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PART ONE

“Redcoats”: The Soldiers of the British Army in North America During the American War of Independence and Before: A Historiography

“They came three thousand miles, and died
To keep the Past upon its throne
Unheard, beyond the ocean tide
Their English mother made her moan”

Inscription at the grave for British soldiers at Old North Bridge, Concord, Mass

Introduction:

Whether you call it “The Revolution” or “The American War of Independence”, the war between Great Britain and her American colonies towards the end of the Eighteenth Century is a source of great pride, happiness and inspiration to modern day citizens of the United States. Together with the framing of the U.S. Constitution, it gives Americans a glorious example of what they feel represents the best of their country. “Patriot” fighters like George Washington, Ethan Allen, Henry Knox, Nathaniel Greene, Horatio Gates and even Benedict Arnold are household names.

Across the ocean in Britain, the Revolutionary era understandably is of much less significance, and there has traditionally been little interest in the war and the beginning of the U.S. nation. Not many people know much about this topic, with the exception of the “Boston Tea Party”. Historically, there are many reasons for this. Initially many Britons felt
shamed by the fact that the finest army in the world had lost to what was widely seen as a rabble. Also, to Great Britain this war was only one of many fronts and Americans were only one of many antagonists. Also, it is fair to say that Britain was engaged in a world war that involved Spain, France and Holland, and that the arenas of the war took place in Europe, the Caribbean, as well as North America. More recently, Britons have developed feelings of regret, shame and deep embarrassment of their imperial past. Thousands of common soldiers were mobilized to North America to fight for their country, and yet history has not been kind to them. Americans have been keen to paint them as a mixture of well trained mercenaries and immoral criminals. Britons have tried to forget them. In this historiographical essay I seek to look at how historians on both sides of the Atlantic have studied the British soldiers in North America. I will cover mostly the Revolutionary era, but I will also take a considerable look at the decades leading up to the war, because much of the tension from the Revolutionary era can be traced to the days leading up to the French and Indian War (1756-1763) and beyond. Students have long been taught that one of the major bones of contention amongst the colonists was the fact that Britain left a standing army in North America, and that that army was a great expense, inconvenience and even a threat to the colonial population. This paper does not look at the historiography of the American Revolution. It looks at how historians have studied the British Army’s common soldiers, and to a lesser degree how historians have looked at the generals, officers, and administrators of the British Army in North America at this time.

Contemporary accounts:

Very soon after the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, people began to write and publish eye-witness accounts of the conflict. Most of these authors had been connected
with the American side. However, there were two notable publications by British contemporaries that looked at the British Army. In 1790, Robert Beaton’s *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain* was published, followed more notably by Charles Stedman’s *History of the Origin, Progress, and Termination of the American War* four years later in 1794. Stedman had served as a commissary under Generals Howe, Clinton and Cornwallis, and his account has been called “one of the two most respected contemporary accounts of the Revolution”¹ (from either side). Stedman does not list many sources, and it is assumed that the account comes from his own memory. However, in 1958, historian R. Kent Newmyer concluded that Stedman had occasionally plagiarized from the British “Annual Register”. The Annual Register, which had been started in 1758, was and remains a year-by-year record of British and world events. It seems plausible however, that Stedman had referred to the Register to help refresh his memory, and had sometimes followed its chronology. This should hardly be surprising because Stedman was relaying events from all across the thirteen colonies in rebellion, as well as Canada, the Caribbean, Europe, the Atlantic Ocean, and the English Channel. The sources he does list however, (and they are few and far between), are letters and parliamentary reports.

Much of Stedman’s report focuses on the major events of the war, and gives the major politicians and generals a lot of coverage. However, when he does mention the common soldiers, and it is occasionally, he is complimentary of them. For example, he describes the British troops that arrived in Boston to reinforce the troops that had been blockaded there in the late Spring of 1775 (after Lexington and Concord) as a “respectable force”, not in terms of size, but in relation to “the excellence of the troops”.² In his account

¹ Newmyer
² Stedman vol, I, p124
of Bunker Hill he claims that the British soldiers despised their enemies. He also reports that they showed “bravery and discipline”\(^3\), and makes pains to describe how well the British soldiers performed on that day despite being put at a severe disadvantage by the poor planning of their leaders. He describes one company of highlander troops serving in Georgia as demonstrating “obstinate bravery” against a much larger force, a characteristic that saw most of them were killed.\(^4\)

Despite these nods to the bravery of the British soldiers, most of Stedman’s work records the military and political strategies and considerations.

**The Late-Nineteenth Century: Sir John Knox Laughton leads the way**

After the initial eye-witnesses of the war, there was very little written about the British Army in North America until the latter part of the Nineteenth Century. Sir John Knox Laughton was a British naval historian who was very active in historical study at the end of the Nineteenth Century. His major focus was on the history of the Royal Navy, and on the biographies of major naval figures throughout British history, including those who served during the American Revolutionary War, such as the Earl of Sandwich and Viscount Hood. Despite Laughton only being concerned with the study of the navy, and not the army, he is relevant here, firstly because his work helped formulate a study of British military direction in the American Revolutionary War, and secondly because he was a very influential historian of his time. In 1875, he delivered a monumental speech to the Royal United Service Institution whereby he stated that in order to decipher what really happened in the past and to dispel the multitude of myths that were handed down from generation to generation, it

---

\(^3\) Stedman, vol I, p128  
\(^4\) Stedman, vol II, p117
was imperative that historians base their analyses of the past on authentic documents and archival research. He also forced the British government to reluctantly allow scholars to have access to the Public Record Office.

As previously mentioned, Laughton focused on the highest echelons of the Royal Navy. This was consistent with other areas of study at this time. Before the First World War, “The Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts” and “The Royal Institution of Great Britain” published important papers and documents pertaining to the British Army in North America during the revolutionary era, but only concentrated on papers that pertained to the leaders of the war effort, such as the Secretary of State for America, Lord George Germain, and the under-Secretary, William Knox.

In the United States, “The New York Historical Society” published collections of “minutes, orders, journals, letters, order books, and similar material written by American, British, and German officers of the King’s forces”5. British officers whose journals were published in depth include Captain John Montressor, the army’s chief engineer between 1774 and 1778 (published in 1881) and Major Stephen Kemble (published in 1884-5) who was the deputy adjutant general of Major General Sir William Howe. A number of individuals also published books that pertained to the British military in North America in the mid and late Nineteenth Century. In 1844, John Graves Simcoe published a book that was presumably about one of his ancestors entitled Simcoe’s Military Journal: A History of the operations of a Partisan Corps, Called the Queen’s Rangers, Commanded by Lieut. Col. J. G. Simcoe, During the War of the American Revolution, and in 1859 a book edited by Charles

5 Syrett, p2 (The page numbers that I cite for Syrett’s article are not recorded in step with the page numbers in the original article. This is because my copy of his article did not come with the appropriate page numbers)
Ross was published entitled *Correspondence of Charles, First Marquis Cornwallis*. Although these books were not about the generals, they still concentrated on officers.

One major work on the British Army before the First World War was J. W. Fortescue’s multi-volume work entitled *A History of the British Army*. The volumes were published between 1899 and 1920, and volume three which dealt with the American War of Independence was published in 1911. It is a long narrative on the events of the war, recording events about the campaigns from both sides. Montescue is especially critical of Germaine back in London and General Burgoyne in the field, and he created sub-chapters with names such as “False Basis on which the British Operations were Planned”, “Indecision of the English Ministers”, and “His (Germaine’s) Singular Unfitness for the Duty”. Fortescue also is critical of the Continental Congress for obstructing Washington’s ability to obtain and retain troops and for reneging on the terms of the British surrender at Saratoga by treating the troops harshly, and attempting to conscript them into the revolutionary force. Near the end of this volume he discusses some of the administrative failings of the army. He even mentions some of the hardships faced by the ordinary troops in terms of pay, and notes the high levels of desertion and the challenges of recruitment. However, as stated earlier, most of this volume is either a narrative that records battles and army movements, or is a criticism of Britain’s war leaders, especially Lord George Germain. A such, Fortescue continues to primarily discuss the actions of the upper echelons of the British Army and British politics.

According to David Syrett in his 1999 article entitled “The British Armed Forces in the American Revolutionary War: Publications, 1875-1998”, Fortescue’s work “is
considerably flawed by modern standards because of its weak research\(^6\). However, to
balance that assertion, Syrett does concede that it is “a magnificent feat of writing”, and is
“the starting point for any student of its (the British army’s) operations during the American
Revolutionary War”\(^7\).

**Between the World Wars:**

According to Syrett, “widespread interest in the role of the British forces in the
American Revolutionary War died with World War One. Both in America and Britain during
the years between the World Wars, there was apathy, if not open hostility, toward all things
military, including the study of the American War”\(^8\). In Britain for the most part, only the
Royal Navy continued to publish volumes on naval documents, occasionally publishing a
work that focused on the American war. However, there were influential historians who did
further the study of the British Army in North America. Perhaps surprisingly, all three
historians were from North America; Jane Clark, a Canadian, and two Americans, Richard E.
Curtis and Stanley Pargellis.

For the most part Clark’s work explored the tactical planning of the British effort,
and especially looked at the army’s failure at Saratoga. Therefore, I feel that her work is not
relevant to this historiography because she did not examine the soldiers who lived and
fought and died during these years. This cannot be said of Richard E. Curtis however. In
1926, Curtis, an American, published “The Organization of the British Army in the American
Revolution”, which according to Syrett immediately meant that “the field had for the first

\(\text{[^6]}\) Syrett, p3
\(\text{[^7]}\) Syrett, p3
\(\text{[^8]}\) Syrett, p3
time an administrative history of the British army during this time”. The book does indeed record the administrative side of the army, but there are also fairly detailed accounts about the soldiers too, especially in chapter one and to a lesser extent chapter three. Chapter One, which is called “The British Army at the Outbreak of the Revolution: A General Survey” begins by stating that there had been a lot written on the Continental (American) Army, but not much on the British Army. He then summarizes the location of the British troops in 1775 (England, Scotland, Ireland, Minorca, Gibraltar, the West Indies, America, and Africa), and states that the total number of troops around the world at this point was 45,123. Curtis explains how many officers and men were in the average regiment, the different kind of regiments (artillery, light infantry etc), and for our purposes actually goes on to explain how administrative challenges directly lead to practical problems for the regular soldiers. The fact that army physicians were not required to have any kind of formal medical training meant that “the physical welfare of the soldier was ill-cared for”. Curtis also explains that each regiment was supposed to have a chaplain, but in reality this did not happen, and he asserts that the common soldiers’ “spiritual welfare was practically neglected”. Curtis describes other hardships facing the common soldiers, such as the inappropriateness of their uniforms (“ill adapted for comfort and speedy movement”), the flintlock muskets nicknamed “Brown Bess” (unreliable at a distance greater than one hundred” yards, and “dependent upon the weather”), inadequate pay in comparison to the cost of living, and harsh discipline. Here Curtis quotes Sergeant Roger Lamb’s journal; “I well remember the first man I saw flogged...I cried like a child”.

---

9 Syrett, p3
10 Curtis, Ch 1, p11
11 Curtis, Ch 1, p11
Curtis also goes on to address some of the charges that have been brought against the British soldiers during the conflict, namely drunkenness, gambling, plundering, and rape, and the issue of general morality. He argues that a drinking culture pervaded British society from the top to the bottom during this era, and does not deny the British soldier’s love of drinking and gambling. In regards to the more serious charges, without denying instances of misconduct on the part of the soldiers, Curtis states that American writers have probably exaggerated the guilt of the “redcoats”, and he concludes that on the whole the forces “manifested unusual respect for the persons and property of noncombatants” when compared with the actions of Eighteenth Century armies in Europe, a statement more interesting written by an American historian than a British one.

The third chapter of Curtis’ book is entitled “The Recruiting of the Army”, and it discusses the challenges facing the British government in terms of expanding the Army to meet the sudden demand for more troops. Curtis explains how parliament enacted, repealed and modified legislation to try to address the problem, and delves into how the government both searched for volunteers and sought to impress men who were imprisoned in jail. He also explains how the men were distributed amongst old and new regiments. The legislation he cites states that in order to be successfully recruited, soldiers had to follow certain guidelines. For example, in December 1775, recruits had to be at least 5 feet 6 and a half inches tall, but in 1778 the law was modified to allow the entry of shorter men into the army, as long as they were at least 5 feet 4 inches tall. However, most of this chapter discusses the logistical difficulties of “beating orders” that were designed for “raising men for rank”.

16
Curtis used many sources, and he lists them all. British primary sources included papers from the government offices of the Admiralty, the Audit Office, the Colonial Office, the War Office, and the Treasury. Curtis included records from the Annual Register, Army Lists, Journals of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, the “London Gazette” (a government periodical concentrating on military news), and reports of Parliamentary Committees. Letters and orderly books written by generals such as Cornwallis, Clinton, Howe, and Burgoyne were also consulted, as was a plethora of officer eye-witness accounts and letters. Curtis describes Sergeant Roger Lamb’s Journal and Memoir as “among the few works that furnish a picture of the life of the British soldier as drawn by himself”.12 Lamb’s journal is one of the most vital sources for students of the army’s common soldiers in North America, and it is used time and again by later historians. One eye-witness account Curtis cites who also is of particular interest to us is Charles Stedman, whose 1794 publication is included earlier in this historiography. As we have seen, in 1958, Newmyer hailed Stedman’s publication as one of the most respected eye-witness accounts, although also as we have seen, he hypothesized that Stedman plagiarized from the Annual Register. Here, in 1926, Curtis calls Stedman’s publication “disappointingly meager in its yield of facts respecting British army organization during the war”.13

Between the world wars, the third major historian of the British Army in North America was Stanley McCrory Pargellis. Pargellis looked mostly at the British Army in the 1750s and 1760s, years that saw British soldiers preparing for or engaged in conflicts with the French and their specific Indian allies. Most of the modern day historians who study the British Army cite Pargellis, and during my research I have come to refer to him as “the

---

12 Curtis, Bibliography
13 Curtis, Bibliography
daddy”. Like Curtis, Pargellis is an American, and in 1933, his work “Lord Loudoun in North America” was published for the first time. Loudoun was the British Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces in North America from 1756-1758, and like all of the commanders-in-chief, he faced logistical and political problems administering an army 3,000 miles from home. He was also forced to negotiate with colonial assemblies and governors who interpreted British law and policy inconsistently, as indeed did different British administrations. Much of the book looks at these political and logistical frustrations.

However, Pargellis also spends some time discussing the soldiers. Perhaps unfairly, he blames the army’s loss at Monongahela, where the previous commander-in-chief, Edward Braddock was killed, on the fact that the troops were undisciplined, claiming that “over half the men in the British regiments were either Irish drafts, the worst soldiers in the Irish army, or raw American recruits”.14

Pargellis takes a major look at how the British government sought to address the problem of colonial defense, describing the different proposed plans. One of the major results of some of those plans was that provincial troops were raised at different times, depending on the direction of the political winds, and at other times, mostly British troops were preferred. Pargellis examines from a purely administrative position how the two groups compared, and concludes that British troops did more and were paid a lot less. He shows that a provincial private was paid over 10 “d” (pence) a day and could keep it all. A British private was paid 8d, but could only keep 3d or 4d due to various “stoppages” (expenses), both in England and America, a fact that Pargellis says “illustrates a divergence between England and the colonies in the ideas of a man’s social and economic worth”.15

14 Pargellis, p36
15 Pargellis, 101
Later historians began to study desertion within the British army, and with these financial figures, it is not hard to see why desertion was rife.

Pargellis also clearly states his belief that by the time he wrote this work, Americans had developed a sense of misunderstanding of the past, and an unjustly negative view of the British soldiery. He argues, that what has developed has been a “latent hostility of the average American towards the British army”, and that stories over the years of British regulars have “exaggerated the evils and suppressed the truth” He goes on to opine that “echoes of that popular feeling.....still sound faintly through the years and embody themselves in our text-books.”\(^\text{16}\)

Pargellis used similar sources to Curtis. In Britain, he consulted papers from the public Record Office, the Admiralty, the Navy Board, the War Office, the Treasury, the private papers of important individuals (such as the Duke of Cumberland), and contemporary eye-witness accounts. Secondary sources are divided up by sub-topic such as general works on the Seven Years War, the constitutions of royal colonies, British politics and government, the army (for example, works by Sir John Fortescue), and biographies.

So, as we have seen, Curtis and Pargellis were the first historians to begin to look at some of the details connected to the regular troops, the privates of the British Army. Even though these two pioneers still focused more diligently on the overall administration of the army, and looked at the leaders in more depth, they did dedicate portions of their work, and in Curtis’ case a whole chapter, to the common soldiers, and they became, especially Pargellis, vital secondary sources that greatly helped later generations of historians.

\(^\text{16}\) Pargellis, p125
Post Second World War Study:

I found that during the 1950s and 1960s, American historians came to two major conclusions about the British soldiers in North America in the late Eighteenth Century. Firstly, the soldiers were well-trained, highly disciplined and brave professional warriors worthy of respect. Their second conclusion was that the British soldiers were ruthless and immoral hooligans described by the noted military historian, John Shy as “cast-offs” and “criminals”.\(^\text{17}\) Historians of this era claimed that their “barbarity” was for two reasons; the soldiers were scraped from the dregs of British society, and then de-humanized by the archaic British class system, which was itself repeated in the military.

In the wonderfully written and fascinating “Rebels and Redcoats” (published in 1957) co-authors George F. Scheer and Hugh F. Rankin reference an American eye-witness, General John Glover. Glover describes the British soldiers who fought at the Battle of Saratoga (1777) in complimentary terms, opining that they “were bold, intrepid, and fought like heroes”.\(^\text{18}\) The historians also evoke sympathy for the soldiers by including a first-hand account by British Lieutenant Anburey, who was given the duty of burying the dead (perhaps because of his name??), a task he described as easy compared to bringing in the wounded. “They had remained out all night...some of them begged they might lay and die...some upon the least movement were put in the most horrid tortures”\(^\text{19}\). In John Shy’s 1965 “Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution”, the historian reminds readers that many colonials in pre-revolutionary days outwardly praised the regular troops of the British army, and includes an account of a

\(^{17}\) Shy, p363
\(^{18}\) Scheer and Rankin, p 275
\(^{19}\) Scheer and Rankin, p277
Boston preacher called Thomas Balch describing the soldiers in 1763 as “skilful and brave...for crushing the papist enemy (the French)”\textsuperscript{20}

However, the historians of this time period painted the soldiers as more barbaric and base than heroic and honourable, and there are many examples given of plunder and barbarity. Scheer and Rankin record the brutality of British troops on their retreat from Concord, their criminal behaviour during the American siege of Boston, and the plundering of both rebel and loyalist private property in New Jersey, South Carolina, and North Carolina. The historians also argue that plundering was counter-productive to military strategy, as in New Jersey these actions turned loyalists against the British, and in South Carolina rebels received valuable additional time to fortify Charleston because the British soldiers “could not pass up the money, jewelry, and silver plate of the plantation houses”.\textsuperscript{21}

Paul H. Smith agrees with Scheer and Rankin in “Loyalists and Redcoats”, his study of the British Army and their loyalist compatriots. According to Smith, the British forces had “alienated thousands of potentially loyal subjects”\textsuperscript{22}

In “Toward Lexington” John Shy concentrates on the British Army of the 1760s and early 1770s. He discusses the behaviour of the troops during their long sojourn in Boston under General Gage before the Revolutionary War began in the Spring of 1775. He highlights incidents of drunkenness, fighting, petty theft, prostitution, and even the organization of horse-racing on Boston common, all behaviours that the puritanical leaders of Massachusetts found abhorrent. According to Shy, religious Boston residents even felt sorry for the spiritual barrenness and bankruptcy of the troops. He also argues that in 1766, recruiters in Britain were unsuccessful in obtaining sound new men, and were forced

\textsuperscript{20} Shy, 147
\textsuperscript{21} Scheer and Rankin, p393
\textsuperscript{22} Smith, p42
into sending to the colonies only “convicts and dregs”. Historian James Kirby Martin concurred, claiming that “ne’er-do-wells, the luckless, and the poorer sort in general filled the ranks”. Shy does however attempt to explain why the troops did undoubtedly sometimes behave in this fashion, laying a large part of the blame at the British class system and the hierarchy of the army. He argues that the individual soldier “was treated in the Eighteenth Century little better than an animal, and (he) behaved like one whenever he dared”. He develops this theme of the unhappiness of the British troops by claiming that in the 1760s, when British regiments returned home at the end of their tours of duty, a growing number of soldiers chose to stay in the colonies instead.

These historians used similar sources to the historians of the previous generation. Shy’s “core of the book is the collection of Thomas Gage (the British commander-in-chief) papers”, and other primary sources, like earlier works, are letters between members of the upper echelons of the British hierarchy. Secondary sources are few, but Shy does mention “the daddy”, Pargellis, whose “Lord Loudoun in North America he calls “a thorough piece of research” and “impressive”. Scheer and Rankin admit in their introduction that they did not attempt to find new sources, and asserted that they felt that the known sources were reliable and important enough. They relied on primary sources such as newspapers, letters, and documents, and eye-witness accounts written by the great Americans of the era such as Franklin and Washington. They also used periodicals from both early and latter-day historical societies. Paul H. Smith too used many of the same sources such as British government records from different departments (for example, the colonial office and the

---

23 Martin, p120
24 Shy, p277
war office), many letters again from the upper echelons of British military and political life, contemporary accounts, and of course many secondary works.

For the most part during this time period, it appears that American historians sought to criticize the British soldiers of the colonial and revolutionary eras, and draw attention to their more negative behaviours. By doing so, they tried to display the sense of injustice felt by rebel (and increasingly, loyalist) colonists and trumpet the victories against British tyranny, tyranny that was imposed on the colonists by the top of British society as well as the bottom. Of course it is only natural that Americans (including American historians) should be proud of the brave and laudable achievements of their ancestors, the generation that lived, fought, and died through this era. Perhaps in these early post-Second World War days, with the American (and Russian) led Allied victory against Fascist tyranny still very much fresh in their minds, when American historians looked at the sources available to them, they saw American exceptionalism and perseverance against a cruel and rabid old-world monster drunk with rum and crazy with an obsession for imperial domination. Although these historians concede that the British soldiers are both well-trained and brave under fire, they paint them as little better than duped slaves whose natural disposition and wretched place in society meant that they were machine-like pawns of an Eighteenth Century axis of evil. However, in his own words, historian John Shy reveals the folly of jumping to conclusions. “Much less”, Shy states, “can be learned about the rank and file than about officers. Records of enlisted men were primitive at the regimental level, and none at all were maintained at the War Office”, and that “only occasionally is there a glimpse of a soldier himself in an officer’s chance remark, a record of a court-martial, or a
list of discharged men". If historians rely on the occasional officer, with all of his potential biases, to record the story of the British soldier, readers should approach with caution.

**The Vietnam Comparison:**

During the American conflict in Vietnam, commentators began to compare Great Britain’s experience during the American War of Independence with the experience of the United States in Vietnam. Although there are some major differences, some of the comparisons are indeed convincing. For instance, the better-trained British troops in North America could not defeat a more inexperienced and hastily established collection of fighters who often used the tactics of guerilla warfare and who benefitted from defending their beloved territory, families and communities. This outcome was also experienced by the U.S. military in Vietnam. Additionally, on their return home, both armies were received by a public that was less than enthusiastic about their toils and their highest of sacrifices. Historian James W. Pohl stated that in “the earlier struggle, a split Parliament and a divided citizenry rent the British state, as a torn Congress and cleaved people rent the United States”. Addressing troop maltreatment of the populace, he also wrote that “British atrocities upon the civil populace in Staten Island and New Jersey remind one of the Song My and My Lai massacres”. Another comparison is that the common foot-soldiers on the ground had to endure incoherent and confused policy making, controlled by men removed from the realities of army life by thousands of miles.

In his article entitled “Ending the War and Winning the Peace: The British in America and the Americans”, published in 1987, historian Neil L. York compares the confused and illogical decision-making of the British government during the war for American
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Independence with that of the American government in regards to the Vietnam War, especially under the leadership of President Richard Nixon. For example, one of the Hessian commanders serving in the British Army named Captain Johann Ewald, said that he had "nothing but disdain for the way the British handled the entire contest", and that the "British had no real plan for victory, no real strategy". Critics of the Vietnam War have echoed this opinion in relation to American planning in Vietnam. However, York also criticizes the general public on the home front during the two conflicts. He wrote that by "supporting a war effort that sputtered along for eight years, the British had indeed suffered from self-delusion. They like Americans of a later generation, also opened the door for governmental abuse...Yet if Britons had been deceived by their leaders, they had to assume part of the guilt. Their dreams of national greatness and fears of national decline made the deception possible.".

Many other historians and commentators have written articles comparing the British experience in North America with the United States' experience in Vietnam. However, most of these articles concentrate greatly on the political folly of the two governments. To a much lesser extent they compare the experience of the British soldiers with that of the American soldiers in Vietnam. Historians argue that like American soldiers in Vietnam, British soldiers had to contend with guerilla tactics in North America that they were completely unaccustomed to. However, in 1978 a revisionist article written by Peter E. Russell was published. In it, he argued that the British Army had indeed gained experience with guerilla warfare during earlier campaigns on the European continent. British commanders “had ample opportunities to observe, combat, and occasionally to conduct
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guerilla tactics²⁸ in the 1740s, in the Balkans, Flanders and Scotland, and they had the ability to apply what they had learned to North America well before the American War of Independence. In Britain, literature had been published on guerilla tactics. For example, a life of the famous Austrian leader and guerilla leader Baron Franz von der Trenck was published in England in 1747, and a publication on French irregular warfare came out in 1752. According to Russell, “British officers were familiar with this literature”,²⁹ and although Russell is arguing that this knowledge of guerilla tactics benefited troops engaged in the French and Indian War, it is reasonable to conclude that the army as a unit had even more time to study guerilla warfare by the time the War of American Independence erupted.

However, at the outbreak of war in 1775, there were as historian Richard M. Ketchum observes, “thoughtful Englishmen” who doubted if the American people or their army could ever be defeated, and he records that the Whig politician John Wilkes taunted the Prime Minister Lord North by warning him of American guerillas waiting for him in the bushes if he ever dared to travel to the American colonies “even if he rode out at the head of the entire English cavalry”³⁰ Importantly, Ketchum states that as “long as the British were able to split up their forces and fan out over the countryside in relatively small units, they were fairly successful in putting down the irregulars’ activities and cutting off their supplies, but the moment they had to concentrate again on the Continentals, guerilla warfare burst out..on their flank and rear”³¹

²⁸ Russell, p630
²⁹ Russell, p641
³⁰ Ketchum, p2 (page numbers not aligned with page numbers of the original article).
³¹ Ketchum, p3
So, as we have seen there have been a lot of comparisons made between the implementation of policy, but not a great deal of specifics written about the whether the soldiers of the two conflicts can be compared. General exceptions include the fact that both sets of soldiers had to endure inane political leadership, that they were fighting relatively unpopular wars, that they sometimes committed atrocities, and that they suffered at the hands of the unconventional tactics used by their enemies. The study of more specific comparisons would not be unwelcome, especially studies of the ethnic make-up of the soldiers. For example, were African-Americans as heavily represented in the American Army in Vietnam as Irish and Scottish troops in the army of King George?

**The Detailed Study of the Soldier:**

In the last thirty years or so, there has been a movement amongst a small group of historians like Sylvia R. Frey, Fred Anderson, Stephen Conway, Richard Holmes and Stephen Brumwell to explore in as much depth as possible the every-day life of the common British soldier. In his 1999 article entitled “The British Armed Forces in the American Revolutionary War: Publications, 1875-1998”, David Syrett concluded that the “historiography of the British forces during the American Revolutionary War is in many respects rather traditional in content. Very little interest has been shown in the so-called new history, race, gender and class. Compared with other conflicts, such as the American Civil War, the two World Wars, or the American side in the American Revolutionary War, there have been comparatively few historical studies of the forces of the Crown”.\(^{32}\) However, the historians at the beginning of this paragraph are scholars who have indeed been passionate about studying to the maximum extent possible the every-day life of the British soldiers. One of
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In Frey’s introduction, she explains that British and American historians have written extensively on the organization and administration of the army, on its campaigns and tactics, and on its leaders. “What is conspicuously missing” she reasons, “is a scholarly treatment of the common soldier”.33 She laments that the War Office did not keep records on the rank and file during the Eighteenth Century, and that “what we know about the common soldier is insignificant and probably incorrect”,34 acknowledging that the stereotypes of the British soldiers are that of “beggars”, “vagrants”, and “criminals”. She explains that this is partially understandable due to her assertion that there are simply not enough documents, memoirs or journals from the common soldiers of this age. However, Frey believes that it is possible to ascertain insights into the lives of the soldiers by studying “him” in an organizational setting, i.e. by studying the institution of the British army. She also explains that some pertinent documents do exist, principally “recruiting returns and regimental records”.35

Frey explains the two systems of army recruitment, volunteerism and impressment. She argues that British soldiers were a diverse bunch, and that the volunteers did so “for a variety of reasons, the most common which was economic”.36 She immediately attacks the stereotype of the impressed soldier from Britain’s gaols, and claims that the majority of the soldiers were not criminals or “the scum of society”. She intelligently argues that changing
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economic conditions in Britain meant that casual laborers and even skilled laborers found themselves out of work, with army life a more attractive option for this group than it might have once been, and she claims that the army was a heterogeneous composition.

From War Office records on specific regiments, Frey is able to deduce interesting pieces of information about the soldiers. In the regiments examined, the average British infantryman was thirty years of age, and he had been in the army since he was about twenty. The average height of the infantryman in these specific regiments was five feet seven in 1782, and in the more elite unit, the Dragoons, was five feet nine in 1775. In Chapter Four, entitled “Crimes and Courts”, Frey explains that previous historians have relied heavily on the records of the army’s Judge Advocate General, records that documented the army’s court proceedings. These court proceedings naturally brought us instances of soldier misconduct, which has “tended to weight the balance conspicuously on the side of criminality”\[37\]

Frey examines the diet of the soldiers of the British army. She claims that “in all probability”, the soldiers’ diet improved when they entered the army. During the actual campaigns, she notes how British troops plundered and foraged the American countryside in order to survive. Soldiers felt as if they had been abandoned by the British people, because as one officer wrote in a letter to his family, “What in God’s name are you all about in England? Have you forgot us?- or are you fascinated?- for we have not had a vessel in three months with any sort of supplies and therefore our miseries are become manifold”.\[38\] The shipping of food from England was also one fraught with danger for the soldiers. Food, sometimes packaged carelessly, arrived contaminated and mouldy, sometimes with live
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maggots to boot. Disease and fever were also severe problems for the British soldier. It is well known that soldiers were more likely to die of disease and fever than from war wounds. One of the army doctors, Dr. Brocklesby put this figure at eight times as much.

Next Frey turns to the training of troops. She argues that British military life was full of training and regulation. She claims that ingenuity was discouraged, and uniform obedience to authority and compliance were drummed into the common soldiers. She explains that during campaigns they were often starving and exhausted, and she cites writings from Sergeant Roger Lamb’s as evidence of this. Also, according to Frey, love of a soldier’s regiment and commitment to its reputation and history was one of the greatest of motivators to the common soldier.

One of Frey’s primary arguments is that even in the late Eighteenth Century, the army offered its troops a primitive collection of services and benefits; pay, food, shelter, medical care, the opportunity of a small pension, and camaraderie and fraternity. However, she also explains the negative components of army life, of which there were many. “Army life was a series of deprivations and frustrations. It was dangerous and uncomfortable.”39 As James Kirby Martin pointed out in his review of Frey’s work, she “correctly states that the soldiery, however lowly its origins, did develop a sense of duty, despite the cruel system that controlled individual lives”.40

Three years after the publication of Sylvia Frey’s book, historian Fred Anderson published “The People’s Army”. Although it is a look at the colonial troops who fought for the King during the French and Indian War, it is a work similar in purpose and ambition to Frey’s book. Chapter Four examines the interactions between the provincial and regular
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troops, and is entitled “There Is No Spare of the Whip”. In his preface, Anderson explains that he has “avoided the classical approaches of military historians...I have focused on the mundane aspects of soldiering – daily life, discipline, common attitudes to war, and so on”\(^41\), words that could have been written by the hand of Frey. Even though the main part of his book discusses the provincial troops, the sources that Anderson consults paint a fascinating and insightful picture of the regular British soldiers as described by their provincial cousins. On the one hand, provincials greatly admired the redcoats, “especially their courage under fire, their ability to remain healthy on campaign, and their greater disposition to orderliness and teamwork”\(^42\). However, on the other hand, they were shocked by many of their behaviours, seemingly most of all, their unwillingness to respect the Sabbath, and their taking of the Lord’s name in vain. One diarist, Caleb Rea, saw in the British defeat by the French at Fort Ticonderoga, divine intervention against the sins of the soldiers in the British Army.

In his article “‘The Great Mischief Complain’d Of’: Reflections on the Misconduct of British Soldiers in the Revolutionary War”, published in 1990, historian Stephen Conway re-examines the traditional theme of the atrocities and crimes committed by some British soldiers during the campaigns of North America. Conway evaluates remarks made by some of the officers who claimed that the common troops were recruited from the “dregs of mankind”, by counter-arguing that most soldiers who were indeed ex-convicts were in fact sent by the military to tropical areas such as the West Indies where the rate of death from disease was the highest among any of Britain’s geographical spheres of interest. Conway, echoing Frey, also argues that of the troops “a surprisingly large proportion had been
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artisans or craftsmen". From this point, Conway next asserts that in pre-Lexington days, many British soldiers actually sought and found work amongst the colonial civilian population, leading to tension in the labour market between British soldiers and the native work force. "This meant that that soldiers were sometimes as much sinned against as sinning".

Tensions obviously augmented rapidly during war-time too. To counter the charges of British barbarity, Conway re-tells the story of the American soldiers who “poisoned their musket balls to increase the agonies of British casualties”. Frey also cites one British soldier, who recorded that the “ provincials charged their muskets with old nails and angular pieces of iron”, purposefully not killing the British soldiers, but bayoneting them in the legs, “to leave them as burdens on us, to exhaust our provisions and to engage our attention as well as to intimidate the rest of our soldiery”. Another historian, Reginald Hargreaves, in an earlier work published in 1968, entitled “The Bloodybacks” goes to great pains to defend the British soldiers. He cites the bravery of British troops at Saratoga and elsewhere, the magnanimity of Captain Patrick Ferguson who had George Washington is his sights but who chose chivalric leniency, Boston rope-makers initiating brawls with British guards, American soldiers shooting and killing British soldiers after a mock surrender after the British had re-won Fort Ticonderoga, provincials committing crimes in the “black market” red coats of British deserters and British soldiers turning out en masse to assist citizens in extinguishing the fires of Boston in 1769 and of New York in 1776. Finally he also charges that Bostonians were responsible for the “Boston Massacre”. Called “Bloodybacks” by provincials due to the
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results of flogging for discipline reasons, the British soldier has seldom encountered a more understanding historian.

Of today’s specialists, perhaps the most influential historians are Stephen Brumwell and Richard Holmes. If I call Pargellis “the daddy”, I refer to these modern British historians as “the young challengers”. In Brumwell’s “Redcoats”, published in 2002, he looks at the British soldiers who fought during the French and Indian War (1755-1763), and challenges the old stereotypes of the men who made up the British Army. This is a theme close to the heart of Holmes too, although in “Redcoat: The British Soldier In the Age of Horse and Musket”, published in 2001, Hollywood is also criticized for its lazy generalizing. In his introduction he writes that Hollywood has given the British soldier a role that is “depressingly reminiscent of that assigned to the German army after the Second World War. Brutal or lumpish soldiers are led by nincompoops or sadists...Watch Rob Roy, Last of the Mohicans or, most recently, The Patriot, and you will wonder how this army of thugs and incompetents managed to fight its way across four continents and secure the greatest empire the world has ever seen”. 47 Although this quote could be viewed as rather jingoistic, his point is well taken. Brumwell argues that this “hackneyed and hostile overview of the British Army has enjoyed a particular resonance in North America, for reasons which are not difficult to fathom: at a ‘popular’ level it fits snugly with the comforting knowledge that such ‘professional’ British redcoats were subsequently worsted by ‘amateur’ American patriots”. 48 However, with a dedication to the truth, Brumwell admits that these stereotypes have endured because they have usually contained a kernel of truth about them, but he correctly asserts that the picture is one of complexity and diversity. Even in
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England, standing armies were viewed with suspicion, and were seen as infringement to English liberties. As Brumwell records, “distrust of the soldier went to the very core of the national character”.49

Brumwell and Holmes are pioneers in their own right in the area of sources they have searched for and consulted. Brumwell notes that many historians have mourned the absence of primary documents that could have told the story of the common redcoats from their own perspective. He claims that “the voices of both officers and other ranks who fought...resonate from the pages of a surprising number of memoirs”. He also states that “letters from private soldiers and NCOs occasionally surface amongst the papers accumulated by senior officials; however the bulk of such collections comprise correspondence between fellow officers”.50 Holmes too consults the letters of the lowly privates of the British army, but here he is at an advantage, because in his book he not only discusses the redcoats who served in North America at the end of the Eighteenth Century, but also those who served in Europe and India during the first half of the Nineteenth, when literacy rates amongst the rank and file were slightly higher. In his introduction Holmes lists many of these privates. However, most of them served in the later campaigns. Only a few, like John Peebles and Sergeant Roger Lamb sent their missives home from the North American campaigns.

Holmes discusses the diversity of the British army in North America. There were the German mercenaries, but there was also a massive British (rather than English) core. It had not been long since the Jacobite rebellion had been quashed at last in Scotland, and Highland regiments were founded within the structure of the British army. Holmes is not
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the first historian to show interest in the diversity of the troops, but his assertion that the army was very British in nature as opposed to English is interesting. He shows that “at the time of the American War of Independence, 60 per cent of its rank and file were English, 24 per cent were Scottish and 16 per cent Irish.” He is also interested in the women of the British army. Again, he is not the first historian to record the fact that the British army often campaigned with a number of women and children. However, we learn that in the British army in general during this time, “most sergeants and around seven per cent of the rank and file were permitted to marry”. We also learn that “in 1758, ten women per company were authorised to accompany six regiments of foot sent to the West Indies”, and that “women who refuse to work for the men....would be sent to the poor house”. Army wives and their children were expected to graft, and as a result many became skilled cooks and nurses.

Conclusion:

It is perhaps the modern day American historian Michael Stephenson who brings us the greatest of sympathy for the British soldier and the image of criminality he has had to endure through the ages. Chapter two of his book “Patriot Battles”, published in 2007, is called “Lobsterbacks”. In it he writes, “in eighteenth century Britain it did not take much – poaching, the theft of a loaf of bread, rent arrears, trespassing, literally hundreds of petty crimes – to land the hapless culprit in the slammer. For example, a justice of the peace in Surrey wrote ingratiatingly to Lord Barrington, secretary of war, on 10 September 1777 that ‘John Quinn an Irish American 29 Years of Age near six feet high very dirty and ragged seemingly of slow understanding was this morning convicted before me of Orchard Robbing.
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He is willing to serve as a soldier”.53 We have seen that some of the major debates that have been discussed by historians of the British soldiers in North America have centered on the conduct of the soldiers, whether they were from Britain’s “dustbins”, how they had come to serve in the army, what they got out of it, whether they can be compared to soldiers from different ages and different wars, how they performed under duress, how they were treated by their superiors, and what services and benefits they received from being in the army to name a few. In her appendix to “The British Soldier In America”, Sylvia Frey notes that Britain’s failures in America during the War of Independence triggered furious debate in Britain’s corridors of power. Seemingly with pride she states that “Members of Parliament blamed ministers; ministers blamed generals; general’s blamed each other, ministers, and admirals. Significantly, no one blamed the performance of British soldiers” 54
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PART TWO

Introduction:

Feelings of discontent amongst a growing number of American colonists gathered pace in the years after the French and Indian War (1756-1763), a war that united the British people. In that war, British-American residents and Britons from the mother country fought against France and certain Indian tribes allied to the French “father”, King Louis XV. Only a dozen years after the conclusion of this war, another one erupted. Anger displaced discontent, and the shots that were heard around the world at Lexington and Concord in the spring of 1775 signaled the beginning of hostilities between former partners and fellow British countrymen. Initially seen by British eyes as a civil war, it became an organized and vigorous rebellion against British imperial might. The British Army in all its diversity, strength and power, and steeped in a long history of experience with the art of warfare, was given the task of crushing the American rebels. It was expected that the British Army, with its highly efficient administrative experience, its well-drilled battalions and regiments, its war machinery, and its support from the Royal Navy and the British government, would defeat the rebels who were first and foremost thought of as traitors and also conveniently painted as rustic simpletons with no experience of war.

We are all familiar with the outcome of the American War for Independence. At school, Americans learn about General Washington, the Continental Congress, the Continental Army, major battles such as Saratoga and Germantown, the final British defeat at Yorktown, and the ultimate victory for the United States. Americans are taught about their ancestors and the many sacrifices that they made for the twin causes of freedom and
liberty and each generation with its millions of school-children makes the daily pledge of allegiance to the nation’s flag.

There is no discussion of and little interest in the plight of the British soldiers. In this research paper I will examine what happened to the British soldiers after the war. Did they all return home? Could they have stayed if they had wanted to? Indeed, did some of them stay? By the end of the war in 1783, when each regiment was ordered to leave the boundaries of the 13 American colonies, could it be said that British soldiers had made any kind of meaningful contribution to American society and life? Or, had they (as many American sources wanted us to believe) only had a negative impact on American life in the form of rape, plunder, murder and death? It is my assertion that British soldiers did make meaningful contributions to American life. I propose that just as the army was a diverse body, the experiences of the individual soldiers were also diverse. Proving this with primary sources will be challenging because there is not a huge array of sources from the late eighteenth century chronicling the life of the average British private. Roughly speaking this is true when examining both British and American sources. However, I will seek to investigate what happened to the British soldiers after they were ordered to leave American shores, and I will seek to prove that even during times of conflict, British soldiers and the British Army in general did to some degree leave some sort of positive legacy in America. Then, using British and American newspapers from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, I will attempt to find stories of the British service-men. Before I began my research it was my assertion that not many stories about individual soldiers, especially the rank and file of the army, would have been printed in the contemporary newspapers. It was my assertion that newspaper from both countries would be more interested in printing stories and narratives about the elite officials of each society.
The Historiography:

Last semester, I wrote a historiography on how the British soldier in North America in the eighteenth century has been studied by historians. The historiography was the first of three parts to my thesis. I looked at how both British and American historians have studied the British soldier in North America over the years. Using a variety of books and articles as sources, I first looked at how eye-witness accounts of the American Revolution were recorded, and highlighted Charles Stedman as one of the outstanding British chroniclers. He mostly recorded the actions of the officers but when he did discuss the rank and file of the British Army he often did so in favorable terms. Next, I turned to late nineteenth century writers, such as Sir John Knox Laughton and especially J. W. Fortescue. The latter published a multi-volume work entitled *A History of the British Army*, volumes that were published between 1899 and 1920. Volume three, which covered the American war, was published in 1911. In it, Fortescue focuses on the officer class and judged the politicians who made the decisions from London as inept. When he mentioned the British soldiers, it was mostly for the purpose of showing how they were undermined by systemic problems such as low pay, which he argued undermined morale, hindered recruitment and fostered desertion.

In 1926 Richard E. Curtis, an American, published *The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution*. I emphasized that in this work, he explained how administrative challenges directly lead to problems for the regular soldiers; problems such as physicians without medical training, a lack of chaplains although each regiment was required to have one, uncomfortable and cumbersome uniforms, unreliable firearms, inadequate pay and inhumane treatment by officers. He also addressed persistent claims that British soldiers routinely abused colonial civilians and prisoners, concluding that
American writers have probably exaggerated the guilt of the ‘redcoats’. He also stated that on the whole, British forces “manifested unusual respect for the persons and property of noncombatants.”

In 1933, Stanley Pargellis, another American, wrote an enormously influential work named *Lord Loudoun in North America*. Although Lord Loudoun was the British Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces in North America from 1756-1758, and therefore before the American War of Independence, Pargellis’ work sheds a great deal of light upon the administration and workings of the British Army in North America during the last years of British colonial rule. Interestingly, he chose to compare British regular troops and provincial troops. He concluded that British regular troops were more valuable, despite being paid less, a fact that understandably encouraged desertion, and one that “illustrates a divergence between England and the colonies in the ideas of a man’s social and economic worth.” Pargellis also recorded his belief that Americans over the years have suppressed the truth about the British troops, and have developed certain de-humanizing myths about them.

Curtis in 1929 and Pargellis in 1933 were solitary advocates for the British soldier. Most historians of their time adhered to the myths of the “redcoats” as vicious criminals, and this trend continued after the Second World War. Many historians argued that British troops were the “dregs of society,” even downright criminals. As historian James Kirby Martin wrote, “ne’er do wells, the luckless, and the poorer sort in general filled the ranks.”
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John Shy claimed that the individual soldier “was treated in the Eighteenth Century little better than an animal, and (he) behaved like one whenever he dared.”

During and after the American-Vietnam War, American troops in Vietnam were compared to British troops in America during the revolution. Both sets of troops, historians commented, were handicapped by policy makers and politicians with insufficient understanding of the realities on the ground, and both sets of troops faced the problem of fighting a force that adopted guerilla tactics. In addition, historians argued that both armies faced an opposition that was fighting on their own land, and fighting for their own families and communities.

In the last thirty years, a new generation of historians (both American and British) seriously attempted to re-humanize the British soldiers. Refuting that the soldiers were mostly criminals, historians such as Sylvia R. Frey and Stephen Conway intelligently argued that changing economic conditions in Britain during the second half of the eighteenth century meant that casual laborers and even skilled laborers found themselves unemployed, with army life an attractive alternative to starvation. However, historian Michael Stephenson explores the idea that the troops were criminals from a different, sympathetic perspective. With truth he says that “in eighteenth century Britain it did not take much – poaching, the theft of a loaf of bread, rent arrears, trespassing, literally hundreds of petty crimes – to land the hapless culprit in the slammer.”

Recently, historians are trying to study the lives and experiences of the soldiers as much as the sources allow. Frey looks at regimental records that list height, age, and length
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of service. Richard Holmes writes about the diversity of the British Army; in America, 60% of the soldiers were from England, 24% from Scotland, and 16% from Ireland; figures that do not even include the Hessian troops. He also studies women and children in the regiments, explaining that there were strict limits on the number of women allowed, and that they were put to work, in the form of cooking, cleaning, and nursing.

However even though some historians such as Stephen Brumwell optimistically try to argue that “the voices of both officers and other ranks....resonate from the pages of a surprising number of memoirs,”⁶ there is not a wealth of primary sources from the privates in the army. Even Roger Lamb, whose journal is most often cited as the primary first-hand account from the non-officer class, was a sergeant, not a private, and even Brumwell concedes that the bulk of written letters are “between fellow officers.” As the famous American military historian, John Shy concluded in 1965, “much less...can be learned about the rank and file than about officers. Records of enlisted men were primitive at the regimental level, and none at all were maintained at the war Office.”⁷

**1775 and Mobilization:**

With the historiography of my topic explained, I next want to turn to my examination of the British Army in North America at the outbreak of the American War of Independence, and it is here that the reporting of my research begins. What did the British Army look like in 1775? What was its composition? How many regiments were there? What kind of units represented the army? In his 1925 study, Edward E. Curtis reported that by the spring of 1775, when the first shots were fired at Lexington and Concord, the total

⁶ Stephen Brumwell: *Redcoats: The British Soldier and the War in the Americas, 1755-1763*, p9
Cambridge University Press, 2002
⁷ Shy, p358-9
number of British land forces throughout the world, not including the domestic militia, officially totaled “48,647 men, of which 39,294 were infantry; 6,869 cavalry; and 2,484 artillery.” 8 The British Army was divided into an English establishment and an Irish establishment, and at the time of the outbreak of the war, there “were roughly speaking 15,000 men in England, 12,000 men in Ireland and 8,000 men in America. The remaining 10,000 were distributed among the West Indies, Africa, Minorca, Gibraltar, and Scotland.” 9 Infantry regiments at this time, the largest part of the army, were numbered one to seventy, although more were soon created to meet the needs of war, and a typical infantry regiment included about 475 men. The other two large units within the army were the cavalry and the artillery. There were 18 regiments in America in 1775 numbering a total of 8,580 infantrymen. 10 One infantry regiment was composed of one battalion divided into ten companies. Each company had about 38 privates. The remainder of the company (about 9 or 10) was of the officer class. Infantrymen were regular foot soldiers. Each infantry regiment was composed of the regular infantry, who made up the lion’s share of the regiment, but they were also joined by more elite troops, who were more unique and who served a distinct military purpose. These were the grenadiers and the light infantry. Grenadiers were tall and strong (their traditional purpose had been to hurl embryonic, but heavy grenades, although these early grenades were antiquated by the time of the American conflict). The light infantry was composed of men who were expert skirmishers. They were of light build and were good marksmen. As Curtis points out, “the grenadiers and light infantry had come to constitute the picked men of a regiment.” 11 When examining one particular regiment, the 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers, Curtis reports that it was composed of a
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colonel, a lieutenant colonel, a chaplain, an adjutant, a surgeon, and a mate. The regular infantry companies were composed of one captain, two lieutenants, two sergeants, three corporals, a drummer, two fifers, and thirty-eight private men. A company of light infantry was composed of exactly the same number of personnel as a regular infantry company, and a company of grenadiers was also composed of the same with one exception; they employed two fifers.  

**Role Call of the Conflict:**

So who exactly was stationed in America during the American conflict by the British government between the years 1775 and 1783? As we have seen, some regiments had a history of service in America, during and/or after the French and Indian War. However, the majority of regiments were only mobilized for America with the coming and the continuation of the American Revolution itself. I researched which regiments saw American shores during 1775 to 1783, which I will turn to now.

The army sent regiments from the cavalry, the artillery, but mostly from the infantry. In addition, a regiment of Engineers and three brigades of Guards were also sent. The following charts document precisely which regiments were employed in America during the revolution.

**1) THE CAVALRY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAVALRY REGIMENT NAME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th Lancers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 Curtis, chapter 1, p5-6
2) THE ARTILLERY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTILLERY REGIMENT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Regiment of Artillery (especially the 4th Battalion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) THE ENGINEERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE ENGINEERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Corps of Royal Engineers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) THE BRIGADE OF GUARDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE BRIGADE OF GUARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grenadier Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots Guards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) THE INFANTRY: The following chart includes the regimental numbers, the official names (if in existence), and/or the county names that were newly added in 1782 as the war was winding down. By that point, defeat in America was inevitable, and re-structuring was occurring, already with an eye to the future. Obviously, for most of the duration of the War
of Independence, the county names had not yet been adopted. All regimental numbers were followed with the title “Regiment of Foot.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFANTRY REGIMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>COUNTY (or region)</th>
<th>REGIMENTAL NAME (if given one)</th>
<th>DATES IN AMERICA (leading up to and during war of Independence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>East Kent</td>
<td>The Buffs</td>
<td>1781-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s Own</td>
<td>1774-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Nor’umberland Fusiliers</td>
<td>1775-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>Royal Warwickshires</td>
<td>1776-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Royal Fusiliers</td>
<td>1776-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s</td>
<td>1776-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1776-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>North Lincolnshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1767-1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>Prince of Wales’ Own</td>
<td>1776-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>East Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1776-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1767-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1775-1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Royal Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td>1767-1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Princess of Wales’ Own</td>
<td>1781-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Battalion</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th Lancashire Fusiliers</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1777-81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Royal Scots Fusiliers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd Cheshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1773-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1773-84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th South Wales Borderers</td>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>1777-81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th Cameronians (2nd Batt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1767-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers (2nd Batt)</td>
<td>Inniskilling</td>
<td>1775-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th Gloc. (2nd Battalion)</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1775-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>East Lancashire</td>
<td>1781-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd Duke of Wellington’s</td>
<td>West Riding (2nd Batt)</td>
<td>1776-81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>1775-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th Royal Sussex (2nd Batt)</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>1775-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Hampshire (2nd Batt)</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>1665-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th South Staffs (2nd Batt)</td>
<td>South Staffordshire</td>
<td>1775-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th Prince of Wales Volunt’s/ S. Lanc (2nd B)</td>
<td>South Lancashire</td>
<td>1775-1783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd The Black Watch</td>
<td>Royal Highland (2nd)</td>
<td>1775-81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Service Dates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>1774-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th</td>
<td>Essex (2nd Batt)</td>
<td>1775-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire (2nd B)</td>
<td>1776-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47th</td>
<td>Loyal N. Lancs (2nd Batt)</td>
<td>1773-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49th</td>
<td>Royal Berkshire (2nd Bat)</td>
<td>1775-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>Queen’s Own</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>1774-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54th</td>
<td>West Norfolk</td>
<td>1776-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>1776-82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th</td>
<td>West Middlesex</td>
<td>1776-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59th</td>
<td>2nd Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1775-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th</td>
<td>King’s Royal Rifle Corps</td>
<td>1776-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>1776-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63rd</td>
<td>West Suffolk</td>
<td>1775-81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64th 2nd Staffordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1773-82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th 2nd Yorkshire (N. Riding)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1769-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70th East Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st Fraser’s Highlanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778-84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74th Argyle Highlanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76th MacDonald’s Highland’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778-84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82nd Duke of Hamilton’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>1780-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83rd Royal Glasgow Volunt’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>1781-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105th Volunteers of Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>1777-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian Regiment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1779-81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Marines</td>
<td></td>
<td>1775-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source for all five charts: Charles H. Stewart *The Service of British Regiments In Canada and North America*. Department of National Defense Library, Ottawa, 1964

**The End of the War: What Next?:**

On October 19, 1781, the British Army under Lieutenant General Lord Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown in Virginia. This was seen as the decisive American victory of the American War of Independence, although the war was not officially over until September 3,
1783 when the British and the Americans signed the Treaty of Paris, which formally renounced any British right to govern or own the American colonies. As we have seen, the British had masses of troops on American soil. Getting the troops out would be a logistical nightmare. I will now turn to examining what happened to the British troops after the British government formally agreed to end the war and their claim to the American colonies. Where did the troops go? Did they all return home? Did some of them stay in the American colonies? Did some of them remain in British Canada? If so, how many? And finally, are we aware of whether any individual soldiers actually remained in the American states?

**The Regimental Histories:**

For the first time, in 1836, the British government ordered that army regiments' histories be written and recorded. These regimental histories are excellent sources when attempting to examine where the British Army went after they left the former American colonies. The introductions and prefaces to the historical records of the regiments mention the reasons as to why these histories were ordered. It was hoped that general readers would be interested in these histories, but especially men who had served in the specific regiments. Also, the records' goals were “to hold forth these bright examples to the imitation of the youthful soldier, and thus to incite him to emulate the meritorious conduct of those who have preceded him.”¹³

**The Eighteenth Regiment of Foot:**

In the opening remarks (a section called ‘General Orders’) of the “Historical Record of the Eighteenth, or The Royal Irish Regiment of Foot”, the adjutant general of the British

---

¹³ *The Historical Record of the Eighteenth*, Preface, pii
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Army, John MacDonald, writing in his name and in the name of the army's Commander-in-Chief, General Lord Hill, explained the reasoning behind the decision to write and publish the records. "His Majesty has been pleased to command that, with the view of doing the fullest justice to regiments, as well as to Individuals who have distinguished themselves by their bravery in action with the enemy, an account of the services of every regiment in the British Army shall be published."\textsuperscript{14} He goes on to explain what the record is expected to include, specifically, "The period and circumstances of the original formation of the regiment; The stations at which it has been from time to time employed; The battles, sieges, and other military operations in which it has been engaged, particularly specifying any achievement it may have performed, and the colours, trophies, and such, it may have captured from the enemy."\textsuperscript{15} It is wholly relevant to my study that the adjutant general notes that it has been ordered that the record must include the names of officers killed in action, and "the number of non-commissioned officers and privates killed or wounded by the enemy."\textsuperscript{16} Apparently, it was deemed that if you were a private or a non-commissioned officer killed in action, it was not worthwhile listing your name in the regimental record. Although it may be partially due to sheer numbers and considerations of space, this decision also reeks of class inequality. If an officer through his actions earned "titles, medals, or other marks of His Majesty's gracious favour"\textsuperscript{17} he had his name recorded in the record. Presumably, privates did not. However, officers and privates would have their names included in the record if "they specially signalized themselves in battle"\textsuperscript{18}.

\textsuperscript{14} The Historical Record of the Eighteenth, p
\textsuperscript{15} The Historical Record of the Eighteenth, General Orders, p
\textsuperscript{16} The Historical Record of the Eighteenth, General Orders, p
\textsuperscript{17} The Historical Record of the Eighteenth, General Orders, pii
\textsuperscript{18} The Historical Record of the Eighteenth, General Orders, pii
The Eighteenth Regiment of Foot embarked for America from Ireland in 1767 after the French and Indian War, at a time when it was decided in London that troops were needed to defend the prizes of that conflict. The Eighteenth was at Lexington, Concord and Bunker Hill (recorded as Bunker’s Hill). It endured Washington’s siege of Boston and was part of the retreat to Halifax, Nova Scotia. That was the totality of its experience in the American war, and by July, 1776 it had arrived back in England. It was stationed at Dover Castle in Kent from 1776 to 1778, and then encamped at a succession of places; Coxheath, Warley, Finchley. At what is described as the “termination of the American war”\(^{19}\), the Eighteenth was transferred to the Channel Islands, British territories off the coast of northern France, first to the island of Jersey and then to the island of Guernsey. In 1783, while in Guernsey, the soldiers of the Eighteenth helped to quell a mutiny of the 104th Regiment of Foot, and “received the thanks of the Lieutenant Governor, and of the States of the Island, accompanied by one hundred guineas for distribution among the non-commissioned officers and soldiers, for their loyal and spirited conduct.”\(^{20}\)

**The Fortieth Regiment of Foot:**

Another regiment, the Fortieth Regiment of Foot was much more involved in the American War of Independence than the Eighteenth. According to the Historical Records of the Fortieth Regiment, the regiment set sail for the American colonies from Cork in Ireland on May 8, 1775. It might be tempting to think that the regiment’s embarkation was a result of Lexington and Concord. However, this is clearly wrong due to the fact that May 8 is less than three weeks after those beginning shots of the revolution. It took between two and three months to cross the Atlantic, so news of the events of April 19\(^{th}\) would not yet have

---

\(^{19}\) *The Historical Record of the Eighteenth*, Contents, pxxx
\(^{20}\) *The Historical Record of the Eighteenth*, Contents, pxxxii
reached Britain. It would though be reasonable to assume that it was a response to the
general acts of disturbance in America. The records name the officers of the Fortieth who
sailed for America, and one such officer makes for interesting reading. In the footnotes, it is
recorded that upon arrival in America, Captain J. Greene left the Fortieth to join one of the
provincial Loyalist armies. "Like many officers at this time, Captain Greene sold out soon
after arrival in America, to take higher rank in one of the corps of Loyalist provincials then
forming."21 The footnote goes on to discuss the life of Captain Greene in some detail,
attributing the reporting of the information to a great grand-nephew. Greene was born in
Greenville, County Kilkenny in 1746, joined the Fortieth in 1767, and when he joined the
loyalist provincial troops, he was appointed as a major in the regiment of Oliver De Lancey,
of New York, who was a leading loyalist. Greene fought in the war "from Boston to the
 Floridas," and successfully defended a key fort against the American General Nathaniel
Greene. According to the historical records of the Fortieth, the two Greenes were "relatives
and intimate friends," and the loyalist Major Greene was offered the rank of general in the
American army by his famous relative, an offer which would have meant turning his back on
the British, and one that he never accepted. At the end of the war, he was given a grant of
land in Canada, but he also very soon returned to Ireland. He was made a major in the
King's army in 1789, and he died at Waterford in Ireland, in 1830, aged 84.

The Fortieth Regiment of Foot was at the Battle of Long Island, the Battle of
Brooklyn, the Battle of "Princetown", and the Battle of Germantown. When documenting
the regiment's presence at the Battle of Brooklyn, we encounter a good example of the way

21 The Historical Records of the Fortieth Regiment, p39
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that deaths were unequally recorded. "Of the Fortieth regiment, Lieutenant-Colonel Grant was killed; one rank and file killed; and five rank and file wounded."\(^{22}\)

By monitoring the movements of the “Fighting Fortieth” we can see the totally international and transitory nature of the British Army. After the French declared war on Great Britain in early 1778 and entered into a treaty with the Americans, the Fortieth was ordered out of the conflict in North America, and instead, ordered to the Caribbean to protect British possessions and interests there. Americans usually think of British troops all being bogged down in America from 1775 to 1783, but in November 1778 the Fortieth was removed from one arena and sent to another, with the mission of protecting British possessions in the Caribbean and/ or fighting the French. Between 1778 and 1781, the Fortieth, along with other regiments, was in Barbados, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Grenada, St. Christopher and Antigua. After nearly three years, in June 1781, the regiment was ordered to return to Staten Island. It was at approximately half strength from when it left for the Caribbean nearly three years earlier. It can be assumed that most of the regiment either died of sickness or were killed in battle, or were left in Caribbean hospitals.

The regiment was in America until the end of the war, and they arrived back in England on December 1783. However, it was almost immediately again on the move, and was transferred from Chichester to Taunton and then to Plymouth, towns that are all either on or close to the south coast of England. The regiment was therefore strategically placed for both defending against a possible attack from the French and a possible immediate embarkation to another corner of the globe. However, in April 1786, the Fortieth was split up, and spread out between Carlisle, Blackburn, Liverpool, Whitehaven, Preston and

\(^{22}\) Historical Records of the Fortieth Regiment, p43
Chester, towns all in the north-west of England, an area of England at the heart of the Industrial Revolution. In the summer of 1787 six companies of the regiment “owing to the prevalence of popular discontent in Liverpool....were subsequently sent to aid the civil power [there].” I cannot help drawing a comparison here between the Fortieth quelling and quashing an internal disturbance in Liverpool, and American troops being used to forcefully counter labor union groups in the American north-east, and Indian tribes in the Far West, in the time period succeeding the U.S. Civil War.

The 16th “Queen’s Lancers” Cavalry Regiment

In the historical records of “The Sixteenth Or..The Queen’s Regiment of Light Dragoons, Lancers”, the introduction of this regiment to American shores in 1775 is covered very interestingly. The historical records begin by stating that the conflict between Britain and her colonies began in 1775, and then go on to opine that the conflict “not being entered into by the British government with sufficient vigour at the commencement, was protracted during a period of eight years,” thereby removing any thought of suggesting that this regiment, or any other, was at fault for the loss of this war. The politicians are blamed. When we remember that the historical records were written with the intent of trumpeting the military achievements of the regiments we can understand why. With pride, it is documented that troops from the Sixteenth Lancers captured General Charles Lee, one of the most important and influential of the American generals. In fact, up to that point, there had been rumors that Lee might even replace Washington as commander-in-chief of the Continental Army. The 16th fought at the Battle of White Plains, were stationed at New Jersey during the winter of 1776/7, occupied Philadelphia, and fought at Germantown. The

23 Historical Records of the Fortieth Regiment, p62
historical records indicate that the conduct of the war was going well until “the King of France had concluded a treaty with, and agreed to aid, the revolted British subjects, which so completely changed the nature of the contest,” a declaration that resulted in the 16th retreating from the Philadelphia area to New York in the summer of 1778, and then back to England after giving its horses to other regiments. We can see that it is this regiment’s assertion that one of the primary reasons the American won the war was due to the fact that troops had to be removed from the American theater.

There is then a big jump to 1781 in the records, when it records that the regiment was encamped in Lenham in Kent. Why is there such a leap? Why is there this gap of two to three years? Although, perhaps there was nothing of note worth adding to the records during these years, given that the British lost the war, it is perhaps not surprising that this record “fast forwards” the narrative. The record, as previously mentioned, has already earlier suggested reasons as to why the war was lost, and when one considers that some of the goals of writing the regimental records in the nineteenth century were to instill pride in the mind of the reader, and to inspire the reader with thoughts of future glories, our questions can be answered.

The Thirty-Fourth and Fifty-Fifth Regiments of Foot:

In 1875, George Noakes, a Quarter-Master Sergeant published a combined historical record of the thirty-fourth and fifty-fifth regiments of foot, two regiments that had been “strangers to each other, but now destined to be sister battalions, they having been, under the new localization scheme, linked together in the Cumberland and Westmoreland Brigade.”

Both regiments were engaged in America extensively. The thirty-fourth was

---

24 Historical Records of the Thirty-Fourth and Fifty-Fifth Regiments, by George Noakes, 1885, pvi
with General Burgoyne at Saratoga, and when he surrendered to the Americans, the record indicates that under General Gates, the Americans agreed to allow the British troops to “march to Massachusetts Bay, for embarkation for England, to serve no more in North America during the war.” However, the record angrily reports that the “American Congress shamefully repudiated this Convention, and the troops, on arrival at Massachusetts, were detained prisoners of war.”

Meanwhile, the fifty-fifth continued in the American arena, but also fought the French in the Caribbean, and at the conclusion of the American war was stationed in Canada. It returned to England in 1785, moved to Scotland in November 1788, and then was stationed over to Ireland in September, 1790. From there, the regiment was moved to assist British allies in Europe, lest “the detestable doctrines which the French revolutionaries were disseminating throughout the Continent should take root in their own countries.” So, we can see that for many of the British regiments, there was little respite between major conflicts. As one door closed, another one opened.

**British Engineering and Sweat: The Forts:**

When looking at how the British soldiers affected the American landscape, perhaps no example is more striking than the physical remains of eighteenth century forts. In colonial days, British, French, and colonials designed and built a series of forts with the purpose of protecting their possessions, gains, and trade routes. Even today there is physical evidence of how the soldiers impacted America. Although not meant to be an exhaustive compilation of forts built in the eighteenth century, what follows is a brief list of

---

25. 34th and 55th, p25
26. 34th and 55th, 25-6
27. 34th and 55th, p33
certain forts built by the soldiers of these two major European powers, with a special emphasis on forts that are in the north-east of the modern day United States, and especially New York State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Fort</th>
<th>Who built it, and it what year?</th>
<th>If captured, by whom, and when</th>
<th>Near modern day evidence today?</th>
<th>Still physical evidence today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Niagara</td>
<td>French, 1726</td>
<td>British, 1759</td>
<td>Youngstown, NY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ontario</td>
<td>British, 1755</td>
<td>Americans, 1788</td>
<td>Oswego, NY</td>
<td>Yes, but a new fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Oswego</td>
<td>British, 1727</td>
<td>French, 1755</td>
<td>Oswego, NY</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ticonderoga</td>
<td>French, 1755</td>
<td>British, 1759 Americans, 1775</td>
<td>Ticonderoga, NY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Crown Point</td>
<td>British, 1759</td>
<td>Americans, 1775</td>
<td>Crown Point, NY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort William Henry</td>
<td>British, 1755</td>
<td>Destroyed by French, 1757</td>
<td>Lake George, NY</td>
<td>Replica only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Stanwix</td>
<td>British, 1758</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Rome, NY</td>
<td>Replica only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Duquesne/Fort Pitt</td>
<td>French, 1754</td>
<td>British, 1758 (re-named Fort Pitt)</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>Brick outline in the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ligonier</td>
<td>British, 1758</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Ligonier, PA</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this very small list of eighteenth century forts, we can see that they were often the target of enemy attack during the French and Indian War, and by American troops during the American Revolution. Some forts were abandoned quickly, but we can also see that the labor of the British soldiers produced buildings that have survived to the present day, and serve very useful purposes for the cultural and financial enrichment of American communities today.

**Post-War:**

After the American War of Independence, as we have seen, the British Army moved on to different conflicts and duties. Some returned home in readiness for a possible attack on Britain by the French. Some were stationed in other far-off geographic areas, especially the Caribbean. The newly formed United States was one area that the British hierarchy was forced to remove from their list of areas of influence. British merchants wished to immediately concentrate on trade relations with the former North American colonies, but the British military was not required to play any further part in what would become the United States of America until the war of 1812. However, that did not stop relations between Great Britain and the United States from sitting conspicuously in the minds of those country's citizens, and from memories of the late war invading the culture of both countries.

Sources: 1) Charles Morse Stotz: *Outposts of the war for empire; the French and English in Western Pennsylvania; their armies, their forts, their people 1749-1764*. Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania. Distributed by the University of Pittsburgh Press
2) www.dmna.state.ny.us/forts/fortsindex.htm
Newspaper Accounts:

One form of expression that communities from both countries participated in was in the publication of newspaper stories in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century newspapers. In London and in the biggest American cities, newspapers printed accounts and memories of the war. When examining these newspapers, two general impressions are formed, one from the British point of view, and one from the American.

The American point of view:

Obviously, as the Americans were the victors of the conflict, there were a lot of accounts documenting the heroics of the Continental Army. It is easy to conclude that such sentiments were only natural in a new nation that was seeking to build a country and a culture. I also found several complaints about the actions of the British army during the war. For instance, very soon after the War of 1812 (the second war between Britain and the ex-colonies, by then the United States), the Independent Chronicle of Boston, reported on the fortieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington that “the soldiers of George Ill....commenced a conflict, barbarous in its onset, and cowardly in its persecution....and in the most waxton manner fired upon a company of militia, without giving them the least warning,”\(^{28}\) and compared the British troops to a “horde of savages.”\(^{29}\) The same newspaper published an article in 1821 about the heavy-handed actions of the British troops during the Boston “Massacre” of March, 1770. In an article entitled “Recollections of a Bostonian” written by Mr. Russell, a British soldier beat “a negro” who had called him a lobster. (Lobster or “lobster-back” was the derogatory term for a British soldier, due to the

\(^{28}\) *Independent Chronicle*, Boston, Massachusetts. 04-20-1815, p2

\(^{29}\) *Independent Chronicle*, Boston, Mass. 04-20-1815, p2
belief that the British soldiers’ backs were always red due to the many whippings and beatings they endured at the hands of the officer class.) Some “rope-men”, including Mr. Gray, “a very respectable man”\textsuperscript{30} told the soldier to return to his barracks, at which point an argument ensued, leading to a physical fight. At that point, the rope-makers were joined by other towns-men, and they “soon obtained a triumph over an idle, inactive, enervated, and intemperate, though brave soldiery.”\textsuperscript{31} According to the writer, over the next couple of days events culminated in what we know today as the Boston Massacre.

These two accounts were printed long after the war, and in March, 1815, the same paper reported the cruel actions of British soldiers in the then very recent conflict, the War of 1812. In a signed letter to the editor of the Independent Chronicle, nine officers of the New York militia complained about the inhuman treatment they received when they were captured by the British. However, although reporting on the cruel actions of British soldiers was quite common-place, I also found several different kinds of references to British military personnel in the newspapers of the post-war period. In the Daily Advertiser, in 1786, a reward of ten dollars was offered to anyone who could find a runaway indentured servant, who apparently was named John G. Hoffman. It was claimed that the servant “is a Hanoverian, was a soldier in the British army in the late war....calls himself a gardener; and fifty years old, but looks older, near six feet high, slim built, red faced, and often sore eyed; loves strong drink, his hair dark, mixed with grey. Whoever will secure him in any gaol in the United States, shall have the above reward.”\textsuperscript{32}

Another former member of the British army who chose to reside in the United States is mentioned in the Providence Gazette. However, in comparison to John G. Hoffman,\textsuperscript{30,31,32}

\textsuperscript{30} Columbian Centinel, Boston, Mass, 12-01-1821, p1
\textsuperscript{31} Columbian Centinel, Boston, Mass, 12-01-1821, p2
\textsuperscript{32} Daily Advertiser, New York, New York, 10-07-1786, p3
the newspaper speaks deferentially of him, and close examination reveals that he was an officer. In a death notice in October, 1810, the newspaper reported that Lieutenant Colonel George Trumbull, died in Bloomingdale, New York, in the heart of what is now the Adirondack state park. The obituary reported that "for upwards of sixty years he sustained in the British army, in every respect, that character which distinguishes the soldier and the gentleman; nor was he less known or less esteemed by his fellow-citizens for the practice of those moral and social duties which inspire respect, and give true dignity to the man."33

The case of another former British soldier was discussed in the *Columbian Centinel* of Boston, which reported on June 11, 1823 that the Massachusetts House of Representatives was to hear the case of George Phips. The paper reported that the question before the House is as follows; "Has George Phips, who was born in England and came to this country as a soldier in the British army, in the year 1776 and was taken prisoner at the surrender of General Burgoyne, and has ever since resided in the town of C. in this State, and who has held real estate, and been taxed therefore, in said town, but has now become a pauper, gained a settlement in said town, or is he an alien, entitled to a maintenance from the State."34 One can imagine differing opinions from the paper’s readership on this question, perhaps especially amongst former soldiers, but it goes to show that whatever the citizens and institutions of the United States thought of the British soldiers, these men enjoyed the right to live, earn money, own land, and receive benefits in the United States, and were not legally barred from such privileges.

However, one last article follows the typical trend employed by the American newspapers. In the *Providence Gazette*, on August 22, 1821, a letter is published about a
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33 *Providence Gazette*, Providence, Rhode Island, 10-20-1810
34 *Columbian Centinel*, Boston, Mass, 06-11-23, p1
British soldier, which leaves the reader awe-struck. Whether the reader concludes that the soldier is remarkably dedicated or remarkably foolish is a matter of opinion. However, his bravery and dedication cannot be questioned. The letter relays a second-hand story of two British soldiers going into a house and abusing a young woman. A third soldier, despite not being involved in the incident, as vouched to by the woman, hid the identity of the other two from the army’s officials. When Lord Cornwallis approached the man, whose name was Campbell, he said “Campbell...what a fool are you, to die thus. Disclose the names of the guilty men, and you shall be immediately released; otherwise you have but 15 minutes to live.” Campbell replied to Cornwallis, “You are in an enemy’s country, my Lord....you can better spare one man than two.”

We can see that in the post-war years there was a mixture of treatment in the American newspapers of the troops who had fought for the King. There was reference to their cruelty, but also to their bravery, and some indeed who became American residents were reported on briefly. Even from this list of brief articles, we can conclude that the British army was a very diverse group of people. Some were not even British, such as the Hanoverian, Hoffman, and like Hoffman, some were semi-skilled, or skilled laborers. Others, as we have seen, were officers. Others fitted into the typical and neat stereotype that Americans liked to foster, such as the brave, but loyal to the point of stupidity, Campbell, who protected his criminal comrades, or like the ruthless, barbaric soldiers who broke all ethical rules of warfare and instigated terrible deeds against the citizenry. Others even found acceptance in America, although from these newspaper articles, it seems that the military men who were more likely to be mentioned, and in more glowing terms, were from

35 Providence Gazette, Providence, Rhode Island, August 22, 1821
the officer class. This may seem ironic in the early days of the republic, in a country which
purported to cherish equality amongst men.

The British point of view:

In British newspapers there were also a number of death notices, advertizing the
death of officers who had lead men in the American war. For instance, on January 6, 1792,
*The Times* recorded that William Bradford, Esq, died in Philadelphia. His occupations are
listed as “author, printer and soldier. During the American war, he wrote, printed and
fought for his country...His rank in the army had been of colonel. Dr. Franklin said of him,
that his writing was spirited, his press was correct, and his sword active.”

In 1828, the same newspaper wrote that Sir Alan Cameron had died. “By birth a Highlander, - in heart
and soul a true one- in form and frame the bold and manly mountaineer,” the newspaper
stated, and continued that few could equal Cameron’s “bravery and energetic zeal.”

Cameron was a prisoner of war for two years in Philadelphia after being accused of trying to
recruit certain Indian tribes as allies to the British. Trying to escape the jail, he shattered his
ankles, and never completely recovered. He raised and founded the 79th regiment of foot in
1793 at his own expense, and bestowed his name upon the regiment. He led his regiment in
the Netherlands, the West Indies, the Spanish peninsula, Egypt, Zealand, Denmark, Sweden,
Portugal, and ultimately at the Battle of Waterloo where Napoleon was defeated. As his
obituary proudly recorded; “A great sufferer in body from severe infirmities, contracted by
continued exposures and fatigues on service, Sir Alan nevertheless lived to an advanced age.
But he was doomed to see his family drop around him – his youngest son, when his aide-de-
camp, early in the Peninsula campaign, from privations and fatigues, - his eldest, when

36 *The Times*, London. Jan 6, 1792
37 *The Times*, London. March 17, 1828
gallantly leading on the immediate advance of the British army at Fuentes d’Onor, - his
nephew and his orphan grandson, both of whom perished from the baneful effects of West
Indian service.”38 Seven years later, Cameron’s superior officer, Earl Cathcart died, and his
death was also printed in The Times. The notice recorded that Earl Cathcart began his
military career in America, serving “in the 16th and 17th Light Dragoons, and as Aide-de-
Camp to Sir H. Clinton, the Commander-in-Chief.”39

One article in The Times reported the ghastly fate of soldiers from the 7th and 8th
regiments of foot, who had arrived back in England in 1809, after a terrible ordeal at sea
during their homeward voyage from the island of Martinique in the Caribbean. The report
stated that the “skeletons of the 7th and 8th Regiments of Foot were on Thursday landed at
Plymouth...They were on board four transports which came under convoy of the Captain,
Intrepid, and Express, and formed part of the unfortunate homeward West India fleet, which
suffered so dreadfully in the late gales. Not 100 of either of the above regiments have been
left alive, and those who landed were in the most deplorable condition from fatigue and
disease.”40 This sensational story is an example of when it was likely that average British
soldiers made it into the newspapers. I found one more post-war article that mentioned
British soldiers, and it also had a sensationalist bent. In fact, the article reflects very badly
on the soldier in question. On July 3rd, 1790, The Times reported that “an officer of the
army...whose demeanor seemed to indicate a deranged mind”41 approached a family that
was out walking on a common, and attacked them violently, supposedly without any
provocation. The assailant, who had lost an arm in the American war was friends with
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38 The Times, London, March 17, 1828
39 The Times, London, April 8, 1836
40 The Times, London, September 25, 1809
41 The Times, London, July 30, 1790
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“several creditable gentlemen,” who attended his “examination.” However, the article concluded that “as no bond could be given for his peaceable and good behavior in future, he was sent to a private mad-house at Hoxton.”

On Boxing Day, December 26, 1788, The Times printed a letter to the editor from somebody who used the moniker, “a soldier’s friend.” The letter is written about a man who apparently “received three balls into his body at Bunker’s Hill…..as soon as he was able to move, he was sent to Long Island, and there…he was wounded in the left arm.” Upon his return to England, he got married, started a family, and returned to his old profession, that of “some branch of the clothing business.” According to the letter writer, the ex-soldier had a lot of trouble obtaining “his pension from Ireland”, where he “had four years pay due, and can neither obtain it, nor is he able to fetch it in person.” He and his family were forced to seek shelter in a “hay rick, but at present a poor family, not in a much better situation, have permitted them to sleep upon a few shavings in a corner of their room.” In conclusion, the writer begs the Marquis of Buckingham to “order it to be paid without the personal appearance of the unfortunate man to whom it is due.” This heart-felt appeal on behalf of a veteran who “bled in the service of his country,” is a classic example of the average foot soldier in the British army during the American revolutionary war; i.e, economically challenged, but with some training in skilled labor. However, it is unusual in personal, compassionate, and empathetic style, especially in its advocating for a common soldier.

The British newspapers then, were just as likely to print stories about the death of the officers who had served with distinction, as the American newspapers were, and also
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42 The Times, London, July 20, 1790
43 The Times, London, December 26, 1788
were attracted to the more sensational and wonderful stories, than personal stories about common foot soldiers.

**Conclusions:**

As I had predicted in the introduction to this research paper, it was indeed difficult to find much information about British soldiers from the rank and file of the army. Most accounts report and examine information about soldiers from the upper echelons of the army. In fact, the higher the rank, the more likely that a newspaper would report on the individual concerned. Usually, only when there was either a sensational story, or if a soldier broke the law would the soldiers make it into the newspaper, and even then, there would not be many basic facts recorded about the person.

As we saw, there were many thousands of soldiers serving in North America during the war of independence, and dozens of army regiments. We saw that they were sent to different geographical areas of conflict at the end of the war, and even during the war. The British army was a gargantuan organization that was constantly being re-deployed, removed, and re-stationed. The average foot soldier could never be sure where he was going to be stationed, and when he was going to be re-located.

However, the British Army and its soldiers did leave part of themselves behind in America. The war dead of course remained, buried or scattered over the eastern part of the United States. Others survived and chose to remain such as Hoffman, the Hanoverian. Part of their daily work and labor remains also, and is visited daily and weekly by people interested in the past. A string of forts built by the British (and the French) provide historical
monuments to future generations interested in learning about the past, and provide a corner of the American cultural tapestry.
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PART THREE

A: Connecting to teaching:

The next step of my thesis connects my original research to teaching the topic. I have studied the British soldier and the British army in North America in the mid to late eighteenth century. This of course includes two major conflicts, the French and Indian War and the American War of Independence. When perusing the New York State Education Department’s official curriculum for eleventh grade U. S. history, it is immediately noticeable to me that the words “French and Indian War” are absent. Over the course of the year, the nation’s history is broken down into seven units. Unit One covers the study of geography, and Unit Two, the first unit in the study of U.S. history is entitled Constitutional Foundations for the United States Democratic Republic. This unit is divided into two thematic and chronological parts. Part one, entitled The Constitution: The Foundation of American Society spans from the colonial era to the War of 1812 and the Monroe Doctrine. Part two, labeled The Constitution Tested: Nationalism and Sectionalism begins by focusing on the unique components of American government, and progresses on to sectionalism in the United States, territorial expansion, and culminates in the Civil War. So, the era that I have conducted my research on is clearly squeezed into section one of unit two. The sections are broken down further into smaller, mini-sections, and the only place that my specific topic of the British soldier in the mid to late eighteenth century, and the broader subjects of the French and Indian War could squeeze into is part four (a), entitled “causes of the revolution”.
When examining a typical text-book, such as *The Americans* by Danzer, Kloere de Alva, Krieger, Wilson, and Woloch, and published by the McDougal Littell publishing company, there is at least a whole, albeit very small sub-section on the French and Indian War. The text-book has a total of thirty-four chapters that run chronologically from the European “discovery” of the Americas to the modern day. Each chapter consists of between three and five sub-sections, and chapter three, entitled *The Colonies Come of Age* is divided into four sub-sections entitled, *England and its Colonies, The Agricultural South, The Commercial North*, and lastly, *The French and Indian War*. However, this last sub-section lasts for a mere five pages, and does a perfunctory and rather boring job of explaining the complexities of French, British and Indian conflict and co-existence. The first page briefly discusses the reasons for the war, the next two pages provide information about the war itself, and the last two pages cover the ensuing tensions between Great Britain and the colonies. The chapter does emphasize that the French were in New France because of trading interests, and briefly mentions that British and French ambitions at empire created tensions all around the globe, but the chapter does not offer much detail about these global tensions. In fact, there is not a great deal of detail or evaluation into anything, a fact that supports the assertion that a teacher should never solely rely on a school text-book.

Of great interest to me is the way that British soldiers are portrayed in this sub-section of this chapter. The reader is introduced to the famous incident in 1755 when General Braddock’s British force fought a French force and their Indian allies near Fort Duquesne in the Ohio valley. The text-book states that the “cowardice of the supposedly invincible British army surprised Washington, who himself showed incredible courage. As he tried to rally his troops, two horses were shot from under him and four bullets pierced his coat – although he escaped unharmed. He wrote to his mother that ‘the Virginia troops
showed a good deal of bravery, and were near all killed...(but the British soldiers) broke and ran as sheep pursued by dogs and it was impossible to rally them”.

Fred Anderson is one of the world’s most respected and knowledgeable historians on the French and Indian War. When you read about the disaster that befell the British troops under General Braddock in his book *The War That Made America*, it is shocking how treacherous with the truth the afore-mentioned text-book is. One does not know whether to laugh or cry. When discussing the same scene, Anderson writes that the “British made it substantially easier for the Indian marksmen to do their work. Hearing firing erupt ahead, the main body of the column rushed forward, colliding with the retreating advance guard...Tangled in confusion on a road little more than twelve feet wide, the British made a splendid, useless target. Unable to see the Indians who sniped at them from cover, the British troops fought as best they could, directing volleys blindly into the woods – and also, all too often, into one another.....for all their confusion and fear, however, the British troops did not flee until a musket ball smashed into Braddock’s back...By then more than two thirds of the 1,450 men and women in the British column had been killed or wounded....For the panicked, exhausted British the next two days of flight became a new kind of hell. Men too seriously wounded to walk were left to die as their comrades stumbled down the road without food or water”.  

The difference between the two passages is startling. Jumping to lazy conclusions without any attempt to analyze or evaluate does damage to the study of history, and short-changes students. The text-books concludes that the British soldiers were cowardly under fire, whereas the history book concludes that they did the best professional job they could
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1 *The Americans*, p84-5 by Danzer, Klor de Alva, Krieger, Wilson, and Woloch. Published by McDougal Little
2 Fred Anderson. *The War That Made America*, p70-1: Viking/ Penguin Group, 2005
under the most harrowing and unfamiliar of circumstances. Did the text-book writers come to their conclusions only from Washington’s letter home? It is the only evidence they give, and so it is reasonable to conclude that they did, especially when you consider that historians concur with Anderson. In addition, I cannot help but question whether Washington himself was a very reliable reporter, and whether he even wrote the afore-mentioned note to his mother, about this particular battle. However, assuming that he did write it about this event, a history teacher can use these two passages to make a pertinent point. Was Washington embellishing the actions of the British troops in his letters home? If this was indeed the case, why was it so? Did embellishments exist because of his sense of frustration towards the British hierarchy? We know of his frustrations later when Lord Loudoun denied his request for a commission in the regular British army. However, even if we assume that Washington genuinely believed the troops had acted in a cowardly manner, responsible historians and teachers should ask whether this was a reasonable conclusion to come to. To skilled historians such as Fred Anderson, who can evaluate all of the documents that reported on that day, we can learn so much more. We can learn that these particular British troops were facing obstacles they did not have a lot of experience of. Although some troops in the British army had experienced such battles before, the norm was for long and wide columns of men marching towards each other on flat, wide-open European landscapes where the battle could be observed and orchestrated without too many unknowns. For the text-book writers and publishers to leave Washington’s remarks in the text-book without some further evaluation and putting it into context, is a curious, worrying, and potentially damaging act, and it even smacks of unashamed propaganda. While the British troops “ran as sheep pursued by dogs”, Washington “showed incredible courage”.3

3 The Americans, p84-5
The next chapter, chapter four is entitled *The War for Independence*, and all four sub-sections cover the build up to the American War of Independence (1775-83) and the war itself. The chapter’s four sub-sections are called *The Stirrings of Rebellion, Ideas Help Start a Revolution, Struggling Toward Saratoga*, and *Winning the War*. I do understand when covering the American War of Independence in the United States, it is important to help American students celebrate the founding of their country and understand the sacrifices that some Americans made. In *The Stirrings of Rebellion*, the narrative covers the tensions between the British government and the colonies, especially Massachusetts, and then the first shots of the war at Lexington and Concord. The text-book correctly asserts that one of the primary reasons for the pre-war tensions was economic. The story of the “Boston Massacre” is told, and the text-book briefly describes how the city of Boston was very tense at this time. Appropriately, it records how there was tension between colonists and the low-paid soldiers, as both groups competed for job opportunities and that this tension ultimately led to the “massacre”. However, it does not mention any of the other sources of tension such as cultural and political. Through my research, I learned that in Great Britain, it would have been unacceptable to have had a large standing army in any town or city, like the presence that was concentrated in Boston. Like Englishmen in the colonies, Englishmen at home were suspicious of large standing armies and it was unacceptable to force citizens to quarter troops in their homes. The term “an Englishman’s home is his castle” applied on both sides of the ocean. Additionally, colonists were annoyed by some of the soldiers’ behaviors, such as gambling, drinking and swearing. However, as previously mentioned, the only time the troops of the British army are mentioned in the sub-section about the lead up the war is in relation to providing competition for low-paid jobs. In the second sub-section, *Ideas Help Start a Revolution*, the narrative skips quickly
from The Battle of Bunker Hill to the Olive Branch Petition, Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense*, the Declaration of Independence, and finishes with a good discussion of how people in the colonies toiled hard over the decision of whether to join the rebels, remain loyal, or stay neutral.

In the third sub-section, *Struggling Toward Saratoga*, the early stages of the war are told, especially the difficulties and hardships facing Washington, and then the American victories at Trenton and Saratoga. The British generals are mentioned much more than the regular troops whose story seems to be completely removed from the narrative. However, these generals are portrayed as bungling buffoons. For example, General Burgoyne was slowed down on the march to Saratoga because of extras such as “fine clothes and champagne”⁴ At Philadelphia, in the winter of 1777/8, the “pleasure-loving General Howe settled in to enjoy the hospitality of Philadelphia’s grateful loyalists.”⁵ While it is true that the British generals made crucial mistakes in North America during the Revolutionary war, the text-book implies that the British just decided to take a hedonistic vacation in the middle of a war-zone. My research has taught me that in the eighteenth century, armies always went into winter quarters, and only campaigned from the late spring to the late fall. Therefore, it made sense to settle for the winter in a town where there was loyalist support. I am not denying that the general had a heavy social calendar, but it is important to explain the context of these actions, otherwise we risk losing the interest of our students, and thereby discouraging their thoughtful analysis. Importantly, the text-book does have one small insert that very quickly compares the military strengths and weaknesses of the British soldiers with the American rebels. Although the British army is described as strong and well-
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⁴ *The Americans*, p109  
⁵ *The Americans*, p108
trained, the text-book only very briefly includes broad, sweeping generalizations, and there is a severe lack of in-depth inquiry based learning. The remainder of the sub-chapter discusses daily life and hardship for the colonists during the conflict. The final sub-section, entitled *Winning the War*, begins with the southern campaign and quickly goes on to discuss the British capitulation at Yorktown in Virginia.

Nowhere then in the text-book, be it in the sub-section on the French and Indian War or the chapter on the American War of Independence is there any sensible discussion of the British army in the eighteenth century in North America. Where they are briefly mentioned the soldiers are portrayed as cowards and the generals as imbeciles. I must re-iterate that I believe that in studying the American Revolution in today’s United States, it is crucial that students learn about the vitality of those times and the unique challenges facing that generation of Americans. However, beginning with the French and Indian War, progressing through the inter-war years, and ending with the War of Independence, British soldiers and the British army in general plays an important role in American history, and they deserve to be examined more closely. Students deserve the chance to study individuals and groups who had vital and intriguing experiences in what would become the United States, and how these experiences interacted with the experiences of other groups and individuals. Such study is of course embedded in the New York State Learning Standards.

My original research examined the composition of the army and the global assignments it was given. I examined regimental histories, recorded information about some of the forts that the British and French armies built and maintained in North America, and examined newspaper accounts about some of the veterans from the American War of
Independence. In studying and recording the historiography of the British soldiers and the British army, I also discovered what generations of historians have concentrated on throughout the over two hundred years since the British army left the United States in 1783. I observed the sources and footnotes of historians, sources such as governmental records and personal diaries and letters. The nature of the regular British privates in these years was one of illiteracy. It was apparently very rare that privates had literacy skills. Therefore, when painting a picture of them we usually are forced to rely on sources written by others, such as officers and government officials. Historians have been able to blend these sources with diaries and letters that privates from succeeding years wrote, and as is their task, formulate opinions about these men.

The general consensus amongst historians today is that the privates were mostly from lower socio-economic groups. In the past, the image of British privates of the mid to late eighteenth century has been that of criminals whose behavior managed to attract support for the rebels. If we believe this story, they all had criminal records, they all drank, swore and gambled incessantly, they all raped and looted their way indiscriminately around North America, and they all were dominated by a bloodthirsty nature that they had learnt from an out of control code of discipline that relied heavily on physical beatings. However, a more careful look shows us another story. Yes, there was corporal punishment designed to maintain discipline, yes, there were incidents of crimes against civilians, just as there were from all sides including American rebels towards American loyalists and British prisoners of war.

However, the accepted picture that is drawn today by historians of the average British soldier is one of diversity. Many privates came from parts of Britain where there was
high unemployment. They had had a degree of training and work experience in artisan
trades such as shoe-making, weaving, and clothes-making. The economic climate of the mid
to late eighteenth century in Great Britain forced many starving and destitute individuals
into accepting a post in the British army. Soldiers were geographically diverse too. The final
termination of the Jacobite threat at the battle of Culloden in 1745 meant that whole
Scottish regiments were incorporated into the British army. My research shows that there
was a massive Irish army. There were many Welshmen too, and famously in the American
War of Independence, there were many German “Hessian” troops, troops whose service
King George III had negotiated for using his German connections.

I believe that when teaching history, it is important not to turn any group of people
in a faceless body of stereotypes. Doing so does the group a great disservice, whoever they
are. It also does a huge disservice to the students that we are teaching. As teachers, we
need to safe-guard the subject of history from those who would turn it into an insipid and
stale collection of topics that we need to drudge through to meet some vague bundle of
expectations. I want to repeat how important it is that American students learn about the
actions of those who helped establish the United States. However, it is also imperative that
the students hear all sides of the story, and learn early on that Social Studies is partially
about multi-faceted approaches to complex historical and contemporary themes and issues.
Students will have a richer understanding of the early years of the American republic if they
have a broader understanding of the British empire of these years, and the empire’s
interests, aspirations and challenges.
**B: A Course Portfolio of Sources**

**Source #1: Topic Introduction: Interactive Lecture:**

My course portfolio on the British Army in North America will begin by introducing the students to the general historical content of mid to late eighteenth century North America. Without the students learning about the wider context, just learning about the British soldiers stationed in North America would have no meaning. The objective is to provide students with a general understanding of the chain of events that shaped; firstly, the lead up to war in North America between Great Britain and France in the mid eighteenth century; secondly, the war itself (in America, called the “French and Indian War”, 1756-63); and thirdly, the lead up to the American Revolution. These fundamental events of early American history are vital for students to explore if they are to have an accurate picture of their nation’s story. With good reasoning, historian Fred Anderson calls the French and Indian War, “The War That Made America.” The events of this era provide a direct link between the European past and the American future. They highlight the multi-cultural element of the American experience. They are vital components of the national and state curriculum and provide many opportunities to synthesize the learning standards.

To introduce the content I will simultaneously present an interactive lecture and a power point presentation. For a print out of the power point presentation, please see appendix I (letter). Both of these tools will highlight important components of the content. Students will receive a multi-sensory lesson on conflict in eighteenth century North America, a lesson which will incorporate maps, artwork and embedded questioning. The purpose of
including all of these different tools is to appeal to different learning styles and to keep the students engaged, focused, active, challenged and involved.

I have called the power point presentation “Conflict in Colonial North America.” I begin by trying to give the students some context about the traditional animosity and rivalry between Great Britain and France, but also about how their acrimonious relationship was uniquely played out in North America. I introduce the idea that both countries subscribed to the belief that if they strengthened their hand in North America, thereby gathering access to resources and trading rights, the strength, power, and influence of the home country would increase. In that vein of thought, I explain to the students that French settlers were mostly based in modern day Canada, especially Acadia, Montreal and Quebec, but that French explorers, traders and missionaries were encouraged by the French government to move westwards and southwards. My first embedded question of the presentation is “Why did the French government encourage this?” By having a question included in the presentation early on, I set the tone for letting the students know that they are expected to be participants and not merely members of an audience.

One of the main objectives of this presentation is for students to be able to understand that the territory that the French claimed was a lot larger than the combined size of the British colonies, and that by 1745, New France enveloped the British colonies. This becomes very clear to the students when they witness slide number six which is a map of the eastern half of the North American continent in that year. I have always believed that maps are fantastic educational tools to use when trying to teach about a topic. I discuss the building of French forts in these areas, and then ask my second embedded question; “Why were forts built near lakes or rivers?” Although this seems like a very obvious question that
is more appropriate for elementary age students, the purpose of including it is to encourage
discussion. A discussion about eighteenth century transportation will provide the students
to think historically. The major rivers are outlined on slide number six, and I will emphasize
that road-building was at a very nascent stage during this era.

The presentation next turns to the early stages of the war and the early French
victories. I list these victories (Fort Oswego, Fort William Henry), but I do not delve into
them at all, as my objective is not to have student memorize dates of battles. I next explain
that the change of administration in Britain that saw William Pitt dominate the British
government, had a direct effect on the war, as Pitt ordered 25,000 British soldiers to be
deployed to the American theater.

I then return to another embedded question (number three), which is; “The French
and the British saw this conflict as vital to their national interests. Why?” By doing so, we
re-visit earlier information presented in a previous slide, which was that Britain and France
were embroiled in beliefs about the importance of maintaining their power and strength. I
will ask a few students randomly to share their answers, sending the message that every
student might be called on to explain their answer at any moment. The purpose of this is to
encourage full participation. Why re-visit this important theme? The objective here is to
emphasize the importance of this concept, and to encourage class discussion. More dates
are discussed quickly that show that the war was starting to favor the British (Louisbourg,
Fort Duquesne, Montreal, and the famous victory at Quebec.) Slide number eleven is a
famous painting by Benjamin Rush depicting the death of General James Wolfe at Quebec.
Wolfe, who masterminded and orchestrated the battle, became a British national hero. I
chose the painting for a number of reasons. Firstly, Quebec was strategically important and
as a turning point of the war is an important part of any narrative on the war. Secondly, by showing a piece of artwork, I am varying the style of the presentation, and appealing to students with artistic and creative strengths. I also chose it due to the fact that General Wolfe was from my home county of Kent. I think that the students will find this personal connection interesting, and it will provide an opportunity to see how societies are interconnected in a historical and contemporary way. I will also mention that Wolfe’s home village of Westerham houses the Quebec House museum which is in his family home, and that the museum often houses exhibits with a North American connection. Just as American students might study British soldiers, British people study American subjects and events. In another aside, another famous soldier, Winston Churchill, lived in the same small village of Westerham for many years.

Slide number twelve is an extremely colorful map of the eastern half of North America at the end of the French and Indian War in 1763. Great Britain won of course, and their increasing influence is easily seen when viewing this map. Next, I turn to the events between the end of this conflict (1763) and the beginnings of the American War of Independence (1775). My objective here is to help the students analyze the different viewpoints that the British and the American colonists had, the actions that both groups implemented, and the resulting events. The interactive lecture briefly refers to Pontiac’s rebellion, and King George III’s “Proclamation” that settlement should not continue further west. I also introduce the concept of financial cost to the British government of administering the colonies, and how these costs increased from 70,000 pounds in 1748 to 350,000 pounds in 1763. In addition, I introduce to the students the British decision to leave troops in North America to protect against further possible attack by Indian groups, and against any possible French threat, and also the fundamental question about whether the
colonists should help with the cost of paying for these troops. Here, I have two more embedded questions for the students to think about and write an opinion on. Question number four is as follows; “In your opinion, do you think that the British were right to leave troops in North America at the end of the French and Indian War?” Question number five is “if no, why not? If yes, do you think that the colonists should have paid for some, all, or none of the cost of having an army in North America?

I then explain some of the parliamentary Acts that angered the colonists (Quartering Act, Stamp Act, Townshend Acts), the building up of mistrust in Boston, and the Boston Massacre. I show the famous propaganda print painted by Paul Revere, and explain what is actually known about the events of that day. As a visual representation from the time period, it serves the purpose of being a historical source that is an alternative to the written and spoken word. I then discuss the tea tax, the Boston “tea party”, a number of the specific “Intolerable Acts”, and finally, the famous day at Lexington and Concord. The American Revolution itself will be a whole other unit, but I briefly mention that the war lasted from April 18, 1775 until September 3, 1783 when the British eventually signed the Treaty of Paris. The penultimate slide is of the first flag of the United States, and the last slide asks students to divide into groups, examine one of the specific disagreements between Britain and the colonies, and actually propose a solution. This activity provides students with the opportunity to work collaboratively, apply their understanding, and take a position about a controversial topic of Social Studies.

After the class has finished the power point presentation and the final group question, I will assign the students one more assignment. The students will remain in their groups and will all design a graphic organizer from a number of different graphic organizers
that they are familiar with. The students must choose one of the following themes or topics related to the power point presentation they have just finished experiencing. The possible themes are “outbreak of war between Britain and France in North America”, “trade with the Indian tribes”, “major battles and sieges of the French and Indian War”, “the colonies rebel against Great Britain”, “How to attract support for rebellion”, and “the shot heard around the world”. The students are also given a list of graphic organizer tools that they have learned, and must adapt their theme to be portrayed by their choice of graphic organizer. This assignment is shown in Appendix C.

For reference the students will be given a copy of a detailed chronology of the main events of the time period covered in the power point presentation. For this chronology, please refer to Appendix B. For the print out of the actual power point presentation, please refer to Appendix A.

Source #2: Comparing the text-book The Americans with The War That Made America:

As I previously discussed earlier in this thesis, a typical school text-book such as The Americans by Danzer, Klor de Alva, Krieger, Wilson, and Woloch relayed a letter that George Washington supposedly wrote to his mother about the defeat of General Edward Braddock’s British and colonial American troops by the French and their Indian allies in the woods near Fort Duquesne. Washington’s letter was disparaging of the conduct and bravery of the British force, and the text-book makes sweeping judgments about the conduct of the British troops too. George Washington from his place in the heated and
confusing battle came to conclusions that may or may not have been reasonable and based on facts. However, responsible historians analyze more than one source. The writers of the text-book appear not to have done this. As previously mentioned, historian Fred Anderson, after analyzing many original sources, came to a very different conclusion about the events of that dreadful day.

I will provide students with copies of these two sources that seemingly describe the same event. I will also provide the students with a copy of Edwin Willard Deming’s 1903 painting *The Shooting of General Braddock at Fort Duquesne, 1755*. Although painted at a much later date, this painting gives students a sense of what recent scholars say about the battle. After showing the students these three sources, I will add a series of questions for them to work with. Students will work collaboratively in small groups, and there will be a large group discussion after the groups have completed their analysis. Copies of the sources and the specific questions are outlined in Appendix D.

**Source #3: The Specialist Historian and her sources:**

In 1979, historian Sylvia Frey’s ground-breaking study, *The British Soldier in America* was published. She used a variety of secondary sources to study and evaluate the British soldiers who fought in America in the mid to late eighteenth century. In the power point presentation, I introduced the students to the general narrative of the topic. Next, I will use Frey’s accomplished and specific study to introduce students to the world of the historian, and to focus on specific information about the men who made up the British army. I will
show students the kind of primary sources Frey accessed and will evaluate how she came to her conclusions.

Firstly, I will tell students which sources Frey accessed. These are mostly eighteenth century official British governmental records, records from offices such as the War Office and the Colonial Office. I will hand out copies of some of the official records that Frey researched and also tables that she compiled after studying these sources. One of Frey’s tables of information includes the age, the height, the national origin, and the years of service of troops in a particular regiment in the year 1782. Frey looked at the War Office’s records of specific infantry regiments such as the 29th, the 31st, the 44th, and the 8th (King’s), and dragoon regiments such as the 1st (King’s), and the 1st (Royal). By receiving copies of these tables compiled by Frey, students will learn some introductory pieces of information about the British army, such as roughly how many men were in a regiment, how many men within each regiment fell within certain heights, ages, nationalities, years of service, what the averages of each of these categories calculate to, and what kinds of differences existed between infantry and dragoons.

Secondly, I will provide the students with paragraphs from Frey’s actual text. While this is not a primary source, students will learn about some of the conclusions that Frey came to about the soldiers, and who they were. Instead of the stereo-type of the British soldier that has reigned supreme in American classrooms for decades, students will have the opportunity to examine the troops as living, breathing individuals. Chapter one of Frey’s book is entitled Volunteers and Conscripts, and in it Frey discusses the large societal changes that were occurring in Britain in the middle of the eighteenth century.
Students will be divided into groups, and I will provide them with pre-chosen segments of this chapter. Each group’s task will be to summarize the paragraphs, and then present this information to the rest of the class. As each group presents the summaries of the paragraphs, the remainder of the class will be writing down these summaries. I will need to monitor closely what the students are presenting to their classmates to ensure that vital information is not omitted.

Students will learn that certain segments of British society faced the biggest challenges. Skilled workers from specific geographical areas and from specific industries faced some of the most unique problems. As technology advanced, there was a surplus of labor amongst men who were weavers, shoe-makers, and clothes-makers. I will provide paragraphs from the text for the students to read and discuss. Unskilled laborers were also represented in these records and documents, and they also represented a surplus in labor at this time. Poverty ran rife in British society, and although being a soldier was monotonous, hard and dangerous in the mid to late eighteenth century, Frey explains that the soldiers did not starve, which was a very real prospect in a changing society with no social service network. Bread Riots in Britain were commonplace, as were poverty and disease. By reading sections of Frey’s text, the students will learn to make global connections. When one part of the world underwent economic challenges, another part of the world saw an influx in manpower. Although American patriots may have been fighting for lofty ideals, in reality they were often also fighting against Britain’s starving and disenfranchised poor.

In conclusion, using this source has three purposes. Firstly, it allows the students to encounter the American story of the British soldier, an individual whose diverse and complicated past was as rich and intriguing as those who fought for independence.
Secondly, it allows students to view the tools, the craft, and the product of the historian. And thirdly, it allows students to work collaboratively and to practice their vital summarizing skills. In addition, it is worth reminding ourselves that by working with this source, students also get to see the common private soldiers and their story, a story that has been missing from the narrative, a narrative that mostly focused on the experience of the officer class.

For the tables and text from Frey’s book, refer to Appendix E.

**Source #4: Newspapers:**

British soldiers of this period are often portrayed as rather stupid, criminally-inclined, alcohol-loving machines who were beaten into submission by their officers. By providing students with a number of newspaper articles from the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, students will be exposed to an array of diverse stories about a number of different soldiers. For the specific newspaper articles, please refer to Appendix F.

The first article is a letter written on Boxing Day, 1788, to the Editor of The Times (London) by an individual who calls himself “A Soldier’s Friend”. It is a sympathetic letter about an impoverished British veteran, who was wounded during the American War, at Bunker Hill and again at Long Island, and who on his return to Britain struggled to support himself and his family. The letter gives a number of interesting details about the soldier; that he is hard-working, honest and industrious, that by trade he had always been part of the clothing business, that the local “Parish Officers” will not help him, and that at the time of the writing of the letter, he and his family were destitute and homeless. By hearing about the plight of this veteran, students will have the opportunity to think about hardships
that veterans had to endure when they returned to Great Britain. This opportunity to process and examine the post-war experiences of late eighteenth century veterans will serve two primary purposes. Firstly, it will allow students to think about British soldiers as individuals who had real lives and real struggles. Secondly, it will provide a link to the modern world by providing students with the opportunity to discuss and compare the experiences of modern veterans.

The second newspaper document is an advertisement published on 7 October, 1786 in the *Daily Advertiser* of New York, written by the master of a missing indentured servant. The writer is appealing for help in recovering the escaped servant, with an offer of ten dollars reward if the indentured servant is found. According to the advertisement, the indentured servant is a Hanoverian who fought for the British Army in the “late American war”. One of the interesting things about this indentured servant is that according to the article, he made the trans-Atlantic journey at least three times. He initially came to America as a soldier of the British Army, he later returned to Hanover for some unspecified reason, and he returned to America again as an indentured servant. This article will give students the opportunity to learn that the British Army was a very diverse organization. Also, by connecting this story to the issue of immigration, students will experience the opportunity to explore larger issues that are connected to the New York State Social Studies curriculum and to today’s wider world.

The third newspaper article was originally published in the *American Federalist Columbian Centinel* of Boston on 11 June, 1823. This interesting article reported that the Massachusetts Supreme Court was asked to give its opinion on whether a British soldier who was captured after the Battle of Saratoga in 1777, “and has ever since resided in the
town of C, in this State, and who has held real estate, and been taxed therefore, in said
town, but has now become a pauper, gained a settlement in said town, or is he an alien,
entitled to a maintenance from the State”. This article about an individual who first came
to American shores to fight for the British against the founders of the United States, but
who chose not to return to Great Britain and settle in Massachusetts instead, raises several
intriguing questions that will require students to formulate opinions and practice their
higher-level thinking skills. Like the second article, it will also provide a connection to other
parts of the Social Studies curriculum, in that it raises fundamental issues about citizenship.
Does residing in a state for a period of time, paying taxes, and owning property
automatically make this man a legal resident and citizen, with all the rights that legal
residents and citizens have? Or, should he be denied a specific right that other residents
and citizens have because of circumstances that happened about forty years earlier?
Students will have the opportunity to formulate opinions on the appropriateness of
providing full rights to individuals who initially came to the United States to help destroy it.

By choosing the three articles that I have already discussed, I have attempted to
show students that there is always more depth to real people than characteristics
conveniently attached to myths and stereotypes. However, in the case of the British
soldiers, the research clearly shows that some British soldiers do seem to fit in with such
stereotypes. Some soldiers had indeed been criminals in Great Britain, some indeed liked to
gamble and get drunk, and some indeed did participate in looting and pillaging the
resources of the American residents. The last two newspaper articles actually lend support
to beliefs that British soldiers were either violent criminals or mindless, subservient slaves.
On 30 July, 1790, an incident was reported in *The Times* (London) that a British officer attacked a man and his two daughters in the Clapton area of London, near a pub called “The Swan”. When the man was captured it was found out that to some degree, he was under the care of “The Invalid’s Office” in Whitehall, the area of London where many different offices of the British government are located, and the article notes that the officer had lost an arm in the American war. After the attack, a group of other officers took the man to his residence, and left one man to guard him. The officer then attacked his guard and threw him out of the window. Concluding he was too dangerous and unstable to leave alone, he was taken for an examination and some kind of formal proceeding. After several of his friends were unable to give testimony that his future conduct would be good, he “was sent to a private mad-house in Hoxton”. This article provides students with the opportunity to see how a returning veteran acted violently in British society, and provides many points for discussion. Students can discuss whether they think a lowly private would have received some form of on-going care from a governmental office, whether he would have been treated so relatively leniently to begin with, and whether he would have actually ended up in jail instead of an insane asylum. Learning about and discussing the British class system will be relevant to students because it will help provide a historical context for some of the causes of the American Revolution.

The final article was printed in *The Providence Gazette*, in Providence, Rhode Island, and published in 22 August, 1821, around forty years after the story allegedly happened. An unnamed writer tells a story that he heard about a British soldier who was executed by his superiors for a crime he did not commit. According to the story, two British soldiers “abused a young woman in a most cruel and shameful manner” in her home. A third soldier upon entering the house saw the two men coming out, and he was jailed when he refused
to give up the identities of the other two. Although the girl cleared him of any blame, he was sentenced to die by a Court Martial. According to the story, General Lord Cornwallis himself, told him not to be so stupid as to die for nothing, and ordered him to give up the names. The condemned man replied, “You are in an enemy’s country, my Lord, you can better spare one man than two”. I would estimate that his pointless gesture and futile devotion to duty would amaze anybody who reads this article. Students will be expected to discuss his action, and the punitive system that was in place. However, students will also be reminded about the date of this story, which will lead to a very valuable discussion about historical accuracy and historical memory. Did this tale ever take place? We will never know. However, students will be given the opportunity to practice the skills of the professional historian in that they will be expected to take into account who it was who told and re-told the story, why it was deemed important enough to print in 1821, what the story might mean to the readers of the article in 1821, and how it might contribute to the readers’ overall image of the British soldiers.

For copies of the newspaper articles and the questions that I developed to accompany them, please refer to Appendix F.

**Source #5: DVD/ Film:**

I have highlighted two documentary series that will be valuable in helping the students explore the mid to late eighteenth century history of North America, and the roles of the British soldiers in particular. Both series are PBS programs. The first, narrated by Graham Greene, an actor and Oneida Indian, is entitled *The War That Made America*, and it
is a four part series on the French and Indian War. The second, a four part series entitled
*Rebels and Redcoats*, looks at the tensions between the British crown and the American
colonies in the years leading up to the American Revolution, and the events of the war itself.
It ends with the British troops being defeated at Yorktown in 1781, and the final British
withdrawal from the United States two years later. It is presented by the British military
historian Richard Holmes, and the writers of the series make no bones about calling it a
“British point of view.” I will carefully choose snippets from these two documentary series,
whose combined running time is close to eight hours, snippets that are aligned with my
teaching objectives.

Although my thesis as a whole has a large focus on the soldiers who served in the
British army during this time period, it would not be accurate, interesting, or relevant to
focus only on the British soldiers when showing parts of these films, as they only represent a
small part of the whole story. It will be educationally necessary and historically pertinent to
discuss the other protagonists too. In these films, the cast of characters include British,
French, various tribal Indian, Canadian, colonial British-American, and United States soldiers,
commanders, generals, politicians and citizens.

The overall outline for teaching using these DVD series is divided into three parts.
Firstly, before we watch the films, I will provide the students with a list of potentially
unfamiliar terms, vocabulary words, people, places and events that are mentioned in the
film snippets, and we will discuss the definitions. Secondly, I will show the students the clips
from the films, but will provide them with a series of “knowledge-level” or “lower-order”
questions for them to answer while they are watching the films. This assignment will serve
as providing a function for the students to perform during the films. Thirdly and lastly, after
the film clips are finished, I will provide a sheet of written questions to each of the students to answer. These last questions will be of a more “higher-order” level, and this last exercise will serve the purpose of evaluating what the students have learned from the DVD series. For the introductory terms, and for both sets of questions, please refer to Appendix G.

**Documentary Film #1: The War That Made America:**

The first documentary film series, *The War That Made America* gives students the opportunity to explore many of the major themes of the French and Indian War. Of course, one of the film’s major themes is the struggle for North American supremacy between two powerful European nations, Great Britain and France, and their battle for land and trading rights. However, I devoted a lot of time to that theme in the power point presentation. So, during the use of films, I have decided to devote more time to other major themes. The four themes I will concentrate on during the showing of the first film are firstly, the role of Indians in the war, secondly, the cultural differences between Indian and European war-making, thirdly, the tensions between the British and the American colonials, a tension that later led to revolution, and finally, the role of women in the conflict. I will show the students various clips from the documentary film, clips that are connected to these themes. This will take a lot of careful planning, and I will need to be very mindful of time constraints and inundating the students with too much spurious information. The film has four DVDs, and to avoid a lot of disc changing, I will download the various clips onto files that can be played through a lap-top computer, and onto a large screen at the front of the class-room.

After choosing the clips, I would need to consider which of the vocabulary terms, people, events and places that are referred to in the clips are potentially unfamiliar to the
students. I would hand out a sheet with these terms listed, and discuss the terms on the list. Students would be expected to write in the definitions on their sheets. After the students had watched the clips from the film, I would then hand out another sheet with a number of questions for them to answer. Obviously, I would need to build in the response time. This would act as the assessment procedure to evaluate whether the students understood the major themes of the film.

The first major theme that I would want the students to be exposed to is the role of various Indian tribes in the war. This theme is gripping but complicated. During the power point presentation, I discussed with the students why the British and the French were fighting, but not so much as to why the Indians were fighting. Firstly, one of the most important concepts to discuss is that there were both similarities and marked differences between different Indian tribes and their goals and ambitions. The situation on the ground was very complex. For instance Canadian Mohawks sided with the French, whereas New York Mohawks were either neutral or sided with the British. Specific tribes chose as allies which ever European nation they thought more likely to honor their land rights, and they skilfully played the British and the French off against each other. Sometimes, during times of crisis, Indians stuck with and fought side by side with their European allies. Other times, for various reasons, like the Indian allies of the French during the British siege of Fort Niagara in 1759, they did not, and they slipped quietly away.

Different British and French commanders felt different emotions towards their Indian allies. One French officer, Daniel Lienard de Beaujeu, donned Indian war paint during battle as a mark of respect and solidarity to his Indian allies. Others, such as General Montcalm the French commander-in-chief in North America resented his Indian allies, and
referred to them as savages. The British general, Amherst, allowed his hatred to go even further. During “Pontiac’s rebellion”, he doused blankets intended for Indians with small pox in an attempt to exterminate them.

To explore this theme, I would show one clip from near the beginning of the film, which runs from minute nine and fifty seconds to minute eighteen and thirty seconds. The clip shows how one tribal leader, known as “The Half King” attempted to secure new lands for his people in the Ohio region, due to his people having been pushed westwards because of Indian tribal warfare and European land encroachments. He did this by allying his people with the British, and he campaigned with George Washington on the area of Fort Duquesne where tensions between French and British claims were the most volatile. The film does an excellent job of explaining that different tribes had sometimes opposing agendas. There were more powerful Indian tribes in the general region that the Half King did not have the authority to represent. The best example was the Iroquois League or the “Five (and later “Six”) Nations.” The film explains this complex political situation as clearly as possible, and my chosen film snippet includes wonderful visualizations of the map of the land from the Atlantic Ocean in the east to the Mississippi River in the west, and Canada in the north to the Gulf of Mexico in the south. This map helps viewers understand what the different groups were trying to achieve, and what logistical challenges and constraints they were facing. In addition, showing a clip that includes the Iroquois League is important because it allows students to see how their local community played such an important role in the war. My students and I are residents of Rochester, NY, which is in the geographic region of the Iroquois League
Another major theme of the film is the cultural differences between European armies and Indian armies. In highlighting this important theme, I would play the students disc two, beginning at minute forty-eight and ending at minute fifty-three. This clip shows the famous battle over Fort William Henry at the southern end of Lake George, New York, and it allows students to explore the cultural differences in war-making between Europeans and Indians. Under General Munro, the British, who were holed up in the fort, were being laid siege to by French and Indian troops. Early in the siege, the British had sent a messenger to another British regiment requesting help, but the French had intercepted the reply that no help would be forth-coming. When, under a flag of truce, the French showed the message to General Munro, they gave him the opportunity to surrender. However, through watching the film, we learn that the eighteenth century European rules of warfare did not allow an honorable surrender unless the fortifications had been breached (which they had not). Only an honorable surrender would have allowed the defeated army to keep their cherished “honors of war” (such as regimental flags and other symbols). A dishonorable surrender would have been unacceptable to Munro. So, he declined the invitation to surrender, and the siege resumed. When later, the fortifications were in fact breached, Munro did surrender and the battle was over. After the battle, to the amazement of their Indian allies the French officers sat down and dined with the British officers, toasting each other’s honorable conduct. Next, to the chagrin of his Indian allies, General Montcalm ordered that the British and American troops would all be allowed to leave the fort unhindered, keep all of their belongings and weapons, and return unharmed to the safety of their homes.

Indian troops began to feel that the war was indeed a “white man’s war.” They had fought, spilled blood, and lost some of their comrades. They had expected to be reimbursed
for their losses. As everybody knew or would soon find out, war-making does not come cheap. Goods and prisoners would have offset some of their financial and personnel losses. The Indians expected goods and prisoners. Prisoners could be either ransomed for financial reasons, held on and integrated into tribal society in order to replace fallen warriors, or killed for spiritual reasons. Montcalm’s continued disregard for and disrespect towards the customs of his allies ended up being self-destructive to French ambitions in North America.

The third major theme of the documentary that I want the students to explore is the tension between the British and the people of the British colonies. To highlight this important theme, I will play disc three from minute nine and thirty seconds to minute fifteen. The action begins with a meeting between Lord Loudoun, the highest British administrator in North America and George Washington, where he denies the latter’s request for a commission in the British army. Washington wanted away from heading Virginian colonial troops on the relatively quiet Ohio frontier, in order to serve in the more dramatic crucible of war in Canada and the Great Lakes region. Britain’s representatives in America were often at odds with colonial troops, legislators, and citizens. George Washington and others felt strongly that his colonial troops were treated inferior to British troops and taken for granted. Washington is left frustrated and angry at Lord Loudoun’s rejection.

Next, the film shows a re-enactment of the Massachusetts legislature vehemently discussing Britain’s expectations that they contribute men to fight the French (and their Indian allies), and also that they contribute financial resources to pay for a percentage of the cost of the war. This disagreement is part of the beginnings of the feelings of colonial
discontent and leanings towards disunion with Great Britain that eventually lead to American independence.

Another important theme portrayed well by the documentary is the role of women in the war, and I will show three brief clips that highlight their contribution. Firstly, by showing disc one minute thirty-four, students will be interested to learn that in the British army, some wives traveled on campaign with their husbands, and that they were employed as cooks and laundresses. With their husbands’ regiments, they often had to travel vast distances under difficult conditions. In the film, actresses replay conversations that could have taken place between women who traveled with the army. They discuss troop movements and administrative decisions. Secondly, in disc one minute ten, the first Indian we meet in the documentary, “The Half King”, belonged to a tribe that strongly valued the counsel of women. In the documentary we see “the Half King” discussing strategic diplomacy and politics with a female elder, and listening to her advice. Lastly, in disc two minute nineteen, and again in disc four minute thirty-four, we are introduced to the story of Mary Jemison. Students will be interested in her story because firstly, it is an inherently fascinating, frightening and romantic story, but secondly because there is a very strong local connection. Jemison lived with the Seneca people in what is now central Livingston County, and represented the Seneca people in negotiations with white traders in the town of Geneseo at the Treaty of Big Tree. The documentary tells and shows us the account of how after being captured with her family by Indians, she realized that the rest of her family had been killed and scalped. When shown the scalps, she even recognized the hair of her dead mother and her dead younger siblings. Despite all this, she chose to remain with the Indians for the rest of her life, even when she was given the choice to leave them.
At the end of showing these clips, the students will complete an assignment. The objective of the assignment is for students to understand how Indians differed from the Europeans (either the British or the French), and how they were similar. An example of a difference might be that during battles if one European side surrendered that was the end of the battle, and no more blood could be spilt. For Native American tribes, captives could be taken and integrated into tribal families, or the killing could continue for spiritual purposes. An example of a similarity might be that both Native Americans and Europeans often took physical possessions to off-set the financial costs of war-making. For this assignment I will provide the students with graphic organizers such as Venn Diagrams.

**Documentary Film #2: Rebels and Redcoats:**

The second documentary film that I will play the students snippets of is entitled “Rebels and Redcoats,” a four part series that shows a “British point of view” about the lead up to the American Revolution, and the war itself. As a whole, the film series has several major themes. For instance, when the narrator, Professor Holmes, analyzes the reasons for colonial discontent, he comes to a diverse set of conclusions. On the one hand, the colonies paid one fiftieth the amount of tax that people in Britain paid, and Holmes infers that their complaints about high taxes were groundless. On the other, Holmes concedes that British demands that the colonies only trade with Britain restricted colonial business opportunities. Again, on the one hand, colonists had to pay a relatively small percentage of the cost of their own defense, but on the other hand standing armies were anathema in Britain and to British society generally, and as the overwhelming majority of colonists saw themselves first and foremost as Britons, the idea of a standing army in the colonies was an anathema also.
It seemed alien and tyrannical, and it countered the expectations that Englishmen had earned during the English Civil wars of the mid seventeenth century. Holmes views the American colonies as the front battle line for the tension that existed between liberty and authority.

Another major theme of the film is the role of the British army in the American War. Historians have often portrayed British soldiers as brutal criminals who were pressed into the army from British jails. There are three brief sections of the series that I will show the students that allow students the opportunity to analyze the experience of the British soldiers during the war. The first snippet is on disc one and runs from minute five and fifty seconds to minute eight and forty-five seconds. This section is a re-enactment of Samuel Adams, Thomas Hancock, Paul Revere and others meeting in a tavern discussing their anti-British rule rhetoric. Holmes explains that these men did not have enough popular support, but that the Boston Massacre proved to serve that purpose. We are shown the print of the massacre that Paul Revere created, and Holmes explains how it was used in the colonies as rebel propaganda. The faces of the British soldiers are shown up close. Evil looks adorn their faces, and a cowardly sniper fires at the crowd from a secluded spot in an upper-story window. This print is widely acknowledged as historically inaccurate. Crispus Attucks, the Native-American/African-American protestor who was killed in the incident is completely missing from the print, presumably because his ethnicity was judged unlikely to invoke enough sympathy.

The second clip I will show the students is a little longer. It is part of disc one, and runs from minute sixteen and forty-four seconds to minute twenty-eight. I will need to explain some background to the students; General Gage wanted to send a message to the
rebel forces, and he sent British troops to take control of a large weapons cache, which involved a long-distance march to the town of Concord through the village of Lexington. The video jumps between re-enactors acting out the drama dressed as British soldiers marching in long columns along the actual route, wearing red, military uniforms, carrying their muskets, and marching to pipes and drums, and Professor Holmes narrating the story, looking into the camera also from the actual route. There is a high drama and Holmes describes the nervousness and paranoia of the British troops. He explains the military tactics of the troops of both sides, and shows how militia troops used some of what they had learned from fighting with the British during the French and Indian War. This visual re-enactment is excellent for students to witness, especially as the film-writers are using the actual terrain of that day. We hear about the “first atrocity story of the war”; according to British troops, they found a dying British soldier who had had his brain and ears removed. During the pursued retreat to Boston, British soldiers took out the anger on people in the town of Arlington, killing snipers and citizens alike. One old man was shot for refusing to leave his house, citing the famous British aphorism, “an Englishman’s home is his castle.”

The last clip I will show is on disc three and runs from minute twenty-one to minute twenty-four and fifty-three seconds. I will need to explain to the students that the story has moved on to the conflict in the south. This snippet begins with a British captain riding into the British controlled city of Charleston in South Carolina. Professor Holmes talking directly to the camera gives us an insight into the thinking that might have gone on in the minds of individuals as they thought about which side they would choose to support. I think that this will allow the students to really think about what might have been happening in the minds of individuals caught up in the midst of the war. It allows us to dispel the myth that colonial people all immediately rallied to the rebel cause. We are introduced to the thoughts of Eliza
Wilkinson, through the form of an actress speaking the words that she wrote in her diary.

At first she was supportive of the British, but as she witnessed the actions of some of the soldiers, she changed her mind. Even her own household was ransacked by British soldiers who wanted to gather valuable possessions in order to make some money. Seeing these harsh actions by British soldiers serves the objective of showing the behavior of some of the troops.

By learning about some of the actions of both sides, the students are introduced to the dramatic reality of events, events which can never be dull or boring. Like before the first film, I will again need to introduce some specific terms, vocabulary, events, people and places to the students before I show clips from this second film. As a class, we will need to discuss these terms to avoid confusion whilst watching the film. Examples of this are General Gage, Charleston, Eliza Wilkinson, Lexington, Concord, Arlington, and the military term ‘flankers’. Again, like during the first film, I will provide a list of “lower-level” questions for the students to answer during the film, and a list of “higher-level” questions for them to answer after the film has finished. For these questions, please refer to Appendix G.

Source #6: Living History: Private Best of the 64th:

A friend of mine, Mr. Ford Best, is a Canadian who has re-located to the Rochester area. He is an expert on matters pertaining to British military life in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and often gives presentations to classes of students in local area schools. In his presentations he is dressed as a private soldier from the British army’s 64th infantry regiment. The regiment was first established in 1758, and although it did not
participate in the French and Indian War in North America, it did participate in the wider Seven Years War that was played out around the globe, seeing action in the Caribbean. It was heavily embroiled in the American War of Independence, and in 1782 the 64th became the 64th (2nd Staffordshire) Regiment of Foot. Ford brings many artifacts with him; artifacts that are either authentic or close replicas. I witnessed Ford giving his outstanding presentation to a class of students in the Churchville-Chili School District, and was extremely impressed by both his enthusiasm for and knowledge of the topic, and by the genuinely unyielding attention of the students. Therefore, my fifth source for teaching my topic is to invite Ford into my classroom to speak to my students. The following is information about his presentation.

The soldiers: Who were they?:

Ford spends part of his presentation talking about who the British soldiers are. He explains about the kinds of conditions in Britain at the time that caused people to either enlist or sometimes be pressed into the army. One of the major reasons was the economic climate at the time. In the mid to late eighteenth century, Britain was moving rapidly from a more agricultural country to a more industrial and financial economy. There was also a series of economic depressions, forcing many skilled artisans out of work and into deep poverty. The British army included many artisans such as shoemakers and weavers. It is also true that some were forced into the army by magistrates to “pay’ restitution for crimes. However, as the historian Michael Stephenson said “in eighteenth century Britain it did not take much – poaching, the theft of a loaf of bread, rent arrears, trespassing, literally hundreds of petty crimes – to land the helpless culprit in the slammer.”

Ford also talks
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about the diversity of the army and those that lived with it. The army was made up of Scottish Highlanders, Irish, English, Welsh, Germans, and Americans, and women and children often lived and worked side by side.

Clothes:

Ford wears the military garb of a private soldier in the British army’s 64th infantry regiment. His red, woolen regimental coat is lined on the inside with linen. On the outside, the coat is adorned with lacings and buttons that are distinct to his regiment. The buttons all have the number 64 showing, and the 64th’s unique lacings which line the coat in a vertical line close to the buttons and on the sleeve cuffs are rectangular and colored white, black and red. Interestingly, the privates were issued new coats once a year on the King’s birthday. As previously mentioned, the coats were distinct to the wearer’s regiment. All of the other clothes were universal across regiments. The soldier wore a basic linen shirt, a white vested waist-coat, breeches, and no underwear. On his legs, he wore wool stockings with gaiters over them. The gaiters were painted, and they helped to keep stones out of shoes, and offer protection from the rough terrain and the wet. The shoes of the “foot soldier” were made of leather, had steel heels, and had a simple buckle adorned to the top. One final interesting fact about the shoes that I learned from Ford is that in the late eighteenth century the foot soldiers’ shoes were made so as to be able to fit on to either of the feet. There was no left shoe or right shoe.

Ford also owns many different kinds of hat which he is able to show students. He has a bi-corne hat and a tri-corne hat, both of which are made from felt. They are kept “folded” in shape by laces, and there are small parts of rope attached to the outside; the purpose supposedly being for the rope to absorb rain-water and moisture. As Ford explains,
everything that the foot soldier carried had a purpose. Nothing was spurious and redundant. Another hat is the Light Infantry’s “jockey-style” hat, with a visor at the front that can sit up, a red colored rim around the base, and a “Mohican-style” plume of animal hair that runs in a thin central strip from the front of the cap to the back. Most impressive is the bear-skin hat of the Grenadier Guards. Although this hat would not have been worn by the 64th regiment of foot, it is the most dynamic of Ford’s hats, and always receives the most interest. It is about two feet high, and it made the already big grenadier appear huge. Regimental symbols adorn the hat’s front plate, a white plume peppers the dark hair of the bear skin, and wicks for grenades were carried in a small area in the back of the hat.

Weaponry:

From one of Ford’s shoulders to the opposite hip, an original cross belt traverses his chest holding a wooden cartridge box that is covered and protected by a double layer of leather. From his other shoulder to his opposite hip runs a belt that holds a steel bayonet and a fairly small but solid sabre, which was used to break bones rather than to pierce skin. Where the belts cross, a regimental plate is in place. The cartridge box holds a total of thirty-six cartridges, which are all tube-shaped paper canisters that hold gun-powder. This gun-powder is made from a combination of carbon, sulphur and saltpeter. From the safety of his own home, Ford demonstrates for me how soldiers fired their muskets. I would want him to do this in the classroom too, but permission from the principal would need to be sought out first. The demonstration does not include firing an actual musket ball of course. Even without the musket ball, firing the musket does induce sparks however. If a musket ball were in the barrel, it would (hopefully for the firer) have caused the musket ball to be fired in the general direction of the enemy. Ford explains to the students how unreliable
the muskets could be, and also how relatively slow re-loading was, which according to Ford took about fifteen seconds for a competent private. In the “firing” demonstration, Ford shows the students that the purpose of parts of the musket such as the cock and the hammer was to snap violently down on a strategically placed flint. When the steel hammer and the cock snapped down on the flint, sparks were induced, and gasses were sent into the gun-chamber, which resulted in the ignition of the gun-powder, and (hopefully) the firing of the musket ball.

**Food:**

The empty haversack of the British infantryman was handed in every day, and replaced by another one with the day’s rations inside. Examples of food that the soldiers of the British army ate in the mid to late eighteenth century were dried peas, dried beans, dried rice, oats, salted pork, salted beef, and salted fish, and these goods were shipped from England in barrels. They could buy other goods such as maple sugar, tea, coffee and tobacco. They were encouraged to grow vegetable gardens when they were stationed, but discouraged to hunt due to a concern that they might desert. Six soldiers formed a “mess group”, and they combined their rations, often cooking stews in a big cast iron pot that was used many times before some poor unfortunate had to scrape out the scum, and clean the pot out. Perhaps surprisingly the scum was left out to dry with the intention of eating it. Ford tells the students that this is how the famous poem “Pease Pudding Hot” was derived:

“Pease Pudding Hot, Pease Pudding Cold
Pease Pudding In the Pot, Nine days Old”.
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Each soldier was also rationed with a pound and a half of flour, which the baker baked into a five pound loaf of bread every four days. On campaign, the flour was mixed with water and some yeast to make "hard-tack", which resembled a cookie, and which could survive for a long time.

The Things They Carried:

Ford carries a large back-pack, which is immediately noticeable for its bushy, snow-white, goat fur exterior. In his presentations, Ford encourages the students to touch the goat fur to feel the lanolin, a greasy texture that is secreted from goats and other wooly animals, which acts as a water repellent. An original tomahawk dangles from the back-pack, which either it, or an ax would have been used for chopping wood and other laborious tasks. He unbucksles and un-wraps the back-pack, and unfolds it on a desk in front of the students. The biggest item inside is a blanket made of unbleached wool which would have been either white, or more likely, grey. For eating and drinking, he carries an authentic wooden plate, a couple of wooden spoons, a spoon made of cow horn which he allows students to touch. He stresses that the soldiers did not need or use knives and forks for eating, as most meals were stews, and could be eaten using the spoons. He also has a tin canteen for carrying water and molasses and a tin cup.

When you see the amount of different items that Ford carries in his back-pack, it surprises you how much the pack can hold. For trading purposes, he carries trade beads that were used for trading with the Indians, and authentic coins such as a British farthing, shilling, penny, and a ha’penny, a German thaler, and a Dutch guilder, for using in the Euro-American markets. For personal grooming he carries an authentic razor, tooth-brush, soap, a shaving-brush, a clothes brush, and a comb made of cow-horn. For cleaning items he
carries a “black ball” and a “white ball”. Both of these are ball-shape globules of animal fat mixed with other items (soot for the black ball, clay for the white ball), and are about the size of a tennis ball. The black ball is used for polishing and water-proofing items such as shoes and gaiters, and for maintaining the musket, and the white ball for whitening the cross belt. Other items include a chunk of rope, extra clothes, a flint and steel kit for starting fire, small tools such as knives, and a sewing kit which includes thread, needles, a thimble, a pair of scissors, and pins that date back nearly 500 years to Elizabethan England.

Ford likes to emphasize that there was a lot of down time in the army, and that life could be dull and monotonous. Fighting was only a small part of army life. For this reason, Ford shows students the kind of recreational activities that soldiers participated in. Ford shares with students some of the items that soldiers often carried for entertainment, such as a deck of cards. There are no letters or numbers on the individual cards due to high illiteracy in the army; there are only the suit shapes, and there is no uniform pattern on the backs of the cards like there are for modern decks. He carries dominoes, marbles, different pairs of dice made out of either wood or bone, and a small wooden board game for playing a game called “fox and geese”. He also has a couple of small musical instruments, a tin penny whistle and an original jaw harp.

Ford is a tremendous wealth of knowledge on this topic, and after his presentation I would want the students to have ample time to ask questions, although having seen Ford’s presentation, I know that he asks good questions to students as he is going along. After the questions were over, I would want the students to thank Ford and give him a warm round of applause. It is likely that there would not be time left enough to ask the students to
undergo a form of assessment, so I would give them homework for this purpose. For this assessment, please see Appendix H.

Source #7: The Field Trip: Fort Niagara:

Luckily, we live in an area rich in connections to the French and Indian War, and one of our most valuable local resources is Fort Niagara. It is situated on the southern shore of Lake Ontario at the point where the Niagara River flows out into the lake after its 35 mile journey from Lake Erie. When the French built the fort in 1726, its function was to control the flow of trade in the Upper Great Lakes area. Waterways were the primary mode of transporting goods, and its location at the top of the Niagara River allowed the holders of the fort the key to control trade to the great American interior. By building strategic forts like Fort Niagara, the French began a policy of trying to connect their strongholds in Canada and the Great Lakes region to Louisiana in the south. Fort Niagara was one of the most important of those forts.

During the summer of 1759, the French and Indian War was at its height, and the British planned a handful of important military strikes on French strongholds in or near Canada. An attack on Fort Niagara was one such operation. This exceptional historical site will allow students to see with their own eyes a local site that helped shaped American and world history.

As I am a member of the Old Fort Niagara Association (OFNA), staff there kindly sent me information about their historical tours. My plan that I am about to share for touring the fort is based on the learning objectives that I will set for my students, my research into
the siege of Fort Niagara in 1759, and tour information that the OFNA kindly shared with me.

Stage One: The Approach:

The first stage of the tour is to stop the school bus outside the park. We will not be driving straight to the parking lot next to the fort. By getting off the bus at the edge of the park, we will review the information about the forces that were chosen to complete the task, and the forces that were defending the French fort. I will remind the students that the British had planned three major simultaneous offensives against the French in 1759. The siege on Fort Niagara was one of them. The other two were firstly on Quebec and secondly on a series of forts in northern New York, Lake Champlain and ultimately Montreal. The British force on Niagara, led by Brigadier General John Prideaux, was sent from Schenectady in New York, over land, up rivers, across lakes to Fort Oswego, and then by boat along the southern shore of Lake Ontario to a point close to where the students are now standing. According to the OFNA, Prideaux’s force consisted of “1,640 British soldiers (redcoats), 760 New York troops, and about 945 Iroquois warriors,” and the 400 mile journey from Schenectady had taken six weeks. I will ask the students to think about something they were doing six weeks ago, and then to consider the thought of having been on a gruelling march through difficult and unfamiliar territory ever since. I will also ask them to consider the diversity of the force marching under the British flag. We will be talking as we talk, and carrying our lunch-packs. I will create a sense of tension by reminding the students that although the British had intelligence about the fort, most of the force had not seen the fort before, and had not been to this part of the country before.

Stage Two: The British set up camp:
According to the OFNA guide, "the British moved inland and set up a camp about a thousand yards to the east. Each tent held five soldiers." Here I will explain to the students that Prideaux’s second in command was Sir William Johnson, and that he was chosen not for military leadership skills but because of his friendship with and respect from the Iroquois’s “Six Nations”. Historians assert that without the assistance of the Iroquois Nations, the British could never have attacked Fort Niagara. I will take the students to the spot where, one thousand yards to the east of the fort, the British set up camp, and began to dig siege trenches.

The French commander, Captain Paul Pouchot did not know that the Iroquois were allied to the British and no longer neutral. At the beginning of the summer he had allowed the bulk of his force to head westwards in order to assist other French regiments to try to regain the Forks of the Ohio. I will remind the students of the strategic importance of the Forks, and that it had been the scene of the beginning of the war in North America. I will explain to the students that due to the size of the British force, Pouchot’s only hope was to stall for long enough to allow for re-enforcements to arrive. It was part of his delaying strategy to call a three day truce that allowed for the French-allied Seneca Indians to parley with their British-allied kinsmen. However, unhappily for Pouchot, at the end of the conference the Seneca people, persuaded that the French were under threat, left the fort.

As the students and I walk closer to the fort, I will explain that during the truce, the British had been building newer trenches closer and closer to the fort. A British attack over open land against fortified defenses would have been suicide. I will also explain to the students that soon after the Seneca Indians left, the siege began, and that the British quickly
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lost their commander, Prideaux. The students will learn that his head was blown off by a siege cannon that he inadvertently walked in front of.

Stage Three: The Siege of Fort Niagara and La Belle Famille:

I will then tell the students that a few days into the siege, the French reinforcements arrived and were seen by the British at a spot just two miles south along the Niagara River called La Belle Famille. Again, I will highlight the important role of the Indian tribes. The British-allied Indians again counseled the French-allied Indians not to involve themselves in the battle, and again the negotiating worked. I will then explain that the British defeated the French and their Canadian militiamen, and with this loss any hope of defending the fort disappeared. Pouchot and his troops held out for as long as they possibly could, but the fort finally fell into British hands three weeks after they had first landed within a few miles of it.

Stage Four: The Museum:

Visitors to the fort enter the small museum first. One of the first exhibits in the museum, and in my opinion the most important is a giant map of the local area displayed on the first wall that visitors see. This visual is a wonderful way of teaching the concept of how trade in the eighteenth century was completely reliant on movement along water channels, and that if you held Fort Niagara, you controlled trade in the vast areas between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River, and beyond. The first time I saw this wall-map, I really felt that it was the first time that this concept hit home for me.

Stage Five: Touring the Fort:
Upon leaving the small museum, visitors to the fort make a brief walk to a drawbridge and gate-way called Le Porte des Cinq Nations. I will point out to the students and comment that upon approaching the gate-way, we cannot see much that is inside the fort. I will ask students to offer answers as to why this would be. The answer is of course that massive earthen works where built around the exterior designed for defense. After arrival at the gate-way, I will tell the students that this stone building was actually called The Dauphin Battery, named after the French Dauphin, the son of King Louis XV, and that the French built it in 1756, three years before the siege that we have just discussed. Immediately after walking through the battery, we meet another stone building, called the South Redoubt, built by the British in 1770. A redoubt is a battlement built for defense, and this one is about twenty feet high. Stairs lead to a top floor guard-room that housed up to twenty men and where cannons were placed.

After passing through the redoubt, immediately to our left is the provisions storehouse. This building was built by the British in 1762, three years after they captured the fort, on the site of an earlier French storehouse. Containers used for carrying food supplies are available to see and touch. Next to the storehouse is the powder magazine, where gun powder was stored. Built by the French in 1757, it was, according to the fort’s printed tour information, “one of the largest powder magazines in all of New France, intended to store powder not only for use at Fort Niagara, but for French operations in the Ohio Valley as well.”8 The building sits deep in the ground in order to avoid being hit by cannon-balls. It was very important that this room was kept dry, as a lot of moisture could potentially render the powder useless. The building’s walls were encased by wood to lock out moisture. In addition, all iron was avoided as a source for potential sparks. For
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example all of the woodworks inside the room were joined together by wooden pegs instead of nails, and the barrels that stored the powder were rimmed using copper or wooden bands instead of iron ones.

The provisions storehouse and the powder room are in one corner of the fort wedged between the south redoubt and the Niagara River. By walking up some steps next to the powder room students will see the Niagara River. On the other side of the river is modern day Ontario, Canada. Cannons protrude the walkway and it is here that students get to understand the strategic importance of the fort. Nothing could have passed by along the river without the holders of the fort seeing it. Continuing along the walkway that lines the river, towards the mouth of the river which flows into Lake Ontario, the students will encounter two more buildings; first the bake-house and then finally “The French Castle”. For school tours, the Old Fort Niagara Association places individuals throughout the fort who can speak about particular buildings and particular topics related to life in the fort during the mid to late eighteenth century. According to the Old Fort Niagara: Rivals For Empire tour script, the association places somebody here to talk to students about food and food preparation. I will not go into the details of this topic here as I already discussed food and food preparation during my discussion about Private Best’s presentation. However, the students will experience this part of the tour from the individual placed there by the Old Fort Niagara Association’s tour planners.

The most impressive building in the fort is the French Castle, placed at the very corner of the peninsula where the river meets the lake. It was here on my very first visit to the fort, looking out at the lake from one of the windows where I first realized what a sense of loneliness might have pervaded amongst people garrisoned here. The building was built
in 1726 and originally was only enclosed by a “simple wooden stockade”. The Iroquois had only consented to the French building it on the condition that it was only for trade and that it not be surrounded by regular fortifications. Over the years more buildings were constructed and the size of the fort grew. Before entering the French Castle, another person from the association’s school tour talks to the students about who the French soldiers were, their uniforms, personal possessions, and duties, and also shows the students a musket firing demonstration.

The first room of the French castle that the students tour is the trade room, where trade goods were stored. According to the guide, the “fur trade involved the exchange of European made goods like cloth, blankets, guns, tools, kettles, and clothing for fur pelts trapped or hunted by Native Americans. Through the trade, the Native people could acquire things that made their lives easier. In exchange, the French received furs that could be used to make fashionable clothing for the upper classes back in France”. I will explain to the students how these goods were transported, and explore some of the logistical difficulties, such as having to carry goods and canoes round un-navigable parts of the Niagara River called portages. Other rooms in the building are the Sir William Johnson Room, the boulangerie (the French word for bakery, where the French baked bread during their tenure at the fort), the Second floor Vestibule (where the association places a character called Madame Douville, who discusses garrison life from a female point of view), the chapel (where the French and Indian converts worshipped), the officers’ sleeping quarters (where the association places character called Lieutenant Danielle-Marie Chabert de Joncaire, a French officer with firm associations with Seneca Indians), the officers’ dining room, and the
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commandant’s bed-chamber. According to the tour script, during the siege of Fort Niagara in 1759, Captain Pierre Pouchot, was resting in his quarters, when a British cannon fired from the other side of the river, “struck the chimney of the commandant’s room, pierced the flue, crashed down the fireplace, and rolled across the floor in front of the astounded Pouchot”.11

Outside again, I will show the students the three historical flags that fly from the three flag poles. These flags represent the three nations that have occupied the fort; the white flag of pre-revolutionary France, the British Union Jack, and the fifteen-star, fifteen-stripe, United States flag. Lastly, I will take the students on to the walk-ways that line the top of the earthwork defenses reminding them of how from outside the fort, they could not see inside. I will remind the students of scenes from the DVD The War That Made America that showed a typical attack on a fort (in the case of the DVD, it was the French and Indian attack on Fort William Henry), and will very briefly discuss some of the weapons and tactics that both sides used.

At this point I will provide the students with an assignment that I made prior to the field trip, and arranged with the association’s tour operators. For the remainder of the field trip, students will be expected to work on their assignment and move about the historic site. For the specific assignment, please refer to appendix I.
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**Synthesizing the Sources: The Project that serves as assessment:**

After the class has explored all of the sources in the unit on the British troops in North America in the mid to late eighteenth century, the students will be expected to complete a detailed project that demonstrates what they have learned. My evaluation of their projects will serve as the unit’s biggest assessment component. In short, the project will serve as a performance or authentic assessment.

Students will be required to demonstrate their understanding of the topic by choosing from a list of formats that I have compiled. The formats that can be used to demonstrate their knowledge are as follows; a play, a historical scrap-book, a journal, a series of letters, a poem, a lecture that incorporates both audio and visual components, or a newspaper. The students must use one of these formats to show their knowledge of one of the following topics which are connected to the unit we have just completed. Students can choose from the following topics and themes; New France, the French army, the Iroquois Confederacy, Pontiac’s rebellion, the daily life of the British soldier, causes of the American revolution, weapons and military tactics, the role of women in the British army, food and food preparation, and the organization of the British army at the time of the American revolution.

For sources, the students will be able to use the ones that we have already analyzed and they will be able to include information that they learned while completing the unit. I will also need to provide them with new resources that they haven’t yet seen, such as primary documents (maps, letters, photographs of authentic artifacts, and official government documents), text-books, secondary texts, and web-sites from the internet. One example of a detailed secondary text is from the Osprey series on military history,
specifically *British Redcoat, 1740-1793*. From reading this work, students can combine their prior knowledge with new knowledge, synthesize the information, and construct their specific presentation. Examples of pertinent web sites are [www.americanrevolution.org](http://www.americanrevolution.org).

I will divide the students up into their small groups and each group will consist of three or four students. All students will be expected to participate in the research and the presentation. For example, if a group decides to present a play that teaches the class about the daily life of the British soldiers, there will need to be as many characters in the play as there are in the group.

I will provide each student with an outline that describes their project, and a guiding rubric, about twenty minutes before the end of class. The students will be put into their groups and will immediately begin brain-storming ideas for their presentation. They will need to have made their decision by the time they return to the next class. They will be given two more class periods to conduct their research and plan their presentation. Students will perform or present their topic at the third and final class period. In assessing their project, I will of course stick closely to the pre-arranged rubric.

For the detailed assignment that I will hand to the students, and for the rubric, please see appendix J.
C: THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Introduction:

In part B of this thesis, I described and explained the different sources that I will use for teaching the topic I have chosen. Here, in part C, I will next explain the strategies that I will incorporate into my teaching and show how they are strategies that are based on solid educational research. For this component of my thesis, I will highlight the research-based educational strategies that are outlined in *Classroom Instruction That Works: Research Based Strategies For Increasing Student Achievement* by Robert J. Marzano, Debra J. Pickering, and Jane E. Pollock. I will also explain where within my thesis I used these research-based educational strategies, and at which point I used a specific strategy to help teach a specific topic. In the introduction to *Classroom Instruction That Works*, the authors state that one of their primary goals “was to identify those instructional strategies that have a high probability of enhancing student achievement for all students in all subject areas at all grade levels”. In this final component of my thesis, I detail which specific research-based strategies I used, and in which context.

Strategy One: Identifying Similarities and Differences:

Marzano et al explain that the strategy of “identifying similarities and differences” is an extremely powerful tool for teachers. I use this strategy in at least two areas. Firstly, in my lesson where I use documentary films to teach the French and Indian War, I ask the students to identify the similarities and differences between Indian and European warfare. For example, one of the clips of the film I chose to share with the students shows how

---

traditional European warfare was often unsuited to North America, and that misunderstandings occurred between the British and their Indian allies, and between the French and their Indian allies. For example, after the French and Indian siege on Fort William Henry, the Indians expected to be given the “spoils of war”, namely prisoners and valuable commodities to help pay for their human and financial expenses. It was a shock to them when the French officers sat down to dine with the British officers. Although the French guaranteed the British and their American colonial allies safe passage from the fort, the Indian allies of the French began claiming what they saw as their right to plunder, capture and to kill. Another difference was that in North America, Indian tribes from this part of North America were used to conducting warfare in woodlands, where there were plenty of nooks and crannies to hide in, or shoot from. In Europe, although this kind of warfare did exist, it was definitely not common-place. European armies preferred to battle it out on wide open spaces. After showing the clips from the documentary film, *The War That Made America*, I set an assignment for the students where they had to use a Venn Diagram to categorize these differences and similarities. Use of this graphic organizer is a useful tool for the students to use and by thinking through the descriptions to add to the Venn Diagram, the students are working on and organizing major themes of the topic. Appendix E also includes questions about the documentary film that force the students to identify similarities and differences.

The second place I use this strategy is during the implementation of source number two, where I ask students to compare two different texts. The text-book, *The Americans* and the history book, *The War That Made America* by historian Fred Anderson, describe the same event, the disastrous battle that befell General Braddock and his British troops in the woods near Fort Duquesne in the Ohio Valley. However, they seem to tell a different story.
The Americans insists that the British were cowardly, whereas Fred Anderson tells the reader that the British troops suffered massive casualties, and fought as best as they could under difficult, dangerous, and unfamiliar circumstances. Appendix C is a list of questions that is the assignment that accompanies the reading of these two texts, and all of the questions require that students compare and contrast these sources, and that in effect, the students are noticing and weighing up the similarities and differences of these sources, before writing answers.

**Strategy Two: Summarizing and Note-taking:**

The second strategy elaborated on and recommended in Marzano, Pickering and Pollock's work is “summarizing and note-taking”. The authors assert that summarizing and note-taking “are two of the most powerful skills students can cultivate. They provide students with tools for identifying and understanding the most important aspects of what they are learning.”

My unit on the British army in North America provides a very early opportunity for students to practice their summarizing skills, while at the same time providing a challenge. Power point presentations can be a wonderful tool for relaying important information. However, in some ways they already provide a summary of the main points. This could cause a problem because one of the benefits of summarizing is the actual process of doing the summarizing. If the teacher already provides a summary, one could reason that the process of summarizing has been removed. However, Microsoft Word’s Power Point package also provides spaces for the students to take notes on lined spaces next to print out of the power point slides. Therefore, my power point presentation actually provides
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students with more of an opportunity to utilize the note-taking strategy rather than the summarizing strategy. Marzano et al would call the power point presentation “teacher-prepared notes”, which “provide students with a clear picture of what the teacher considers important”\(^\text{14}\) However, I believe that the power point presentation is indeed summarizing the content, and the summaries can be kept, referred to, and used as study guides by the students.

The second place that I use this strategy is when I introduce source number three to the students; “the specialist historian and her sources”. As outlined in part B of my thesis, I give students photo-copies of sections from historian Sylvia R. Frey’s book entitled The *British Soldier In America*. The assignment is for the students to summarize these sections and then present the summaries to the rest of the class. From the presentations of these summaries, the whole class will learn more information about the British soldiers who served in North America.

**Strategy Three: Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition:**

According to Marzano, Pickering and Pollock, “reinforcing effort can help teach students one of the most valuable lessons they can learn – the harder you try, the more successful you are. In addition, providing recognition for attainment of specific goals not only enhances achievement, but it stimulates motivation”\(^\text{15}\). This seems like common sense. However, the authors very clearly state that undeserved praise can actually harm students. According to the research, “it appears that praise given for accomplishing easy tasks can undermine achievement”\(^\text{16}\). As a teacher, I would need to work very hard at providing the
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appropriate feedback and praise to all of my students where it is deserved. Grading assignments in a timely fashion and providing meaningful, specific feedback in response to these assignments will mean that the students’ effort will be reinforced. Talking in person to all students individually, highlighting their achievements, but also detailing the areas that they need to improve will provide them with recognition. When groups present their work to the class, I will have the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback to the students. If their work is as good as I hope it is, these presentations will be the perfect opportunity for me to provide the students with recognition. There will also be opportunities to provide recognition when I speak to the students’ parents. However, I should not wait until the quarterly report card, and the parent-teacher evening. This praise and recognition should occur intermittently throughout the school year, and in direct response to achievement.

Strategy Four: Homework and Practice:

As the authors of *Classroom Instruction That Works* assert, “homework and practice are ways of extending the school day and providing students with opportunities to refine and extend their knowledge. Teachers can use both of these practices as powerful instructional tools”.

One of the times I use homework to refine their knowledge of the British soldiers is in my homework assignment connected to the lesson where the class is visited by Private Ford Best. Private Best’s presentation is full of so many interesting parts that there would in all likelihood not be enough time for an assessment during class-time. There would most likely not even be enough time for a quick “ticket out of the door” assessment. Therefore, I designed ten questions that I want the students to answer for homework. Marzano et al state that the research indicates that there are two purposes for

---
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homework, practice, and preparation or elaboration. This assignment falls into the latter category, specifically, elaboration. The students experienced Private Best's presentation, and it is during their homework assignment that they will be elaborating on their new understanding. I have devised different types of questions for the students. They are not just lower level, or "knowledge" level questions. However, I will explain this more when elaborating later on the "questions, cues and advance organizers" strategy.

**Strategy Five: Non-linguistic Representations:**

The authors write that "knowledge is stored in two forms – a linguistic form and an imagery form. The imagery mode...is expressed as mental pictures or even physical sensations, such as smell, taste, touch, kinesthetic association, and sound....It has even been shown that explicitly engaging students in the creation of nonlinguistic representations stimulates and increases activity in the brain". 

One of the ways which I incorporate the non-linguistic representations is by inviting Private Ford Best into the classroom. Although he does present material linguistically, the students also get to see, touch, and smell the artifacts that he presents. Examples of this are touching the goat-skin covered back-pack that British soldiers carried whilst out on manoeuvres. When touching the goat-skin, the students can feel the moist lanolin, and they learn that this secretion helped to repel moisture and water and keep the contents of the back-pack dry and therefore functional. The students see all of the different artifacts that Ford displays for them. They get to witness how he loads a rifle, and the different steps that had to be followed in order for it to be fired competently. If the school allows Ford to fire

---
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the weapon (obviously without the musket-balls), the students get to smell the result of sparks igniting gun-powder.

Another non-linguistic opportunity is the showing of the two documentary films. Although there is a lot of verbal information presented, there is also a lot of dramatic re-enactment in both films. Being able to see re-enactments of the battles in the woods or the sieges of the forts is a memorable opportunity for the students. Being able to see the surprise and the anger of the faces of the Indian warriors who fought with the French at the siege on Fort William Henry allows students to remember that allies in the French and Indian War often distrusted each other. Being able to witness George Washington’s involvement in the skirmishes of the war helps students store the fact in their long-term memory that Washington was an active participant in the war, and helps to prepare the students for their later units on the American War of Independence.

Another non-linguistic opportunity that the students experience in these lessons is the lesson at the beginning of the unit where I present a power-point presentation. I included non-linguistic representations such as maps and historical paintings that help students remember the major points of the topic. The slide that shows the map of North America in 1756 helps students visualize how the eastern half of the North American continent was mostly divided by New France and the British American colonies. Although the paintings might stretch the historical accuracy somewhat, they are visual representations that show the drama that unfurled throughout these bloody years.

Another example of the use of a non-linguistic strategy is when I take students to the Old Fort Niagara Museum. I begin the tour by starting outside the fort, at the place where the British troops began their march on the fort. By re-enacting the march to the
fort, I am incorporating kinesthetic strategies. Although there is a lot of linguistic
presentation during the field trip, there is also a lot of non-linguistic representations. It is in
the museum that students can truly understand how eighteenth century forts could control
trade, due to the huge wall map of the great lakes area. It is on the battlements that
students get to understand that the fort was in a great strategic position, by witnessing Lake
Ontario and the Niagara River.

**Strategy Six: Cooperative Learning:**

Cooperative Learning is very popular in today’s schools. The authors champion this
strategy and see it as highly effective. They state that “of all the grouping strategies,
cooperative learning may be the most flexible and powerful”\(^\text{19}\). However, they do caution
that it not be over-used. Sometimes, students get sick of working in groups and pine for
quiet time where they can concentrate and work silently on their own. They cite studies
that warn that “cooperative learning can be misused and is frequently overused in
education; it is misused when the tasks given to cooperative groups are not well structured;
it is overused when it is implemented to such an extent that students have an insufficient
amount of time to practice independently the skills and processes that they must master”\(^\text{20}\).

In my thesis, I have used cooperative learning for a number of different tasks. At
the field trip, after students have had a tour of Fort Niagara, I assign them into small groups
to work on their assignment. As is recommended in the Marzano book, the groups are
small. I take great care to plan this assignment, and plan to have each group at different
parts of the fort at different times, in order to avoid large concentrations of students at one
particular station. I will need to plan which students are assigned to each group. My plan

---
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would be for me to decide which students are in each grouping. I would take into account different learning styles of the students, and would try to avoid having a group made out of students with the same learning style.

Another place that I use cooperative learning is for the assignment that I give to the students after they have participated in the power point presentation. Their assignment is to craft a graphic organizer that tells the story of one of the themes that I have listed that was discussed in the power point presentation. Students work in small groups to achieve this, and I provide them with a list of graphic organizers that the Marzano book recommends. As previously mentioned, the Marzano book recommends that the project be well structured. The objective of the assignment is clearly stated in the instructions, and I will have ensured that before I use this strategy, all of the students are aware of how to use all of these graphic organizers.

Perhaps the assignment where cooperative learning is incorporated the most is in the final project. Again, students work in small groups and design a project where they can demonstrate what they know. Students are clearly told that their grade will rely on every member of the group’s participation in the research and the presentation of the project. For example, if the group decided to present a play about the daily life of British soldiers, there would need to be four characters in the play, all with roughly the same amount of responsibility. Using cooperative learning for this activity is highly useful, because it provides students with the opportunity to problem solve together and to practice their negotiation skills.
Strategy Seven: Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback:

Throughout my thesis I have constantly referred to my objectives. I will have set learning objectives for the students. However, I have not explicitly included many opportunities for the students to set their own learning objectives. I think that opportunities for students to set their own goals would only arise during my actual teaching of this topic. Having said that, I can point to the final project which gives the students a lot of choice, firstly in terms of choosing a topic to research and present, and secondly, to choose a format of presenting it. In addition, I have allowed the students to choose their own topic and/ or their own format if they feel that they have something that they would like to learn more about that I have not included in my list. This project is in accordance with the guidelines of goal setting that Marzano et al state as being backed up by sound educational research. Within my written description of the project, students are informed of the expected performance (“what a learner is expected to be able to do”), the conditions (“under which the performance is to occur”), and from the rubric, students are communicated what the expected criterion (a description of “how well the learner must perform in order to be considered acceptable” is.\(^\text{21}\)

I believe that it is easy to build in opportunities for feedback for this, or any topic. However, it does take time. It also requires a commitment to the students. Part of a teacher’s job is to be a diagnostician. Teachers need to be specific about the strengths of a student, and where the student is making progress, as well as about the specific areas that they need to improve. I think that the newspaper article assignment would be a good opportunity for me to provide feedback to the students. The assignment requires that the
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students read five newspaper articles about people who served in the British army in North America. After each article there are four of five questions that the students are required to answer. I will discuss the purpose of these questions when I turn to the final strategy (strategy number nine: questions, cues and advance organizers), but when I collect the answers that the students wrote, it will be a great opportunity to provide contemplative feedback to the students about how they are progressing when writing their responses to questions that are specifically connected to the central tenet of this thesis, the British soldiers who lived, worked and fought in North America.

**Strategy Eight: Generating and Testing Hypotheses:**

One of the ways that students generate and test hypotheses is through historical investigation and analysis. As the authors of *Classroom Instruction That Works* write, “students are engaged in historical investigation when they construct plausible scenarios for events from the past, about which there is no general agreement”\(^{22}\). In the lesson where students analyze two contrasting recordings of the same historical event (the disaster that befell General Braddock and his British troops in the woods near Fort Duquesne in the Ohio Valley), students are performing a historical investigation. Also, by working on their final project, students are researching a specific sub-topic, and in doing so they are performing a historical investigation.

**Strategy Nine: Questions, cues, and advance organizers:**

My thesis project has a lot of questioning embedded within it. Immediately in the first part of this unit, the power point presentation, there are embedded questions that the students must work on. It is not enough for me to stand at the front of the class-room and
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lecture. To ensure that the students are actively engaged, I include embedded questions. I include five questions in the presentation. For the first question, I include a plausible answer for the students. For the remaining questions, I do not. I also clearly state within the presentation that I expect the students to think first and then write their questions. Each question shows the words “think and write”. This “think time” is also known as “wait time”. The inclusion of “wait time” is vital, and its purpose is so that all of the students can actively think. If the teacher allows the first person who raises their hand to give their answer, it is likely that a large proportion of students will stop working. Marzano, Pickering and Pollock write that the educational research clearly states that “wait time appears to be a highly useful instructional technique”.

Most of my other sources have questions that are linked to them. After Private Best has given his presentation, students are given questions related to the presentation to ponder over homework. After the students have finished watching the documentary films, they must answer questions. After they have read the newspaper articles about British soldiers, they have questions to answer. Throughout all of these assignments however, there are different kinds of questions. Some of the questions are “lower level questions” that require the students to recall factual knowledge. A lot of the questions however are “higher level questions” that require students to apply knowledge or analyze or synthesize information. The research supports the assertion that “higher level questions” are more desirable than lower level questions. Marzano, Pickering and Pollock record that “a fair amount of research indicates that questions that require students to analyze information – frequently called higher level questions – produce more learning than questions that simply require students to recall of recognize information – frequently referred to as lower order
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questions”.

For example, some of my questions ask students to make predictions. Others ask them to empathize with a subject in order to express an opinion or an emotion. Others ask students to perform a task. Others ask them to make comparisons between the subjects of the questions and people today. One of the primary functions of asking questions is to provide the opportunity for students to perform a thinking process. As Marzano et all conclude, “helping students think about new knowledge before experiencing it can go a long way toward enhancing student achievement. Teachers can use cues, questions, and advance organizers to facilitate this type of thinking in a variety of ways and formats”.

Conclusion:

In this final part of my thesis, I have demonstrated how I have incorporated the strategies that Marzano, Pickering and Pollock have recommended as deeply rooted in sound educational research. The writers’ beliefs are that no instructional strategy works equally well in all situations”. Different teachers use different strategies at different times to help teach different topics. It is important for the individual teacher to calculate based on the research when a particular strategy works at a particular moment. Probably the three specific strategies that I have incorporated the most into my thesis are cooperative learning, questioning, and non-linguistic representations. I believe that reinforcing effort and providing recognition, and providing feedback are strategies that must be actively performed, as they are difficult to write about in a thesis. The other strategies that are analyzed here are all used in my thesis but to a lesser extent than the initial three strategies that I just referenced.
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APPENDIX A:

Appendix A is a power point print out that immediately follows this page. The power point presentation is entitled *Conflict In Colonial North America: British, French, Indian tribes, Americans, Canadians*, and it is the opening component on this topic. I would begin teaching the topic of this thesis with the power point presentation as it would be a good way to introduce French, British, and Indian conflict and co-existence in North America, the lead up the American War of Independence, and the British soldiers in North America in the mid to late eighteenth century.
Conflict in Colonial North America

France and Great Britain

- Traditional enemies in Europe
- In North America
  - French colonies, and British colonies
  - Trade disputes. Land disputes
  - Religious differences
  - France and Britain were allied to different Indian tribes

New France

- Most French colonists live in Canada (Acadia, Quebec, Montreal). However, in the late 1600s and early 1700s, the French government encourages French explorers and missionaries to push west and south.
- **Question #1:**
  Why did the French government encourage this?
Answer

- By exploiting American resources, French wealth and power is increased. If French power and wealth is increased, they can compete with other European countries, especially Great Britain.

The growth of New France

- French build forts near major waterways (rivers, lakes, portages)
- French regiments remain to guard the forts, and cultivate alliances with Indian tribes
- New France circles the British colonies

**Question #2:**
Why were the forts built near rivers or lakes?

New France, 1745
1756: Beginning of war between Britain and France

Known in America as “The French and Indian War.” Known in Europe as “The Seven Years War.”

Causes of the war:
- Territory disputes
- Rivalry for trade rights and land rights
- Both sides see the other’s fort building as a direct threat
- Long-term conflict between France and Great Britain. (Fourth time they had been at war since 1689). However, this was the first time that large-scale war between them had reached North American soil
- Both Britain and France wanted to be the most influential European power in North America, and they were willing to fight for dominance

Early stages

• 1756: French defeat British at Fort Oswego and Fort William Henry in upstate NY

• 1757: In Britain, William Pitt rises in political power, and brings decisive leadership. He sends 25,000 British troops to America

• Even though it will be expensive, Pitt believes Britain cannot afford to lose the war

Question #3: Think, and then write your answer

3) The French and the British saw this conflict as vital to their national interests. Why?
Turning of the war in North America: British victories

- 1758: Louisbourg in Nova Scotia
- 1758: Fort Duquesne (re-named Fort Pitt) in the Ohio Valley (modern day Pittsburgh)
- 1759: Quebec
- 1760: Montreal
- 1763: Treaty of Paris ends the war in Europe and in America. The French lose ALL of New France
After the war

- 1763: “Pontiac’s rebellion.” Ottawa Chief Pontiac aims to drive the British out of the Ohio Valley. He and his followers destroy many British outposts

- 1763, Oct: King George III’s “Proclamation”. Forbade colonial expansion west of the Appalachian Mountains

The cost to Great Britain of administering the colonies

- 1748: 70,000 pounds per year
- 1763: 350,000 pounds a year

- Britain leaves many troops in North America to protect colonies from Indians, and from a possible French return. Britain believed that the colonists should help pay for this cost

Questions #4 and 5: Think and write your answer

4) In your opinion, do you think that the British were right to leave troops in North America at the end of The French and Indian War?

5) a) If no, why not?
   b) If yes, do you think that the colonists should have paid for some, all, or none of the cost of having an army in America?
British laws that angered the colonists

1765: The Quartering Act: Colonists forced to provide food and quarters to British troops
1765: The Stamp Act: Goods sellers forced to buy stamps to place on their goods. Colonists see this as a direct tax. If people were accused of violating this Act, they were tried in admiralty courts without a jury. They were presumed guilty unless proven innocent. Dissent forces the British government to repeal the Act
1767: The Townshend Acts: Duties placed on imported goods (ex. tea). Customs officials could search any vessel, warehouse or home for smuggled goods

Boston: Hot-bed of conflict

- 1768: 2 British regiments sent to Boston
- Boston citizens annoyed at having such a strong military presence
- March 5, 1770: Tensions boil over. The Boston Massacre. 5 civilians killed
The road to war

- 1773: British government gives "The British East India Company" a monopoly on selling tea in America. The unpopular import tax on tea remains.

- Dec 16, 1773: Boston Tea Party

- 1774: British government passes a set of retaliatory acts that the colonists call "The Intolerable Acts". (Examples: a) closing of the port of Boston, b) restrictions placed on town meetings, and c) colonials who killed officials could be sent to England for trial)

Lexington, Concord, and all out war

- On April 18, 1775, the British commander-in-chief, General Gage, sends troops to seize weapons. Fighting ensues between his troops and Massachusetts militia at Lexington and Concord

- About 300 British troops are killed, wounded or missing. About 100 American militia troops are killed, wounded or missing

- The American Revolution sees fighting lasts until the Treaty of Paris (September 3, 1783), when Britain formally agrees to recognize the United States as an independent country
In your groups

- Examine the following disagreements and propose solutions
1) The Quartering Act
2) The question of paying for troops
3) Tax on goods being imported into the colonies
4) Violators of the Stamp Act
APPENDIX B:

Timeline of British and French tension in America and then the road to the American Revolution:

1682: French explorer La Salle reaches the Mississippi delta, and calls the area Louisiana

1689-1763: During this time, Britain and France fight four separate wars in Europe. The last is the Seven Years War (1756-63), which spreads to North America where it is called The French and Indian War

1689-1763: Tensions exist between French and British in North America. Religious differences, trade disputes, European wars spread to America. Different Native American tribes ally themselves with either British or French

1690, 1704: French and their Indian allies attack British colonies. Schenectady, NY (1690) and Deerfield, Mass (1704)

1710: British colonists capture French colonies in French ‘Acadia’, and re-name Acadia, ‘Nova Scotia’

1713: By now, New France is a vast area west of the British colonies from Quebec and Montreal in the north all the way to Louisiana in the south

1745: British colonists attack fortress of Louisbourg in Nova Scotia, and defeat the French

1748: British government gives Louisbourg back to the French, angering the British colonists

1749: Influential Virginia land speculators target lands in the Ohio Valley that the French claim. Various Indian tribes forced to choose sides

1754: French build Fort Duquesne on the banks of where the rivers Monongahela and Allegheny converge to form the Ohio River (at modern day Pittsburgh)

1754: Governor of Virginia sends George Washington and a small band of militiamen to claim the area of the Ohio Valley for Virginia. The French defeat Washington’s men on July 4, 1754
1755: British expel Acadians (French colonists) from Nova Scotia

1756-1763: The French and Indian War (The Seven Years War) is fought in America, Europe, the Caribbean, India, and the Philippines. Later Winston Churchill refers to it as “the first world war”

1756: Early French successes. General Montcalm’s forces defeat the British at Fort Oswego and Fort William Henry. American colonial assemblies unwilling to pay for the appropriate war costs

1757: William Pitt recalled as Prime Minister of Britain. Pitt offers very strong war leadership, and sends 25,000 regular troops to America

1758: British siege Louisbourg and defeat the French troops there. British defeat French troops at Fort Duquesne, and re-name it Fort Pitt

1759: Battle for Quebec. General James Wolfe’s British troops seize control of Quebec from the French

1760: British seize control of Montreal from France

1763: Peace settlement of Paris ends the war. Great Britain controls Canadian and American colonies. France has virtually nothing left in North America

1763, May: Pontiac’s rebellion. Ottawa chief Pontiac sought to drive out British from the Ohio valley. His army destroys every British post west of Niagara except Detroit

1763, October: Proclamation of 1763. British government forbade colonial expansion west of the Appalachians

1763: British decide to keep troops in America to ensure that the French did not decide to try to return, and to guard against Indian raids. This “standing army” was a bone of contention to the colonials. Englishmen were philosophically opposed to a standing army. An army might infringe on individual rights. Also, who would pay for it? The British expected the colonies to share the cost

1763: Cost of colonial administration in 1748 was 70,000 pounds per year. By 1763, it was 350,000
1765: The Quartering Act. Colonists forced to provide food and quarters to British troops when needed

1765: The Stamp Act. Stamps were required on bills of sale for almost 50 trade items. If accused of violating the Act, people were tried in admiralty courts without jury. The burden of proof was on the defendants, who were seen as guilty unless proven innocent

1766: Popular unrest against the Stamp Act makes it impossible to enforce. Parliament repeals the Stamp Act

1767: The Townshend Acts placed import duties on goods coming into the American colonies. One example was tea. Customs officials could search any vessel, warehouse or home for smuggled goods

1767: British government suspends New York legislature for failing to comply with the Quartering Act

1768: British landed 2 regiments of troops at Boston

1770, March 5: The Boston Massacre. 5 Bostonians killed

1773: British government gives ‘The British East India Company’ a monopoly on selling tea in America. British government also keeps the import tax on tea. Colonists outraged

1773, December 16: Boston ‘Tea party’

1774: British government passes a set of retaliatory acts that the colonists called the “Intolerable Acts”

1774, April 18: Lexington and Concord. The Revolutionary war begins

1781, October 19: General Lord Cornwallis surrenders his army at Yorktown, Virginia. The war is effectively over

1783, September 3: Treaty of Paris grants independence to the United States
APPENDIX C: (Graphic Organizer assignment that comes after the power point presentation)

You have just seen and participated in the power presentation entitled Conflict in Colonial North America. Now, your last assignment today is to remain in your groups and create a graphic organizer that describes and portrays one of the following themes:

1) The outbreak of war between Britain and France in North America
2) Trade with the Indian tribes
3) Major battles and sieges of the French and Indian War
4) The colonies rebel against Great Britain
5) How to attract support for rebellion
6) The shot heard around the world

You may use any of the following graphic organizers that we have practiced in the past:

1) Descriptive Pattern Organizer
2) Process/ Cause – Effect Organizer
3) Episode Pattern Organizer
4) Generalization/ Principle Pattern Organizer
5) Concept Pattern Organizer
6) Time Sequence Pattern Organizer
APPENDIX D:

In silence, read the following descriptions of the disaster that befell the British Army under General Edward Braddock near the forks of the Ohio in 1755 at the hands of the French and their Indian allies. When I can see that everyone has finished reading, you will work in your groups and answer the accompanying questions. You have ten minutes to work on the questions, and afterwards, we will have a class discussion about these passages and your answers. Everybody should be prepared to participate in the discussion. At the end of the discussion, I will then collect your written answers.

Passage One: Taken from the text-book *The Americans* by Danzer et al, p84-5;

The cowardice of the supposedly invincible British army surprised Washington, who himself showed incredible courage. As he tried to rally the troops, two horses were shot from under him and four bullets pierced his coat — although he escaped unharmed. He wrote to his mother that “the Virginia troops showed a good deal of bravery, and were near all killed...[but the British soldiers] broke and ran as sheep pursued by dogs and it was impossible to rally them.”

Passage Two: Taken from *The War That made America* by Fred Anderson, p70-1;

The British made it substantially easier for the Indian marksmen to do their work. Hearing firing erupt ahead, the main body of the column rushed forward, colliding with the retreating advance guard. Tangled in confusion on a road little more than twelve feet wide, the British made a splendid, defenseless target. Unable to see the Indians who sniped at them from cover, the British troops fought as best they could, directing volleys blindly into the woods — and also, all too often, into one another....For all their confusion and fear, however, the British troops did not flee until a musket ball smashed into Braddock’s back, knocking him from his horse after three full hours of fighting. By then more than two-thirds of the 1,450 men and women in the British column had been killed or wounded.

1) Why do you think these two accounts are so different?

2) What do you think was the purpose of the text-book only using George Washington as a source?

3) What picture of George Washington emerges from the text-book?
4) What surprised you about reading Fred Anderson’s passage after reading the text-book’s passage?

5) What do you think a professional historian should do before presenting an event to the reader?
APPENDIX E: (Assignment that asks students to analyze and summarize information from text and tables from historian Sylvia R. Frey’s *The British Soldier In America*. All text is from her first chapter entitled, *Volunteers and Conscripts*;

**Passage One:**

There was bound to be great diversity in the quality of recruits. Without doubt some of the scum of society was netted by the press. Convicted criminals, highway robbers, sheepstealers, smugglers, “desperate rogues” awaiting transportation to penal colonies, and the bottom of society wasting away in taverns, jails and prisons were coerced into the army by press gangs. This is the source of the stereotype of the common soldier, but it is a misconception to suppose that such men were a majority in the British army.

**Passage Two:**

In England, changing economic conditions produced a special kind of recruit: an urbanite either by birth or migration, of lower-class or lower-middle-class background, with a defined occupational skill, the victim neither of crimps (civilians who forcibly recruited men for the army) nor of a press gang but of incipient industrialization – of machines, of technology, of democratic change.

**Passage Three:**

Although economic historians continue to debate the question of precisely when the relatively static economy of Britain began to grow at a more rapid and sustained rate, expansion of the iron and coal industry, the development of the factory system, innovations in such industries as textiles, and changes in agricultural methods, together with a burgeoning and increasingly mobile population, produced a surplus of labor in some areas to fill the ranks of the army with average citizens fallen on hard times.

**Passage Four:**

The recorded civilian occupations of the soldiers recruited by the Guards and by the 58th Regiment establish one fact: as civilians the men had defined socioeconomic roles. The great majority appear to have been either permanently or temporarily displaced by changes in the English economy. The textile industry felt the impact of industrialization first and it was that industry which furnished most recruits to the service. Twenty percent of both the Guards and the 58th Regiment were former textile workers. Volunteers enrolled by other regiments during the period of the Revolution show similarly high proportions of textile workers; fifteen out of thirty-four recruits signed by the Royal Welch Fusiliers in 1772 were textile workers, as were three out of eight recruits enlisted in 1780 by the 84th regiment. A register of British deserters kept by Americans shows that one-fifth of the British war prisoners held in American prison camps were former textile workers.
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Passage Five:

Mechanization and overcrowding were already beginning to displace workers in some crafts. Although artisan guilds still protected the economic status of many craftsmen by limiting the numbers in the trade, the guilds were losing their influence and various crafts were suffering a labor glut leading to increasing numbers of unemployed workers. Shoemaking, for example, was one of the earliest trades hit by change. By mid-century, the self-employed master, working alone or with one or two helpers, was gradually being squeezed out by large shoe-making masters using primitive assembly-line techniques of production. One alternative to unemployment was military service, and comparatively large numbers of cordwainers entered the army. One hundred and thirty volunteered for the Guards and the 58th Regiment—a number exceeded only by weavers among skilled workers. Shoemakers appeared in conspicuous numbers in the London and Middlesex rosters of recruits as well, underlining the chronic malaise in the trade. By contrast, better-organized trades, such as cabinetmaking, were able to limit the numbers of craftsmen and so maintain high wages. Their relatively secure economic status is reflected in the social composition of the army—only thirteen cabinetmakers served in two regiments studied.

Passage Six:

The military—and particularly the infantry—traditionally drew from the laboring classes, capitalizing on their chronic distress. Almost 40 percent of the Guards and over 16 percent of the 58th Regiment were laborers. Only 10 percent of the two regiments came from the area north of the river Humber in the east and the Mersey in the west, where labor remained at a premium.
### TABLE 2. The 29th Regiment of Foot, 1782

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origins</th>
<th>Years Service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average service: 27.6 years
Average age: 9.7 years
Average size: 5'7"

Note: There are minor discrepancies in the regimental records upon which the above calculations are based. Although the total strength of the regiment is given as 485, the numbers listed under the age category total 484, those under the category of size, 516.

Source: W.O. 28/10.

### TABLE 3. The 44th Regiment of Foot, January 1, 1782

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origins</th>
<th>Years Service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average service: 8.2 years
Average age: 26.8 years
Average size: 5'7½"

Source: W.O. 28/10.

### TABLE 4. The 31st Regiment of Foot, 1782

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origins</th>
<th>Years Service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average service: 8.9 years
Average age: 29.4 years
Average size: 5'7"

Source: W.O. 28/10.

### TABLE 5. The 8th (King's) Regiment of Foot, 1782

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origins</th>
<th>Years Service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average service: 14.7 years
Average age: 36.9 years
Average size: 5'8"

Note: Although the total strength of the regiment is given as 695 in the regimental records, the numbers listed under size total 698.

Source: W.O. 28/10.
**TABLE 6. The 1st (King's) Regiment Dragoon Guards, 1775**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origins</th>
<th>Years Service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average size: 5'9½"
Average age: 8.9 years
28.6 years

*Four years later statistics for the same regiment show average age of 26.6, average experience of 5.7, reflecting the manpower shortage of the Revolutionary War years.

*Statistics for 1779 show no change in average height.

Source: W.O. 27/33.

**TABLE 7. The 1st (Royal) Regiment Dragoons, 1775**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origins</th>
<th>Years Service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average size: 5'9"
Average age: 8.5 years
28.5 years

*By 1779 average age was 27.4, average experience was down to 5.9.

*Statistics for 1779 show no change in average height.

Source: W.O. 27/33.
APPENDIX F: Questions to be distributed to the students along with the newspaper articles.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE 1: (A Soldier’s Friend):

1) The letter states that the soldier had a history of working in the “clothing business”. Why do you think he joined the army in the first place?

2) Why do you think that the British government did not make sure that his and his family’s needs were being met?

3) Why do you think that the letter was published on December 26?

4) It appears that the soldier has an income (pension) he is trying to claim, but that there is some sort of difficulty in accessing it. Try to specify what the difficulty is.

5) Do you think that some veterans might experience difficulty in accessing resources today? Explain why or why not.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE 2: (The Escaped Indentured Servant):

1) The escaped man is from Hanover. Where is Hanover? Why was the man in the British Army?

2) Why did people become indentured servants?

3) How could he have afforded the price of the three trans-Atlantic trips?

4) Assuming that he was never found and returned to his “master”, what do you think might have happened to the man?

5) If he was eventually captured, what do you think would have happened to him?

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE 3: (The Massachusetts Resident):

1) State whether you think the ex-British serviceman should a) the forced back to Great Britain, b) be allowed to stay but receive no “maintenance” from the state of Massachusetts, or c) be allowed to stay and receive “maintenance” from the state. Back up your answer with reasoning.
2) Why do you think that the soldier did not return to Great Britain at the end of the war?

3) Using your timeline of the American War of Independence, explain what this soldier’s part was in the war.

4) In the brief story, the soldier goes from prisoner-of-war to owner of real estate. Explain how you think this happened?

5) How do you think someone who was enlisted in an army that had fought against the United States would be treated today if he attempted to live in the United States?

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE 4: (The violent officer)

1) What do you think the “Invalid’s Office” was?

2) Why do you think this officer was behaving violently?

3) Why do you think he was not immediately taken to jail?

4) Do you think that he would have been treated differently if he had been a private in the army, rather than an officer? Explain your answer.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE 5: (The needless execution)

1) How accurate do you think this story was? Explain your answer.

2) What did this story say about British justice say to the readers in 1821?

3) How does this story relate to what the reader probably already thought about the American Revolution? Take into account where the newspaper story was published.

4) If it is a true story, what do you think about the British soldier’s actions? Do you think he was brave in any way?
To the EDITOR of the TIMES.

SIR,

As your paper is always open to tales of woe, permit me to state the case of a soldier now in this city: I will stick to facts, without endeavouring to use more words than necessary, to excite those who have the power to render him justice, for then he will not want assistance, and for the truth of it, I will appeal to the benevolent and respectable Rector of my parish, Mr. Sibley. This unfortunate man received three balls into his body at Bunker's Hill, and lay a long time in a languishing condition under those wounds: as soon as he was able to move, he was sent to Long Island, and there, while he was conducting the sick to the hospital, the Americans fired upon them, and he was again wounded in the left arm. Being an industrious man, he returned after the war into this neighbourhood, with a wife and child, and got his bread by the profession he was bred to, i.e. some branch of the cloathing business, and with his pension on Ireland, flattered himself he should be able to maintain his family, but at length he wanted employment, and could not obtain his pension from Ireland, where he had four years due, without appearing there in person; and a master, a humane Gentleman of this city lent him a guinea to go over to that island—when he obtained it, he returned and paid the guinea he had been defrauded with, but he is again in the same sad situation, for he has again four years pay due, and can neither obtain it, nor is he able to fetch it in person. The parish officers here will not assist him, and he has with his wife and child, been obliged to sleep this severe winter, for some nights, in a hay rick, but at present a poor family, not in a much better situation, have permitted them to sleep upon a few shavings in a corner of their room. This is barely the outline and state of a man who has bled in the service of his country, and who now has four years pension due in Ireland, but unable to procure it, unless his excellency the Marquis of Buckingham would
ms. excuency the Marquis of Buckingham would be pleased to order it to be paid without the personal appearance of the unfortunate man to whom it is due. The truth of this matter, with the man's name and the writer's, is at the service of any person who will call at your office; I have never seen the man, but I engage to confirm the facts as above stated.

I am Sir,

Yours, &c.

A SOLDIER FRIEND.

Ten Dollars Reward.

RUN-AWAY from the subscriber the night following the 11th ult. an indented man servant man, named John G. Hoffman, says he is a Hanoverian, was a soldier in the British army in the late war, lived with Colonel Biddle, in Philadelphia; was exchanged and returned to his own country; came out in the ship Watson, to New-York, in August 1785, calls himself a gardener; and five years old, but looks older, near six feet high, slim build, red faced, and often sore eyed; loves strong drink, his hair dark, mixed with grey. Whoever will secure him in any gaol in the United States, shall have the above reward, by applying to J. Wadsworth, of Hartford, James Watson, of New-York, or James Lockwood, of Philadelphia.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
SATURDAY, JUNE 7.

Ordered, That the Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court be requested, as soon as may be, to give their opinion on the following question, viz- Has George Phips, who was born in England, and came to this country as a soldier in the British army, in the year 1776 and was taken prisoner at the surrender of Gen. Burgoyne, and has ever since resided in the town of C in this State, and who has held real estate, and been taxed therefore, in said town, but has now become a pauper, gained a settlement in said town, or is he an alien, entitled to a maintenance from the State.
A very alarming and disagreeable circumstance took place on Monday last, between seven and eight o'clock, on the Common at Upper Clapton. Mr. Clifton, of Great Winchester-Street, with his family, son and daughter, with a few friends drank tea at the Swan, at Clapton; after which, a party of the company walked in the fields beyond the Common. During their absence, Mr. Clifton, took (who remained in the house) observed an officer of the army on the common, whose demeanor seemed to indicate a deranged mind; and sometimes seemed to threaten as if he would put a period to his existence. Mr. Clifton trembled for his son and daughter and the rest of the company, who were approaching the style, but at too great a distance for him to give them any notice of their danger.

His fears were not groundless, for on their appearance, the officer ran fiercely towards Mr. Clifton, Jun. and struck him a violent blow with the hilt of his sword on his temple; then drew it out of the sheath, pursued Miss Clifton and a Miss Town, who seeing their danger, instantly separated, ran different ways; and were providentially saved by the resolution and activity of a young man, brother to the landlord of the Swan, whom the shrieks of the ladies had brought to their assistance. He pursued him over the common, and disarmed him at the hazard of his own life, having received several wounds in the face with the hilt, and brought him to the Swan, where he was confined that night in Hackney, and examined the next day at the Rotation Office, in Worship Street. Mr. Clifton and the other parties attended to give evidence, where his behavior was equally expressive of insanity. After some time he produced a letter which was directed to Capt. Wm. Pemble, R. J. Invald, Invald's Office, Whitehall, where he was sent under the care of the officers— at that place they were informed where he lodged, where they took him; and while he was left in the room, with only one man, who imprudently threw up the family.
and bending himself to look out of the window, the Officer (who had but one arm, having left the other in the American way) came behind the man, and fairly tumbled him out of the one door of stairs room,—by the fall he was much hurt, though not dangerously. The Captain's friends were made acquainted with his situation, and several creditable gentlemen attended at his second examination on the same day in the evening, in Worship-Street; and as no bond could be given for his peaceable and good behaviour in future, he was sent to a private mad-house at Hoxton.

On Sunday last, about four o'clock in the afternoon, a well drested man knocked at the door of some apartments in Kennington Palace, which are occupied by ——— Weston, Esq. and desired admittance. The servant had no sooner complied with his request, than the man began to beat him unmercifully; upon which Mr. Weston came to see what was the matter, and shared the same fate. An alarm being instantly spread, the man was secured, and committed in charge to a constable, who took him before a Magistrate to undergo an examination, in the course of which he said, that the apartments belonged to him, and that he only went to claim his own; he talked likewise in a very-incoherent style about the whole Palace, and showed many strong marks of insanity. The Magistrate directed that good care should be taken of him, till it should be known who and what he was, and whether he be actually mad or no.

Saturday Mr. Claxton, of Bedfordshire, was stopped near Finchley, by a single highwayman, who robbed him of his watch, and upwards of 3l.

Monday last Mr. Middleton, of the Temple, had his pocket picked, in the Strand, of four guineas.

Same night Mr. Jeffery, of Ormond-street, had his pocket picked, in the Haymarket.

Tuesday the house of Francis Ruddle, Esq. at Finchley, was broke open, and robbed of a variety of plate and other articles.
FROM THE VILLAGE RECORD.

An anecdote has been related to me, of a character so extraordinary, that I think it ought to be recorded. It comes from a source entitled to perfect credit. During the revolutionary war, two British soldiers of the army of Lord Cornwallis, went into a house and abused a young woman in a most cruel and shameful manner. A third soldier, in going into the house, met them coming out and knew them. The girl acquitted him of all blame, but he was imprisoned, because he refused to disclose the names of the offenders. Every art was tried, but in vain, and at length he was condemned, by a Court Martial to die. When on the gallows, Lord Cornwallis, surprised at his pertinacity, rode near him—

"Campbell," said he, "what a fool are you, to die thus. Disclose the names of the guilty men, and you shall be immediately released; otherwise you have but 15 minutes to live."

"You are in an enemy's country, my Lord," replied Campbell, "you can better spare one man than two."

Firmly adhering to his purpose, he died.

Does history furnish a similar instance of such strange devotion for a mistaken point of honour?

I do not recollect to have seen the fact stated, though it deserves to be remembered:—Gen. Washington had two favourite horses. A large elegant parade horse. He was of a chestnut colour, high spirited, and of a gallant carriage. This horse had belonged to the British army. His other was smaller, and his colour sorrel. This he used always to ride in time of action. So that when the General mounted him, the word ran through the ranks, "We have business on hand."

At the battle of Germantown, General Wayne rode his gallant roan, and in charging the enemy, his horse received a wound in his head, and fell, as was supposed, dead. Two days after, the roan returned to the American camp, not materially injured, and was again fit for service.
APPENDIX G:

PART ONE: LIST OF TERMS:

A) List of Terms, Vocabulary, People, Places, and Events for film #1: The War That Made America

The Half King
Pontiac's Rebellion
General Montcalm
Lord Loudoun
Fort William Henry

Fort Duquesne
Ohio country
General Munro
Mary Jemison

B) List of Terms, Vocabulary, People, Places, and Events for Film #2: Rebels and Redcoats

Samuel Adams
Paul Revere
General Gage
Concord, Mass
Eliza Wilkinson
Crispus Attucks

John Hancock
Boston Massacre
Lexington, Mass
Arlington, Mass
Charleston, S.C

PART TWO: LIST OF QUESTIONS TO COMPLETE WHILE WATCHING THE FILMS:

A) The War That Made America

1) What was the main goal of the Half King?
2) Which European nation did the Half King choose to ally his people to?
3) What is the Iroquois Confederacy? Who were they allied to?
4) Which fort in the film was the subject of a French and Indian siege?
5) What did the French and British officers do together at the end of the siege?
6) How did the Indian allies of the French react to this?
7) In the film, what did George Washington want from Lord Loudoun?
8) What was the Massachusetts legislature angry about?
9) According to George Washington, how did the British treat the American colonial troops?
10) Why did women travel with the British Army?
11) Who was Mary Jemison?
12) What happened to her family?

B) Rebels and Redcoats

1) What was the name of the part African-American and part Native American protestor who was killed during the Boston Massacre?
2) Was he included in the famous painting of the massacre?
3) Who painted the famous print of the massacre?
4) Name some of the people who the films shows argued for breaking with Great Britain
5) Where did the British Army and the American militia first fight each other?
6) Who fired the first shots?
7) Who led the British campaigns in the south?

PART THREE: QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS TO COMPLETE AFTER WATCHING THE FILMS:

A) The War That Made America

Theme 1: Indian aims:

1) What important factors did Indian groups take into consideration when deciding which European nation to ally themselves with?
2) To what extent was the Half King authorized to speak on behalf of all Indians?
3) Name one thing that surprised you in the depiction of the negotiations between the Half King’s tribe and the Virginia traders.
Theme 2: Cultural Differences in war:

1) After the battle at Fort William Henry, the Indians who had fought with the French expected some financial rewards. Why?

2) What specific custom from eighteenth century European warfare surprised you? What was surprising about it?

3) How do you think you would have felt if you were an Indian ally of the French, and you witnessed the British and French officers dining together after the British surrender?

4) What were some of the differences between Indian tribes and Europeans (either the British or French), and what were some of the similarities?

Theme 3: Tension between the British and their American colonies:

1) How do you think Lord Loudoun treated George Washington?

2) Why were the Massachusetts state legislators reluctant to pay for the war and send colonial militiamen to fight the French and their Indian allies?

3) The Massachusetts state legislators had strong feelings about the cost of war. Indians who fought at Fort William Henry also had strong feelings about the cost of war? Explain how these feelings were similar.

Theme 4: The Role of Women:

1) What surprised you about seeing women with the British army?

2) What role did women play in the tribe that the Half King belonged to?

3) Mary Jemison had the chance to return to live in a society that was dominated by whites. Instead, she chose to stay living with the Indian people of the Genesee, even though her family had been killed by Indians. Given what we have learned about Indians, why do you think she made this decision?

B) Rebels and Redcoats:

Clip 1: The Boston Massacre

1) How were the British soldiers portrayed in Paul Revere’s print?

2) By depicting the British soldiers as he did, what message was Paul Revere trying to send, and to who?
Clip 2: Lexington, Concord, Arlington and the Retreat to Boston

1) Why was the first shot at Lexington known as “the shot heard around the world”?

2) What was the biggest difference you noticed between how the British fought and how the militia fought?

3) Why do you think militia fighters were able to inflict such heavy casualties on the British troops?

Clip 3: The War in the South

1) Why did some people choose to stay loyal to Great Britain?

2) If you’d have been alive during the American Revolution, how would you have made up your mind which side to support?

3) Do you think it is possible that you might not have decided to support either side? Explain your answer.
APPENDIX H:

Homework: After viewing Private Best’s presentation today, please answer the following questions for homework.

1. What kind of materials were the clothes made from? Where do you think these clothes were made? (3 points)

2. What kind of person became a British soldier? (2 points)

3. What would life have been like for a woman who accompanied a soldier? What kind of responsibilities did she have? (2 points)

4. Where did soldiers get their food? What kind of food did they eat? (3 points)

5. Why was the cartridge box important? What was important about the material it was made from? (2 points)

6. Imagine that you are a soldier in the British army fighting in the French and Indian War.

   Either: a) Write a poem that captures some of your experiences. The ‘voice’ of the poem is more important than the length. However, as a guideline, it is unlikely your voice will say much in much less than fifteen lines.

   Or: b) Write a letter home to a family member or friend that tell of some of your thoughts and/or experiences.

   NOTE: Although many soldiers were illiterate, for this assignment I am more interested in your thoughts about army life and what you learned from Private Best’s presentation. (10 points)

7. When a British soldier was killed in battle during the French and Indian War, what may have happened to his belongings? (2 points)

8. Which is of the artifacts did you find most interesting? Why? (2 points)
9. Name one thing that surprised you about Private Best’s presentation? Tell me about why you found it surprising. (2 points)

10. Each year, I send off some follow-up questions to Private Best. What question would you like to ask Private Best? It can be about anything connected to the time period and have a connection to North America. (2 points)
APPENDIX I:

For this field trip assignment, I will break the students down into a number of sections in order to avoid over-crowding at the separate sites. Within each section, students will work in small groups. I will designate five stations throughout the site, and organize it so that different sections of students work at the different stations at different times.

Station 1: The Flag-Poles

Station 2: The raised earthen-works

Station 3: The raised walk-way that overlooks the river

Station 4: On the grassy bank next to the Castle that overlooks the lake

Station 5: On the grass by the south redoubt

At Station One:

1) What was the most interesting thing that you learned today?

2) What surprised you the most today?

3) Most visitors drive to the parking lot and begin their tour at the museum. Why do you think I started the tour at the edge of the park?

4) Remembering the presentation that Private Best gave, what were some of the essentials that you would have needed to carry if you were a British soldier in the British force that attacked Fort Niagara in 1759?

5) How long did the British siege take?

At Station Two:

1) As you look out from the earthen works at the direction the British came from, what do you see?

2) The French had long prepared the fort for the eventuality of a siege. What changes to the landscape in front of you had they made? Why?

3) Which groups of people were fighting with the British?

4) Why was Sir William Johnson an important part of the British force?

5) What was strategically important about the fort?

At Station Three:
1) Why did the French build Fort Niagara where you are standing today?

2) At first, what did they tell the Native American tribes from this area they wanted with the land?

3) Later, when French troops were garrisoned here, describe some of the characteristics of daily life that they experienced.

4) When they built the powder magazine, what kind of considerations did they have to consider?

5) Go to the bake-house. The volunteer there will allow you to touch some of the goods and help with the preparation of bread-making. As you spend time with him, ask him some questions. Write down two questions you asked him, and his answers.

At Station Four:

1) Why do you think that the British did not attack the fort from the water?

2) How did trade with Europeans change the lives of the local Indians? In your answer refer to some specific items that were traded.

3) What responsibilities do you think French soldiers had during the time they were garrisoned at Fort Niagara?

4) What other important sieges or battles were being conducted simultaneously as the siege on Fort Niagara?

5) What materials do you think were used in making the French castle?

At Station Five:

1) In silence, spend a few minutes imagining you are a French soldier on guard. Write down some of the things you might have been thinking about.

2) What changes to the fort did the British make when they captured it in July 1759?

3) Who was in charge of the British force and who was in charge of the French force? What happened to them?

4) Find another person who gave a presentation. Ask him or her two questions. Write down what the questions were and what answers they gave you.

5) Today, Fort Niagara is run by the Old Fort Niagara Association. In order for it to be run successfully, what does the association need?
APPENDIX J:

In class we have studied the last years of British rule in North America during the mid to late eighteenth century, and have closely examined the British troops stationed there. For your final project, in a small group of three or four students, you will choose and research a sub-topic that is related to the major topic that we have studied for the last few weeks. Once you have researched the topic, in your groups you will present your findings to the rest of the class. In your groups you will choose how you will present your topic from the list of options listed below in Part B. After your presentation, you will also hand in a written final product. (For example if you choose to present a play, you will hand in your final script). Each student will be graded on both the written product that is handed in and the presentation.

Part A: Choose your topic: The topics are as follows;

1) New France
2) The Iroquois Confederacy
3) Daily Life of the British Soldier
4) Weapons and Military Tactics
5) Food and Food Preparation
6) Indian tribes allied to the French
7) Pontiac’s Rebellion
8) The Colonial Militias
9) The Organization of the British Army in 1775
10) A topic of your choice not included here

B: Choose your mode of presentation: The modes are as follows;

1) A set of journals
2) A series of letters (at least 3 letters per student)
3) A newspaper (that includes news stories, letters, opinions and editorials)
4) A lecture that includes both speaking and visual components
5) A historical scrap-book
6) A set of poems or short stories
7) A play
8) A format of your choice
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Each member of your group will be expected to conduct research and participate in the presentation. For example, if your group decides to compile a newspaper, there must be stories, letters and/or opinions written by each member of the group.

For the remainder of today’s class and during two more whole class periods, in your groups you will choose a topic, research the topic and plan the presentation. All of the presentations will be presented in one final class, and each presentation will last approximately 6-8 minutes. You will be graded on your demonstration of the material that you learned during this unit and during your research. As you can see, it is also possible for you to choose a topic and/or a format of your choice. Please feel free to propose to me your original ideas. I can help you locate other resources.

**RUBRIC:** The following rubric is included for your guidance.

4 The presentation showed that the student understands the key components of the topic, and that these components were historically accurate. The student handed in high quality materials that were thoroughly researched using a variety of resources. The presentation was highly thoughtful, creative and engaging.

3 The presentation showed that the student understands the key components of their topic, and that most of the components were historically accurate. The student handed in good materials that were researched using some of the resources available. The presentation was thoughtful, creative and engaging.

2 The presentation included some historical errors, but the students included some key components of their topic. The student handed in good materials that relied on some research. The presentation had some engaging components, but lacked creativity and depth.
The presentation made so many historical errors that it cannot be said that the students demonstrated any understanding of their topic. The presentation was unimaginative.