Chapter 5

Multiple-Choice Questions

1a. Correct. While the coercive practices of British officers were ended by William Pitt, many colonists, especially New England soldiers who were in close contact with British soldiers, vividly remembered the British as being profane, haughty, and unfair. Therefore, they were left with feelings of animosity. See page 80.

1b. No. The British victory over the French and their Indian allies was so decisive that the likelihood of the colonies being drawn into a European-based conflict seemed remote. In addition, although the war was fought to achieve European objectives, it should be remembered that the conflict began in North America. See page 80.

1c. No. As a result of the war, two major sources of colonial insecurity, the French and their Indian allies, had been defeated. Therefore, colonists felt more secure than they had in years, which caused some Americans like Benjamin Franklin, to think expansively about the colonies’ future. See page 80.

1d. No. Although the colonists and the British ultimately cooperated and achieved victory over the French and Indians in the Seven Years’ War, the alliance produced tension between the two rather than eliminating it. See page 80.

2a. No. By the Treaty of Paris, France ceded all of its territory in North America to Great Britain and Spain. In other words, since France had lost its North American empire, the Indians could not negotiate trade agreements, separate or otherwise, with the French. See pages 80-81.

2b. No. Although France ceded all of its territory west of the Mississippi and the city of New Orleans to its ally Spain, the interior Indian tribes realized that Spain was no longer a major power and could not help them counter the power of Great Britain. See pages 80-81.

2c. No. Pontiac was not willing to accept British superiority in the Northwest and would never have advised his tribe to do so. See pages 80-81.

2d. Correct. Pontiac, realizing that British victory in the Seven Years’ War placed the Indians of the Northwest in jeopardy, persuaded many Indian tribes in the area to join him in an anti-British alliance. This led to Pontiac’s uprising. See pages 80-81.

3a. No. Although the proclamation did confine colonial settlements to the area east of the line, “regulation” of colonial settlement in the west was not the proclamation’s major intent. See page 81.

3b. No. The proclamation did not deal with trade issues, and it was not designed to regulate colonial trade with the Indians. See page 81.

3c. Correct. The British hoped that they could prevent clashes between the colonists and the Indians by confining colonial settlements to the area east of the Appalachian Mountains. See page 81.

3d. No. The proclamation did confine colonial settlement to the area east of the Appalachians, but the British saw this as a temporary measure. See page 81.
4a. Correct. Debt burden was Britain’s most pressing problem in the aftermath of the French and Indian War. Grenville’s colonial policies were largely designed to solve this financial crisis by raising revenue in the colonies. See page 81.

4b. No. Encouragement of colonial manufacturing would have increased competition for colonial and international markets between England and its colonies; and such encouragement would, therefore, have been contrary to mercantilist philosophy. See page 81 and review the discussion of mercantilism on page 52.

4c. No. Grenville’s colonial policies were not specifically or intentionally designed as an attack on the taxing powers of the colonial assemblies. See page 81.

4d. No. Only in an incidental way did Grenville’s policies regulate colonial trade and commerce (the Sugar Act, 1764), and this was not the primary purpose of his policies. See page 81.

5a. No. The idea that each elected representative represented all people in the colony is a restatement, on the colonial level, of the British idea of virtual representation (a member of Parliament virtually represents every English citizen). See pages 81-82.

5b. No. In 1765 the colonial theory of representative government had not yet reached the point of a belief in the one man, one vote concept. It was not until 1964, in the case of Westberry v. Sanders, that the Supreme Court applied the one man, one vote concept to state districts in the United States. See pages 81-82.

5c. No. The American colonists denied the right to vote to women, blacks, and Indians. They clearly did not believe that all people over twenty-one years of age had to have the right to vote before a colonial assembly could be considered representative. See pages 81-82.

5d. Correct. Whereas the British believed in virtual representation, the American colonists believed in individual or direct representation. This difference between the English and the colonists on how to define representative government was a major factor in the coming of the American Revolution. See pages 81-82.

6a. No. The Real Whigs did not deal specifically with the Sugar Act in their writings and did not suggest that the intent of the Sugar Act was to regulate trade. Furthermore, one of the most influential essays written by the Real Whigs, Cato’s Letters, was published in the 1720s, long before the Sugar Act. See page 82.

6b. Correct. In their writings, the Real Whigs warned of the tendency toward corruption and oppression inherent in powerful government. The colonists began to interpret British actions, such as the Sugar Act, in light of these warnings. See page 82.

6c. No. The arguments presented by the Real Whigs in their writings did not, in any direct way, lead to the establishment of a Continental Congress. See page 82.

6d. No. The right to petition the government for redress of grievances was a recognized right of English citizens; and English citizens regularly exercised this right concerning local matters by engaging in street demonstrations. In other words, the idea of this right was not new to the Real Whigs. In 1764 eight colonial legislatures sent separate petitions to Parliament, but the protests had no effect. See page 82.

7a. No. James Otis asserted in his pamphlet that Parliament was the supreme legislative authority in the
British empire. If Otis clearly recognized Parliament’s legislative power, what was the point of his pamphlet? See page 83.

7b. No. James Otis did not assert that the colonists could refuse to obey the laws of Parliament even if they knew those laws to be unconstitutional. What, according to Otis, could the colonists do about unconstitutional laws? See page 83.

7c. No. James Otis did not go so far as to say that a colonial assembly was equal in power to Parliament. See page 83.

7d. Correct. James Otis asserted by implication that Parliament did not have the right to tax the colonies without their consent. However, he further asserted that even unconstitutional laws passed by Parliament had to be obeyed because Parliament was the supreme authority in the empire. See page 83.

8a. No. In its debate relating to the Stamp Act Resolves, the Virginia House of Burgesses accepted the idea that the colonists were British subjects. It was on the basis of this idea that the colonists asserted certain rights as English citizens. See page 83.

8b. Correct. The idea that the House of Burgesses had the sole right to tax Virginians was rejected as too radical by the burgesses in 1765. See page 83.

8c. No. In their debate over the Stamp Act Resolves, the burgesses accepted the idea that the colonists enjoyed the right of consent to taxation. See page 83.

8d. No. In its debate over the resolutions presented by Patrick Henry, the House of Burgesses accepted the idea that the colonists were English citizens and enjoyed all of the rights as Englishmen. See page 83.

9a. Correct. Crowd action against the Stamp Act was so widespread and so effective that no stamp distributor was willing to enforce the law when it went into effect on November 1, 1765. See page 84.

9b. No. The Stamp Act Congress was important as a show of unity on the part of the colonies, but its statements were relatively conservative and did not cause divisions within the British Parliament. See page 84.

9c. No. Parliament never viewed the tax imposed by the Stamp Act as excessive. See page 84.

9d. No. Since the Stamp Act taxed most printed materials, it had an impact on most colonists. But the genteel used printed matter more frequently than the ordinary. As a result, the tax fell most heavily on the genteel. See page 84.

10a. No. Although many merchants supported economic protest against the British by organizing nonimportation associations after passage of the Stamp Act, the Sons of Liberty was not intended to organize merchants and was not a nonimportation association. See page 84.

10b. Correct. Protest leaders recognized that the involvement of ordinary people in crowd action could give these people a taste of power and endanger the position of the dominant elite within colonial society. The Sons of Liberty was formed to channel popular resistance into “acceptable forms.” How successful was it in doing this? See page 84.
10c. No. Although it is quite possible that members of the Sons of Liberty advanced ideas found in the pamphlets associated with the resistance movement, the organization was not created for the purpose of distributing such pamphlets. See page 84.

10d. No. Popular demonstrations against the Stamp Act were already widespread, and the Sons of Liberty was not created for the purpose of organizing Liberty Parades. See page 84.

11a. No. The idea of “virtual” representation was an idea advanced by Parliament and one that they found perfectly acceptable. Dickinson did not advance this idea in his pamphlet. See pages 85. For a discussion of the idea of virtual representation, see pages 81-82.

11b. No. Parliament accepted the idea that English citizens have the right of consent to taxation. See page 85.

11c. Correct. Parliament could never accept Dickinson’s contention that colonists could determine the intent or motive of an act of Parliament before deciding whether to obey the act. Such an idea would undermine parliamentary supremacy. See page 85.

11d. No. Parliament totally agreed with Dickinson’s contention that it had the right to regulate trade, but it disagreed with other beliefs he asserted in his essays. See page 85.

12a. No. The Massachusetts governor did not disband the Massachusetts assembly because he wanted to govern the colony on his own authority. See page 86.

12b. No. While the Massachusetts assembly often agreed with protests coming from the Virginia assembly, this was not the reason for the dissolution of the assembly in late 1768. See page 86.

12c. No. The Massachusetts assembly did not call for open resistance to the Townshend Acts. See page 86.

12d. Correct. When Lord Hillsborough heard of the Massachusetts circular letter, he ordered Governor Bernard to insist that it be recalled. By a vote of 92-17 the Massachusetts assembly refused to do so. As a result, the Massachusetts assembly was dissolved. See page 86.

13a. No. Resistance against the Townshend Acts indicated a growing willingness by the colonists to defend what they perceived to be their rights as English citizens, but it did not indicate the growth of sentiment in favor of independence. See page 86.

13b. Correct. The nonimportation movement created divisions between urban merchants and artisans. In addition, continued crowd action, the use of force and violence as part of the resistance movement, and the increasing political activism of ordinary folks frightened the elite and widened the rift between these two groups. See page 86.

13c. No. Analysis of the resistance to the Townshend Acts does not provide evidence that a new sense of equality was emerging among the colonists. See page 86.

13d. No. Analysis of the resistance to the Townshend Acts reveals a growing rift between the colonists and Parliament but does not demonstrate that the colonists were questioning their loyalty to the king. See page 86.
14a. No. Although it is true that some Massachusetts towns disagreed with some of the ideas presented in this pamphlet, the evidence does not indicate the presence of “serious divisions” between urban and rural colonists. See page 89.

14b. No. This pamphlet, prepared by members of the Boston Committee of Correspondence and containing a statement of the rights and a list of the grievances of the colonists, did not advocate independence. Accordingly, response to the pamphlet did not indicate that Massachusetts’ colonists favored independence in 1772. See page 89.

14c. Correct. The pamphlet was written in an attempt to involve people of the rural areas of Massachusetts in the resistance movement. The fact that most of the colony’s towns agreed with the sentiments expressed in this document indicates widespread agreement throughout Massachusetts with the patriot position. See page 89.

14d. No. Although some towns disagreed with the sentiments expressed in this pamphlet, the pamphlet did not deal directly with the nonimportation movement and reaction to the pamphlet does not provide evidence that the nonimportation movement was in serious trouble. See page 89.

15a. No. Most patriots throughout the colonies approved of the Boston Tea Party and did not see the Coercive and Quebec Acts as justified. See page 90.

15b. No. Although the Quebec Act was actually unrelated to the Coercive Acts, the patriots perceived the two as being linked. See page 90.

15c. Correct. Although the Quebec Act (a reform measure that applied to Canada) and the Coercive Acts (laws designed to punish Massachusetts for the Boston Tea Party) were in reality unrelated, the patriots perceived a link between the two and pointed to both as further evidence that Parliament was conspiring to destroy colonial rights. See page 90.

15d. No. There were divisions among the patriots, but these divisions did not prevent the patriots from having a unified view with regard to the Coercive and Quebec Acts. See page 90.