

Summer assignment critical analysis

[Law](#), [Constitution](#)



Compare and contrast the government, religion, geography, and economy of the three English colonial regions. Be sure to consider the role of race, gender, and ethnicity. English colonies in America were, for the most part, successful and fruitful, albeit for starkly different reasons. The three regions of New England, the Carolinas and the Chesapeake Bay had different ways of earning their ways, which translated into gaps in culture, religion, and forms of government.

The economy in New England was based off of small food farms owned by families, artisans products, and trade with Native Americans. Consisting of almost singularly Puritans wishing solace from England's corrupt monarchy, the region became a series of small, tight-knit communities which were bound together by their hatred of England. The commonwealth nature of New England brought about elected governors and a modern-style two party government, but created a slightly socialist way of distributing wealth throughout the interconnected community.

This region contrast heavily with each of the two southern regions, which were much more diverse ethnically and religiously. The Carolinas were filled with all types of European immigrants, treated mostly equally, while the Chesapeake was a refuge for Catholics and a destination for slave labor. Both the Carolinas and the Chesapeake region were based on large plots of land, headed by aristocratic leaders, although the structure differed slightly as the Carolinas fell back onto a pseudo-feudal system while the Chesapeake region had more of a slave-master dynamic.

Women had a slightly bigger role in these parts as co-leaders of labor workers. Not surprisingly, the limited and geography of each region dictated what was grown there and consequently the economic systems in each region. The southern, hot, humid, flat, swampy climate gave way to rice and tobacco, grown on hundreds of acres, while the harsh winters of the north limited agriculture to small home farms. Slavery gained traction in the south as a way to raise profit margins, as landowners eschewed the practice of keeping indentured servants in favor of free labor from "anonymous." The diversity of the regions was remarkable, although what would be more remarkable to the common eye would be the way they all bound together despite their differences in the face of a common enemy, the British, in the years to come. And thought? As the beginning of revolutionary thought and action by a unified American people, the Great Awakening left its bigger mark as the sparks of revolt against the British government. The media through which it achieved this were the minds and hearts of Americans.

One of the most unifying principles of Awakening thought was that all denominations of Christianity were more or less equal, giving the diverse population of the colonies a sense of belonging in a new land as opposed to the resection of Catholics and other Christian minorities in England at that time. Demonstrations by otherwise commonly such as Jonathan Edwards reduced the sense of authoritative leadership by the Awakening preachers. This sense of togetherness bound colonists as one.

The Awakening also made a change in people's values, taking the emphasis ever so slightly off prayer and worship and instead compelling people to

appreciate their own self-worth. While this shift was not universally accepted, it had a big enough impact to influence the interests of colonists towards materialism. As people began thinking for themselves instead of eating the Jumbled British church/state govern their lives, they began to see the flaws in the system they were being ruled by. The Great Awakening was the first demonstration of American culture, uniting a people more tightly than any population under the British Empire. Hey should control their own economic, political, and religious destiny? A slew of events and other influences convinced English colonists in the Americas that they be better off without Britain providing a "guiding" hand. In the mid to late sass, after incurring war debts from military involvement both in the New World ND in Europe, England began imposing taxes on its colonies, using them as a scapegoat to regain lost funds. These duties seemed unfair and useless to colonists, who did not benefit from the tax, because many Bruits residing in Europe were exempt.

The placement of British troops in the colonies to help enforce the taxes further annoyed colonists. This quartering, combined with fickle restrictions on settlement boundaries that prohibited settlement of colonists in thousands of acres of British territory, caused unrest and calls for internal control were heard. Having pirated without much conflict across an ocean from the technical rulers of the colonies, and having established autonomous legislative bodies such as the House of Burgesses resist Parliament, there was no apparent reason to have further governance from such an estranged leader.

Enlightenment beliefs that supported religious tolerance also distanced, and in colonists' minds, elevated the ideals of the soon-to-be Americans over the British norm of strict Protestantism. The amalgamation of these different impetuses drove the colonists to believe they, and only they, should be in control of their destiny moving forward. Why did the events following the French and Indian war separate England from its colonies and serve to unite the colonies? The rift between England and its colonies continued to grow following the Seven Years War, first with the Proclamation line.

This limited opportunities for westward expansion, stunting economic growth for those wishing to extend across the Appalachians. Next, a series of acts passed by Parliament whose aim was to recuperate funds lost from the war through duties on the colonies elicited both grumblings and outright protest from citizens, as well as implant with Parliamentary rule, the disobedience was a sign of things to come. Looking to counter with a stronger grip, Parliament passed the Declaratory Act, an aggressive statement saying that Parliament had the right to enforce and put in place any law at any time anywhere in the colonies.

Presumably, this did not go over well with the colonists, many of whom came to the colonies to catch a break from the set-in-stone procedures of British life. The first fracture between the two sides most probably was the Boston Massacre, and its effect is prominent in the modern opinions of the event. In America, we see the Massacre as ruthless murder, while in England the killings were just subjugation of rowdy protestors. The entire colonial system now had a common enemy.

Once Parliament took over even more power in the colonies by handling the pay of Massachusetts officials, which sent off cries of despotism through the colonial population, the collective colonial disgust for Britain showed itself through the Boston Tea Party in allegory of the war soon to come that would change the face of the planet until today. Chapter 6: Analyze how the American people made the shift from separating from an imperial system to creation of a republican form of government. The announcement of American revolution prompted formation of new governments to control the people and fulfill the dream of true independence from Britain.

Extricating the colonies from political influence from England was a task eagerly performed by civilians, who, at the sound of the word "independence," took to the streets to level statues of British authority. While freeing America from European influence was largely achieved by war, the Continental Congress that had drafted our nation's founding documents took to the more daunting task of setting up a government for the newest nation backed by a republican ideology. In the interim, questioning "what it meant to be no longer English, but American," the people of America felt lost and without identity.

There were basic principles the people desired in the United States, free of countries, such as the eradication of hierarchical protection for members of the government. Guided by these basic necessities for legislature and society as a whole, state constitutions reflected more accurately the many identities of America in each state. One differentiating factor between states was the level of democracy; still it was important for commoners to have

oversight of the government, states like Pennsylvania were chided for perhaps giving the people too much power.

As time went on, these procedures were whittled closer to the Massachusetts template of building a constitution, in which the people had the final say. The US Constitution followed much of the same principles as the states', confirming the republican equality of all citizens (read white landowning men). As young America began to find states. Evaluate the key differences between the Pennsylvania and Massachusetts State Constitutions. After independence was achieved, there was a clear consensus in the United States that the nation was to be free, and a democracy.

However, the degree to which democracy was implemented was up to each individual state. An excellent paragon of different interpretations of democracy is seen when the state constitutions of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts are put side by side. In the northeastern Massachusetts, where communities were tightly bound together, the freedom was given to the people, who reviewed and approved or disapproved of a working constitution at a special convention. The overall fate of the state was left in the hands of the citizens rather than a few elected officials; they had the final say.

Furthermore, Massachusetts residents were sure to put boundaries on what legislators could do, such as delegating the tasks of budget control and appointment of certain officials to an assembly of normal citizens. In Pennsylvania, however, republicanism was interpreted as a super-democratic state of being, where every white, taxpaying male had an equal say, and

could contribute to debates on key topics. While there was just a single legislative house, its constituents could be changed yearly.

These two points attracted raised eyebrows and had other states question Pennsylvania long-term viability with the potential for such an unstable system of government. To boot, property was nearly redistributed to compensate for the danger of "an enormous proportion of property vested in a few individuals" endangering the common happiness and rights of the citizens. It seemed as if Pennsylvania was willing to resort to economic socialism to preserve political democracy. The popularizing nature of these propositions divided the state, whereas in Massachusetts, the best interests of all citizens were kept in mind to avoid conflict.