revolution. He indicated that the salutary neglect of Great Britain in the early colonial period resulted in strong
self-government tendencies. When King George III ascended the throne and began working in concert with Parliament to change this, the rebellion was imminent. This article gave a succinct account of the causes of the Revolution.


Peckham provided a military history of the American Revolution. He not only summarized each of the battles, but he attempted to contextualize them by situating them in larger campaigns and strategies. While this paper does not focus on military strategy, Peckham poignantly argues that it was the colonists deep commitment to the fight for rights that enabled their victory.


Peterson explored the relationship between Adams and Jefferson. He characterized them as fast friends based on shared views about the American Revolution. Although political differences separated them, they restored communication in later life. Peterson did a good job of explaining the similarities between these two historic figures, both of whom were active in the committees of correspondence.


Plumb documented the reigns of George I, George II, George III, and George IV. The British historian painted a balanced picture of the Hanoverian dynasty and, in doing so, redeemed the negative characterization typically ascribed to them. I used this book for information on King George III.


This biography of Samuel Adams won the Fraunces Tavern Museum Book Award. It described the role of Samuel Adams in the early resistance against the Sugar Act and Stamp Act as well as his involvement in the Boston Tea Party. Puls characterized Adams as primarily concerned with local politics but noted his skill in manipulating British officials into coercive action that would require a response.


Rakove detailed the creation and work of the Continental Congress in four sections. The first section described the years between 1774-1775. This book helped document the crowning achievement of the committees of correspondence, their pivotal progression into the Continental Congress.


Reid argued that the extreme American reaction to the Stamp Act occurred because it was an entirely new kind of tax. While previous duties were placed on
trade, the Stamp Act was an external tax to obtain revenue. This article explained to me some of the many reasons the Stamp Act evoked such a powerful response in the colonies.


This compilation included many primary source documents from the American Revolution. It included letters, diaries, newspaper articles, and political documents to provide eyewitness accounts of the major events. This was one of the first books that I read when trying to narrow down the focus of my paper.


Ryerson recorded the creation and actions of the Philadelphia Committee of Correspondence. He credited Charles Thomson’s leadership with moving many towards independence. Few books deal specifically with the committees of correspondence, so this was a very useful source of information on the Philadelphia Committee of Correspondence.


This collection of 33 sermons demonstrated the degree to which religion and politics were intertwined during the Revolutionary period. In them, the nature of tyranny and the moral responsibility of Christians to address it were considered. This book explained the ways in which sermons were used as propaganda during the American Revolution.


Schiff’s biography of Benjamin Franklin focused on his time in France during the American Revolution. It underscored the importance of his efforts at securing aid despite the ambivalence about receiving foreign assistance at home. This provided another account of Franklin’s sense of duty to the colonies.


Schlesinger divided the colonists into three groups and considered the motivations each had for participating in the American Revolution. The categories were: the merchants of the commercial colonies, planters of the south, and democratic farmers of the interior. He indicated that they became motivated to participate in that order, respectively. This gave a different kind of framework from which to view the Revolution.


Schlesinger argued that the Stamp Act resulted in a great deal of newspaper propaganda. This occurred both because it was a new kind of external tax and
because the tax would fall disproportionately on publishers. This article provided me with another explanation on why the Stamp Act was so controversial.


This is a collection of essays about issues related to the American Revolution. Two particular essays assisted in the construction of this paper. One explored the socio-economic reasons behind participation. Another tried to define the nature of the revolution—that is, whether it was a conventional war, civil war, or insurgency.


Smith reflected on the significance of writs of assistance. He emphasized the Paxton case in Boston in 1761 in which James Otis declared that writs of assistance violated natural law. Adams cited this case as the beginning of the American Revolution because it changed how colonist perceived their rights, and this source provided more information about that case.


This book interwove the involvement of Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, John Hancock and the other Sons of Liberty in the pre-Revolutionary movement. It chronicled the beginning of the Sons of Liberty in New York to its spread throughout the colonies and discussed its interrelationship with the committees of correspondence and the major events building up to war.


Tyler argued that the numbers, prominence, and character of Loyalists have been historically misrepresented. He estimated that one in three Americans was Loyalists and that these individuals have been unfairly discredited because they did not realign themselves in 1773-1774 when tensions with Great Britain escalated. He offered an interesting view of who the Loyalist were and their role in the pre-Revolution.


Van Tyne described how most colonists were religiously divided with Great Britain. He also discussed how sermons became a powerful tool for communicating messages about natural rights. Clergymen were often approached about helping dispense revolutionary messages to the masses. This source provided information about the many sermons that were used during the pre-Revolutionary movement to garner support.


This article considered the degree to which the Continental Congress considered and conducted itself as a sovereign governmental body. Van Tyne argued that it had
conflicting mandates, which made its decision-making process more complicated. This article presented an interesting discussion about what the Continental Congress actually was and entitled to do.


Warner described the *Boston Pamphlet* as a new form of communication for the time period: a popular declaration. He indicated that it was through this vehicle that the towns in Massachusetts were mobilized against Britain. This article informed my section on exploring intra-colonial unity.


Warner asserted that the colonial committees of correspondence were essential to the American Revolution. He argued that these bodies not only allowed the spread of revolutionary ideas, but they also created the organizational infrastructure necessary for rebellion. This book provided a great deal of information on the development of the committees of correspondence.


Webster compared and contrasted colonial constitutions. He noted that most future states discussed inalienable rights, and many of them attached bills of rights to these. Many also attempted to address perceived social injustices of the time—e.g., prohibiting the quartering of soldiers and declaring the sovereignty of the people. This source attempted to analyze causes of the American Revolution by looking at these documents.


This collection of essays explored many issues related to the American Revolution. Topics included the religious and legal implications of liberty at this time and views on natural rights. “Liberty, Metaphor, and Mechanism” was particularly helpful in its discussion of how Enlightenment ideas informed Revolutionary notions of government.


Wood’s biography of Franklin described his many roles in history. It discussed the initial reluctance he had in breaking with Britain, and then his role in securing America’s independence by appealing to France. This account underscored how much Franklin was willing to do for the cause despite his ambivalence.

Wood used pamphlets, sermons, letters, and other texts in order to provide insight into the early American mindset. It is considered a foundational text for those studying the creation of our nation, so I read it. It showed me the overlap between all of these instruments of communication (or propaganda, depending upon the point of view).


Wood described how mobs were a necessary component of the American Revolution. Although many actions preceding and during are not historically considered the efforts of mobs—e.g., the Gaspee Affair and the Boston Tea Party, they fit this description. This source demonstrated the overlap between mob action, resistance leaders, and the committees.


In this study, Wood underscored the importance of considering the American Revolution as an effort to transition from monarchy to democracy. He characterized the movement as a “revolution” of the mind that is without parallel. This was one of the first sources that I read and assisted me with separating the ideological American Revolution from the military Revolutionary War.


Wright’s biography of Benjamin Franklin praised him as “the most modern-minded” of the Founding Fathers. He highlighted the development of Franklin’s political thought and described him as a reluctant revolutionary. This source portrayed Franklin’s diplomacy during the early events of the American Revolution.


Young presented the American Revolution from the viewpoint of a Boston shoemaker. George Robert Twelves Hewes was a lesser known participant in the Boston Massacre and the Boston Tea Party. This account provided me with a unique perspective of the events in my paper and demonstrated the degree to which ordinary individuals also became consumed by the cause.


This book was published on the bicentennial of the Boston Massacre. Zobel’s book recounted the events of that day and the trial that followed. He tried to separate myth and propaganda from reality. This book helped me place the Boston Massacre within the framework of other events leading up to the American Revolution.