

ROUGH DRAFT FORMAT  
PARTNERS INTERPRETING  
UCONN-US HISTORY TO 1877  
9/19/17  
9:30-10:20 A.M. ET

REMOTE CART/CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY  
ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION SERVICES, LLC  
[www.CaptionFamily.com](http://www.CaptionFamily.com)

\* \* \* \* \*

(This is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation is provided in order to facilitate communication and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.)

>> PROFESSOR: Good morning, everybody!

I'm trying to upload today's PowerPoint. I'll get it there in a minute.

So some people have told me that they had some trouble opening some links because they were trying to open the links directly from the syllabus, and apparently that doesn't always work, even though logically it should. And that has to do with the way that Blackboard is set up. So if you actually go into the readings section on the menu and access the readings from the links that are there, they should get you where you're going. If you encounter technical difficulties, let me or your TA know about it, because we need to know if Blackboard is working properly, because it doesn't always work properly, as I'm sure you have realized by now. And so we want to know about stuff like that so we can solve problems as they pop up.

Okay. We're ready to go. So we had been talking last week about John Smith and Pocahontas. A foundation myth, basically I'm not saying it's not true. The word myth comes from the Greek mythos, story, and it's the stories we tell about how we got to be who we think we are. All people have foundation myths. We're not alone among them. It's what people do. And then we do things like that.

So a foundation myth could be true. It could be false or could be partly true and partly false and almost always foundation myths have elements to them that are probably not true but they also have kernels of truth worked into them. So what we're doing is examining the foundation myth of John Smith and Pocahontas as you encountered it in various places. You told me when you were little kids you saw that -- maybe when you were little, maybe more recently than that, but you saw the Disney Pocahontas movie, so you're familiar with that. At the same time, you know, gave you something to look at, which you would have discussed on Friday about a more traditional, the James town settlement, the website. Then what I did was gave you a description of the early parts of the encounter up through the first Anglo war, where what we really saw, looking at it from the perspective of the Powhatan Indians of Virginia, what we saw is not an example of John Smith and Pocahontas working

together to bring peace and save a colony but rather something that led to a war that almost destroyed the colony and the colony would not survive, the English colony, but troops and reinforcements to back it up eventually.

Okay, so it's not quite the story that we've always heard. And there was this war that history has forgot. What I wanted to do, now at the beginning of the class tell you about what happened to Pocahontas, the end of the slide show that we didn't quite get to last week so that we know what happened to her personally. Now that we've looked at sort of the big picture of what happened in Virginia. So Pocahontas had been captured during the first Anglo-Powhatan war, and that's what ended the war. Her father agreed to not a permanent peace treaty but a truce to end the war. That truce means ending a war temporarily and agreed to a truce, okay, we won't be fighting now, or for a while anyway, and he kind of held it as long as Pocahontas was captive. So she is held captive. During this time she either willingly converts to Christianity or maybe accepts baptism because maybe she figured she had no choice, so she becomes a Christian. Whether or not it was a sincere conversion, we don't know, but she does. She takes the name Rebecca. That's not as unusual as it may sound, that Native Americans usually took a new name around the time of going through puberty, and so the idea that your adult name is not the same as your childhood name is something that was deeply embedded into Algonquian culture, so not a surprise she would have done that, but she takes an English name, Rebecca. The English interpret this as meaning Pocahontas is becoming culturally English, she's agreed to accept their culture and give up her own.

In 1614 she marries the colonist, John Rolfe. Were they in love? Who knows?

This may have been just another political marriage in the way both her people and the English did things among leaders. Leaders had political marriages in England. They had political marriages among the Powhatans as well. It may be she was being used in order to have an alliance between the two people. Or she may have been in love. We don't know. She didn't say. So we have to make guesses at things. She has a son, Thomas, who will later go on to become one of the founding fathers of Virginia. When she was 20 or 21, or maybe 19, hard to tell, he took her to England to visit her ancestral home. She wanted to introduce her to his English family, parents and other relatives. He wanted to show her off to King James, I, hey, I married an Indian princess, isn't that cool? That's what he wanted to do. Other Powhatans went on the visit. This is simply a Democratic mission of the Powhatans, and she's at the center, but likely she was assigned by her father the task of actually negotiating with the English because he wouldn't have been able to discuss it with her anyway, so probably the other ones that went along were charged with something like that.

Once again, it looks like she is being used by man for political purposes, which seems to be what most of her life was. But she goes along as well. Her husband doesn't mean anything bad by this, you know, trying to introduce your wife to your parents is not a bad thing to want to be doing, but in point, he did probably the worst thing he could have done for her. He took her to London, a place just full of germs to which she had no natural immunities, and as they were about to return, she took sick and died. Probably either from smallpox or pneumonia. It's kind of hard to say. And actually you can get the two at the same time, and it might have been a combination of them. Or even something else. Diseases are often hard to diagnose hundreds of years later. It's hard to blame Rolfe for this. He didn't know what a germ was. On the other

hand, you know, he had seen many of the Native Americans die of disease. Maybe he should have thought it through a little more, but she never makes it back to Virginia. And that's her life. She dies at a very young age. The picture you see is the only picture made from life made during her visit to England where she's dressed up in an English ladies clothing with the exception of the beaver felt hat on her head, which symbolizes her [ audio interference ]

What happens next? With Pocahontas no longer a prisoner, well, okay, is there any reason to have peace? But as it turns out, Wasahanika (phonetic) will also die. With Pocahontas and her father deceased, leadership of the Powhatans comes into the hands of her younger brother or maybe brother-in-law. Hard to tell. He becomes the chief of the people. He was the one upon whom John Smith has pointed a pistol. Smith held a pistol to his breast during an earlier scuffle over the night marks. He was angered by that encounter and not in a mood to have peace. He had all along counseled his brother not to make peace with the English, not to have a truce. He thought it was a mistake. He believed they would keep coming and you waited too long it would be impossible to get rid of them. He's dead-on right and assessed the situation correctly.

What happens as the Anglo Powhatan war. Not one forgotten. It's in the history, but it's blamed on Ankachopanoff (phonetic). So we're retelling the story of John and Pocahontas, they wanted heroic peacemakers. How do they explain war? They just ignore it and pretend it doesn't happen. They acknowledge the second war but blame it on Ankachopanoff and Pocahontas is dead and John is not around anymore, and it would have been different if they had still been there.

In this war, the English will win. The numbers of the Powhatans are... [indiscernible]...

This is no longer a struggle between the Jamestown colony and the Virginia company on one hand and the Powhatan confederacy on another. That's not a battle the confederacy can win. They're outnumbered. England has a population in the millions. The confederacy was a country with a population in the thousands. Just no contest between them.

There will be a third Anglo-Powhatan war, which destroys. Remnants of [indiscernible] through war and disease. It will disappear as political entity. No longer will be a country with leaders.

There will be a fourth war in the 1670s. One historian calls this Virginia's first true race war, because essentially the leaders of the colony, which are no longer the Virginia company, now a royal colony with a royal governor appointed by the government back in England, appointed by the government of king Charles, II back in England, and this government -- well, what they intend to do is essentially not just destroy Tsenacommacah as a country, but they want to destroy the Powhatan people and get rid of them so they can have the last remaining pieces of land. The goal is to wipe out, dispossess or enslave the remaining Native Americans in Virginia, of all tribes, whether they were part of the Powhatan confederacy or up in the mountains as well. They won't get rid of all of them. They pretty much succeed. They create reservations on which a few remaining people are put. This is the beginning of the reservation system. It goes back to colonial times in Virginia, the idea of reducing Native American populations and sticking them on reservations of undesirable land that nobody else

wanted. And we point out they did enslave a number of them as well. Americans were frequently enslaved by Europeans.

In 1691, later on, at the end of the 1600s, Virginia did outlaw the enslavement of Native Americans. By that time there weren't many of them left and they were replacing them with Africans, and African Americans. Those were the people becoming slaves by that time. They did this when native populations were no longer viewed as a threat. Others subsequently were resettled on reservations and some of them still around. Still the Pamaki (phonetic) and Powhatan tribes exist and reservations still there. There about 200 living on the reservation. This is supposed to be a picture of Pocahontas and her son, but a fanciful picture.

[ audio interference ]

So what happens is we get a myth out of all this the myth is Pocahontas was the good Indian. The myth of the good Indian is the myth repeated in American history. Most Indians were bad, but there are good Indians. If all were like the good Indians, everything would have been fine. The good Indian is one that befriends the English and willingly accepts culture acknowledging it to be superior to their own. We don't know Pocahontas did that, but that's what in the myth it said about her, that she becomes English, she tries to then negotiate peace between the two peoples and so that's the good Indian. So the good Indians in American history are those who accept the coming of the Europeans, acknowledge the superiority of European culture and want to adapt to it and then try to work out some sort of peace between the two groups that is based on all of that.

And if there were no Indians that actually did that, then we do as we mythologize them.

Pocahontas is somebody that the Europeans and Americans in the 19th century want to do this with because she was an Indian princess in their minds. To a racist American in the 1800s-- Americans in the 1800s were racist. It was deeply embedded in American culture. There was a belief by almost all white Americans that whites were superior to non-whites, so the idea of a white man marrying a non-white woman was looked down upon in the 1800s, if you did that as a white man you would be thought of as kind of scummy for doing that. Why did you take her as a wife? That's awful. But she was a princess, so that's okay. So you can elevate a few non-whites to sort of these royal roles and they become okay. Because she's a princess, safe for Rolfe to marry. We make her in 1800s the lover of John Smith when she first meets him and the two of them were together to save the colony. We've seen they were not lovers and she was only 10 when she met him. She wasn't working to save the colony because she probably didn't understand what the colony was. She was 10. Let's not expect more out of a 10-year-old than we possibly could.

She wasn't the one directing policy at any time. She was a symbol we have seen more than anything else. And in our retelling there's no Anglo-Powhatan war until... it's a myth we created, but not as we saw the true story. The painting behind me is a 19th century painting from the 1800s and supposed to show the baptism of Pocahontas, I'm pretty sure clothing of that quality was not there and I don't think the chapel of Jamestown was that grand, but that's how people imagine it after many years.

[ audio interference ]

So the myth continues. So this is Pocahontas's depicted in part, so the one picture that is on your right up there, that's a 19th century picture. That is actually supposed to be deer skin she's wearing, but the artist made it look like a southern belle dress, so she looks like she's right out of *Gone with the Wind* or something. And the hair was made to look southern belle-ish. Turned her into a southern belle basically. The statue of Pocahontas is a little better. That still is in existence. The sculptor did try to make something that looked like Native American dress and she actually has a feather in there.

What we've seen that's not what she would have looked like when she met John Smith. She was considerably younger. She would have had spikey hair, would not have worn clothing at all as a child, but as an adult, if she was dressed like a Native American, she would have worn an apron, not a dress, not a skirt. That is not what she actually wore. But I guess you can't put up statues of half-naked women and expect you're going to get away with that, so the sculptor took liberties with her.

And he wanted to do her as an adult, she should have put her in English clothing, because that's what she would have worn.

[ audio interference ]

Then we have a painting on the right that is supposed to show Pocahontas saving John Smith. It is laughably inaccurate as a historical painting. They were indoors, not outdoors when the event took place. Look at the teepees in the background. That's what the Plains Indians had. The dress is more like the dress of -- more western or more southern groups that -- more like Seminoles or something like that in the way they're dressed, not the clothing worn by the Algonquins. The artist made no effort to capture them. They make Pocahontas older than she really was in the picture.

On the stamp we use the real picture of her. So I guess kudos to the U.S. postal service. They came closer to getting her right than anybody else.

[ drum roll ]

There's the Disney version.. We know that's not accurate. And Pocahontas images I came up with a Halloween costume I thought I would share with you, and so, you know, we know that's not her either, right?

[ drum roll ]

who was she? Her name was [indiscernible]. Pocahontas was a nickname.

She was a pawn in international diplomacy between the leaders of the Virginia company and the leaders of her own Powhatan peoples. She was probably too young to be taking a leadership role. She wasn't actually a leader. She didn't hold a leadership position by the Powhatans. She's used by her father as somebody through whom he could get at John Smith and the other English. The English then capture her and they use her as a captive and a pawn, and that's really what she -- I think this is sad. It's a sad story of someone who never really gets to be an adult and never really gets to live an adult life and never gets to make her own decisions about things because she's being used and then she dies before she can attain any age where she can go off and do things on her own, if really she could have anyway.

As a child and as a woman she had a few choices.

First her father and then the English circumscribed her choices so she can't really do a whole lot. She was never a lover of Smith and he never said she was. She was

possibly not even in love with Rolfe either, because it might have simply been a marriage of convenience, a political marriage that took place. Possibly she was not even a sincere Christian. We don't know that either.

The woodcut is supposedly showing her capture, by the way, but that was made up by an artist.

[ drum roll ]

So we can reach some conclusions now about what happened in Virginia.

The encounter between the Powhatan and the Tasintasin (phonetic) became a model for most of the future encounters between the invading Anglo Europeans and Native Americans and that's why we study it. Not just about Virginia per se but because we're going to see this pattern repeated over and over and over and over again. So if we understand what happened in Virginia, we're going to understand an awful lot of what happens in New England and New York and Pennsylvania and in the Carolinas and Georgia and west of the Appalachians in years later on because it's going to be repeated over and over again.

Second conclusion, the myth of Pocahontas is not good history. There are too many flaws to consider history. It's a story, but not history. It's generally not very accurate in the way that we have told it over the years. Rather the myth was attempted by 19th century Americans -- created in 1800s. They don't create it in the 1600s or 1700s. Pocahontas and John Smith are largely forgotten by the end of the 1600s. They're not really major figures as far as colonial Americans are concerned, major historical figures as far as they're concerned in the 1700s and up to the American Revolution. It's in the 1800s that the story is brought back out, it's dusted off and the myth is really created. It's a 19th century creation. Why would 19th century Americans reach back in time 200 years to pluck John Smith and Pocahontas out of historical obscurity and make them central figures in American history? Because they're looking to justify the English/American conquest of the Americas. If you can justify the English conquest of Tsenacommaca, by Pocahontas being the good Indian princess who befriended the colonists and assimilated their ways, then you can argue that this whole process is justified every time that it happens.

Americans were spilling west of the Appalachian mountains and filling up the whole continent. The land gobbled up in 1600s and 1700s is puny compared to the land in 1800s. It's when the United States grew to pretty much its full size over the course of the 1800s, and much of that was done to the conquest of numerous western Native Americans. By "western," we mean the Appalachian mountains, which is 80% of the country. These areas were being added.

As Americans were taking Indian lands they wanted to come up with a story that justified what they were doing, so they look back in time and say that the Indians would just be like Pocahontas, everything would be fine. If they would recognize, we're better than they are, we're more advanced, we're civilized, they're savages, if they would accept culture as good for them, if they would agree to live on smaller pieces of land, because clearly they don't need all that land, we should -- they don't need all that land, we should get most of it. If they would befriend us, there wouldn't be problems. There wouldn't be the Indian wars and fighting going on. And I must tell you, the Indian wars in the 1800s make the wars of the 1600s look like a Tea Party. They're much fiercer wars and battles going on, so it's the idea, let's create a model Indian and try to

convince all the Indians this is what they should be like. They do the same with Squanto in New England, a similar character created.

In addition what Pocahontas did she became a proper lady, because she was a princess. They make her a leader of people, which she really wasn't, who nurtured and obeyed European men, and by having a child by a European man helped populate the colony, something she does. The real Pocahontas we've seen barely reached adulthood, was never a leader, was used by native and English as a bargaining chip and rarely permitted to make her own choices.

Finally we should say what happens, Virginia will replace Tsenacommacha. And Virginia thrives as a place. Partly because of luck and the greater power of the English state, the willingness of the monarchy to send troops to back up the colony, which is government didn't have to do, but they did. Partly because real-life people facing real-life problems, so even if we can see them making mistakes, they should seem to be reasonable in the light of what he knew and didn't know. You know, looking at him making decisions as they happen helps us to understand how this process unfolds and why native leaders did what they did. Because really he probably could have wiped out the colony at the very beginning if he really tried to do that. So we should understand why he didn't try to do that. You know, perhaps if he had known what was going to happen, otherwise he might have. But he didn't know what was going to happen. In the long run we saw his war-like brother was obsessed with the situation maybe more, but we don't want to blame him, because how was he going to know what was going to happen the way it did? He was trying to make good decisions based on what he did know. The Powhatans did not wipe out the strangers when they had the chance. Partly because of long-term factors, a balanced gender ratio. There may not have been women they first arrived, but 1700, there's 50/50 ratio between men and women in Virginia, so eventually it becomes a self-replicating colony, but they have to get women over there, so they do, that's part of their policy, to figure out how to get women to migrate to Virginia, but Virginia for a long time will have far more men than women.

Finally because of an economy based on plantation, agriculture, and exporting a drug -- because you know tobacco is a drug, right? It is. I'm not saying it's the worst drug in the world. We're not talking heroin or opium or something, but an addictive substance and a drug.

I'm teaching world history in another class and we're discussing the significance of drugs in creating global trade and commerce in the 1500s and 1600s and 1700s and starting with sugar, which technically is an addictive substance but converted to rum, is a more addictive substance, and tobacco, we're talking about as well, and coffee, which is also an addictive substance, and then we're moving on into opium. But we're seeing how a lot of these early corporations globally made their money in addictive substances. Once you've got customers hooked on tobacco, you've got them for life. Even if their lives are not quite as long as they might have been otherwise.

So they do, they will create -- and it's Rolfe who does this. Rolfe is the guy who figures out how to grow tobacco for a profit in Virginia, which maybe means he is historically more significant than John Smith, because he is really the architect of the Virginia economy.

We talked about the death by disease and war of most of the Powhatans, the introduction of gray slavery, meaning African American slaves, without whom the

plantations could not have functioned, and the use of racism to keep the slaves under control.

The Powhatans were not conquered because they could not maintain unity. They did. They stuck together. They fought together, but as it turned out, unity was not enough. When you're dying of disease, when you're so badly out-numbered, unity isn't going to help you win, and it didn't for the Powhatans.

So those are our conclusions about Tsenacommacah.

We have Virginia created. So we will escape that and move to the next topic.

So south to north. We started with Virginia and talked about what it was like. Virginia is going as a colony. Now what I want to do is go north and look to more than one colony, a group of colonies collectively called New England. Ironically, a term coined by John Smith who was later sent over to specially explore and map the coast of New England, and produced a map.

So, okay, New England. And we want to talk about, what was that? Is New England actually a New England or is it going to be something else?

Is it going to be Puritan? What is it going to be?

I want to look at this, and partly what we're going to do is we're going to see this is in some ways the same history of Virginia but in some ways a different history, and it's the difference that perhaps lies a great deal of significance for the way that American history...

[ audio interference ]

>> PROFESSOR: I put in a different sound effect. So you can wake up in the morning.

What were the New England colonies? First was Plymouth, founded in 1620, but in 1691 it was doubled up by Massachusetts Bay, and the current state of Massachusetts was called Massachusetts Bay in colonial times. Now it's just Massachusetts. I mean, that's one. So Plymouth, around the town of Plymouth, Massachusetts, that was for a while a separate colony. Massachusetts Bay, founded in 1629, although a few people came earlier than that, and the people who went to Plymouth were people we call pilgrims. The people in Massachusetts Bay were Puritans. We'll find out about them in a minute.

Then New Hampshire founded in 1629, with a few that came earlier, and mostly Puritans too. New Hampshire is a lot like Massachusetts. I grew up in Maine, in Maine we believe that New Hampshire is exactly like Massachusetts. In New Hampshire they deny that fervently. You can take either interpretation you want. Actually, northern Maine where I grew up, we think Portland, Maine is part of Massachusetts. Just the same.

Then there's Maine, which was a separate colony for a while. Then becomes part of Massachusetts Bay. So the colonial period it's gobbled up by Massachusetts Bay. New Hampshire keeps separate status throughout. So Maine, too, founded in 1629, but a few colonists came earlier. Mostly Puritans that go through, not many. It was on the frontier. And it was cold.

Connecticut as a colony 1633 founded mostly by Puritans. If we want to understand New England, Puritans are more important than pilgrims. Showing up more Puritans than pilgrims. We make a big deal out of pilgrims, but they're not that important in the unfolding of New England. Puritans are more significant. Since we live in Connecticut, it must be more important than other places.

Then Rhode Island in 1636. Originally on the slide I made all sorts of weirdoes, but that might be insulting. But they are Rhode Island. It's strange people that go to Rhode Island. Rhode Island will be unlike the other New England colonies, a whole bunch of ways. Most good, actually. You're going to like Rhode Island when we talk about it. Because of the direction that it chooses.

Frankly, the Puritan colonies, including Connecticut don't like it and would pretty much like to get rid of it throughout the colonial period, and they try.

Then New Haven is a separate colony founded in 1637 and 1662 it becomes part of Connecticut. So Connecticut is also gobbling up territory, although not as much as Massachusetts was. So those are New England colonies. Notice I did not list Vermont. It doesn't become a place until the time of the American Revolution. Vermont is either part of New Hampshire or New York or maybe nothing, depending on how -- or maybe strange people there. We're just going to leave Vermont out of the story because it's not populated by European colonists in the 1600s. People move into there at a later date.

So we've got a bunch of these places that are there. There are a number of colonies...

[ audio interference ]

So I want to introduce you to a concept term and that's the concept in Europe. So a story you've already met, Alfred Crosby, the guy that came up with the concept of the Columbian Exchange that we talked about. He's a high concept guy, Alfred Crosby. Another book he wrote, better than the Columbian Exchange, it's a real good book, Ecological Imperialism. He argues that Europeans deliberately attempted to reshape into an image they left. Spain or Portugal or wherever they came from. They try to reshape their new homes in the New World into as much as possible images of what they left behind. He calls these neo-Europes. "New Europes" that are being made. Some places he says they're more successful than others, and some places they fail miserably. In no place did they succeed entirely in creating a neo-Europe. It's impossible really to create an exact image of Europe to duplicate Europe exactly in a new environment, he says.

But in some places they come closer than others, and where they come closer, Crosby argues, is where they thrive. That's where numbers increase most rapidly. Since we see the numbers in New England, increasing very rapidly at the beginning. The New England colonies in Virginia and Pennsylvania will be very successful colonies. We might think, well, maybe they're more successful in creating neo-Europes there than there are in other places if indeed Crosby is right. So one of the things we want to do is we want to say, to what extent was New England really a New England? Was it really a duplication of England?

There is another way of looking at it, however. And that is -- so look at the people who came here, the Puritans, who are the majority of those who come in the 1600s. Was it really their goal to duplicate England as it was? Or are they trying to create a Utopian version of England as they want it to be? Are they attempting to create a Puritan Utopia in the forests of America? And if that's what they're trying to do -- I think exactly that is what they were trying to do. Were they successful? Did they get there? So is New England duplicating England as it actually was? It is a Puritan utopia, an

idealized version of what England could be? Or was it actually neither? Those are questions we should be asking because we're looking at the history of colonial England.

[ audio interference ]

And there's another way of looking at it. There's another conceptual way of grappling with what New England was. I'm throwing a lot of concepts at you, I realize that, but I know you're smart and you can handle all these concepts.

So some historians think that the different colonies were different from each other. Although all of them were in part neo-Europes, none of them actually successfully duplicate Europe as it really was. In fact, there's more than one Europe too. So the result was the different colonies become different cultures or sub-cultures, they're very different from each other, an idea we're going to follow through over the next few weeks and think about.

So some historians think that the New England colonies were very different from the so-called Chesapeake colonies. That's Virginia and a few years after Virginia Maryland is founded and it's very much like Virginia in the way that the culture of the place develops as time goes by.

All right. Is it really different? Or are they largely the same? And we want to find that out as well. Are there significant differences between these New England colonies in the north and the Chesapeake colonies in the south. So we're going to be investigating that too.

So I think we're going to go to England. To understand what is going on, who are these people coming over? What we left off in Virginia was a company sending employees, a corporation sending employees. We've got to get beyond that for Virginia and for New England, and the way to understand what is going on [ bird chirping ]... and why people are leaving... why people are leaving... Old England to come to America means we have to take a peek what is going on in England itself. The history of America in the 1600s is the history of Europe and Africa as well. We need to know what is going on in those places.

Lots of stuff going on in England. Early 1600s in England. Jamestown we know, pilgrims, 1620, Plymouth and Puritans, 1629, early 1600s. So early 1600s in England, first King James I and his successor, King Charles. England was poor compared to Spain, France, and gripped by religious discourse. Not the only country gripped by religious discourse, others were as well. But the Netherlands were not France was but it had gotten over it by now. Mostly by slaughtering the Protestants is what they had done in France, but they had gotten over it. England is one of those countries deeply divided religiously. Not so much between Protestants and Catholics, but between two different kinds of Protestants. How does this come about? Let's go back a little further in time into the 1500s. In 1500s we will go back to the early to mid-1500s when the English king is King Henry VIII. Henry VIII of England is a big supporter of the Catholic part of Europe in the religious civil wars that are gripping Europe at the time. So in those civil wars that we talked about in the 1500s, Henry VIII of England initially has England on the Catholic side until he decides he wants to divorce his wife, Catherine of Aragon was his wife, and he wants to divorce her for some reasons, but the main reason is she has not produced a male heir, and he wants a son and doesn't want a daughter.

But also, you know, Henry has a wandering eye and he is smitten with a beautiful young courtier named Ann Boleyn and she puts him off and says she doesn't want to have sex until he's divorced his current wife. She's not happy with that. Henry had many mistresses until now, so he's surprised by the reaction.

Henry, let's admit it, he's a male chauvinist pig. He really was a pig. He decides to divorce his wife and his wife Catherine of Aragon had been married to Henry's older brother Arthur, they had been married. Henry was not supposed to be king, his older brother was. A piece of trivia. Every time the English monarchy names the heir to the throne Arthur, the Arthur dies before becoming king. They no longer name heirs to the throne Arthur. Bad luck. I guess there's only one King Arthur in England and never another unless a lady gives him a sword out of the lake or something like that. That's may be what we're waiting for.

Henry married as young prince, marries Catherine in arranged political marriage. So Henry -- that's what it was, this was really incest. Because I married my sister-in-law, I never should have done that. He asks the Pope for a divorce, and normally would have gotten it, because they normally give them when they ask for them, but Katherine of Aragon is the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain and the aunt of the current king of Spain, the biggest defender in the religious civil wars, Catherine of Aragon is an important person in Roman Catholic hierarchy within Europe and the Pope is not going to insult her family at all. This is not going to do that because those are the people he is depending on. So basically he says to Henry, no, politically I can't do that, you can't have a divorce. So Henry declares England to be Protestant, declares himself head of the church and grants himself a divorce.

Henry dies and so in his will, he leaves actually the -- as heir to the throne, the son Edward, not either by Catherine or Anne but 'another wife -- he had six you know. He's young, a kid, sickly. But his advisers are radical Protestants and they use the position to go to power. They kill Catholics in England. Edward is sickly and dies, and next in line is Catherine of Aragon's daughter, Mary, who is Catholic, and Mary becomes queen. Mary is her cousin, the king of Spain, and not the king of Spain who objected to the divorce but the son of the guy who objected to the divorce because some years have gone by. And Mary now starts to execute Protestants. She gets the nicknames Bloody Mary. The drink is named after her, she's not named after the drink. But Bloody Mary dies as well. Probably cancer. Without having children. Now the throne goes to Henry's last remaining legitimate child, Elizabeth, Anne Boleyn's daughter. She becomes queen for a long time. She's confronted with an issue. They are divided between Protestants and Catholics intent on slaughtering each other. They have carried out executions against people. Elizabeth doesn't want that crap going on, it's stupid as can be, what a way to destroy a country, have people kill each other over religious differences. We need to get together and unite and get along, but Elizabeth could not possibly accept Catholicism as a genuine religion because according to Catholic beliefs she can't be queen. She is a bastard because her parents' marriage was not a legal marriage so she can't legally be queen. So she has to be Protestant, and she is a sincere Protestant. So she has to be Protestant, and Protestantism has to be the official religion but she doesn't want Catholics killed. She doesn't want to do that.

So there's the famous Elizabeth

Compromise, the first example of "don't ask and don't tell," historically. The law in England said if you are examined by the authorities and twice under questioning by the authorities you refuse to accept, swear an oath, you refuse to swear an oath that you accept it, the queen of England as the head of the church, you were supposed to be executed.

And so, you know, Elizabeth is saying, I want tolerance. I don't want Catholics killed or anything like that. Advisers say, your majesty, what do we do if somebody twice refuses to take the oath? And she has the pragmatic reply, only ask them once. If you don't get the answer you want, don't ask again. Don't ask, don't tell.

So we won't ask you if you're a Catholic. Don't tell us you're a Catholic. Everybody shuts up and we'll manage not to kill each other.

That's not true tolerance, but not dying is what she comes up with. It's called the Elizabethan compromise and it holds England together for a while. When we get to the 1600s, though, a new division, not the Catholics who have gone underground and being quiet about the whole thing, but it's a division between moderate Protestants and radical Protestants, between Anglicans and Puritans, and exactly what that struggle was we'll talk about at the beginning of our next class.

[ class dismissed ]