

King Philip's War

1675-76, the most devastating war between the colonists and the Indians in New England. The war is named for King Philip, the son of Massasoit and chief of the Wampanoag. His Wampanoag name was Metacom, Metacomet, or Pometacom. Upon the death (1662) of his brother, Alexander (Wamsutta), whom the Indians suspected the English of murdering, Philip became sachem and maintained peace with the colonists for a number of years. Hostility eventually developed over the steady succession of land sales forced on the Indians by their growing dependence on English goods.

Suspicious of Philip, the English colonists in 1671 questioned and fined him and demanded that the Wampanoag surrender their arms, which they did. In 1675 a Christian Indian who had been acting as an informer to the English was murdered, probably at Philip's instigation. Three Wampanoags were tried for the murder and executed.

Incensed by this act, the Indians in June, 1675, made a sudden raid on the border settlement of Swansea. Other raids followed; towns were burned and many whites--men, women, and children--were slain. Unable to draw the Indians into a major battle, the colonists resorted to similar methods of warfare in retaliation and antagonized other tribes.

The Wampanoag were joined by the Nipmuck and by the Narragansett (after the latter were attacked by the colonists), and soon all the New England colonies were involved in the war. Philip's cause began to decline after he made a long journey west in an unsuccessful attempt to secure aid from the Mohawk. In 1676 the Narragansett were completely defeated and their chief, Canonchet, was killed in April of that year; the Wampanoag and Nipmuck were gradually subdued. Philip's wife and son were captured, and he was killed (Aug., 1676) by an Indian in the service of Capt. Benjamin Church after his hiding place at Mt. Hope (Bristol, R.I.) was betrayed. His body was drawn and quartered and his head exposed on a pole in Plymouth. The war, which was extremely costly to the colonists in people and money, resulted in the virtual extermination of tribal Indian life in southern New England and the disappearance of the fur trade. The New England Confederation then had the way completely clear for white settlement.

The Indians were warrior societies. Despite the imbalance of arms since they lacked cannon, and depended upon the English or French for muskets and powder, they were effective against European military formations. Colonial militia, which quickly adopted the Indian's style of combat, what we call guerrilla or insurgency warfare, were better able to deal with Indian tactics. Indian warfare often involved surprise raids on isolated settlements as a way of evening the odds. In King Philip's war (1675-1676), the Indian attacks left: "In Narragansett not one House left standing. "At Warwick, but one. At Providence, not above three. "At Potuxit, none left. ... "Besides particular Farms and Plantations, a great Number not be reckoned up, wholly laid waste or very much damnified. "And as to Persons, it is generally thought that of the English there hath been lost, in all, ..., above Eight Hundred." This is followed by a claim that fearful atrocities were worked on the survivors, and the women raped.

Captured, King Philip was "taken and destroyed, and there was he (like as Agag was hewed in pieced before the Lord) cut into four quarters, and is now hanged up as a monument of revenging Justice, his head being cut off and carried away to Plymouth, his Hands were brought to Boston."

We should not be surprised that the colonists, often hard pressed to win these all-out assaults, developed not only a fear of Indians but a hatred as well. Treating with the Indians as equals, or even as psuedo-

equals was quite beyond their comprehension or in most cases their abilities. This problem conflicted with the general imperial policy to improve relations, especially in peace time.

-----Increase Mather

Indian Treatment of Captives

The "bonds of attachment" between the adopted English and Indian adopters and their tribe, whether as children or adults, sometimes became very strong, even within months and were maintained on both sides for a lifetime if circumstances at all permitted. Redeemed captives repeatedly testified that despite being powerless in captivity, they were not subjected to sexual advances. The general Indian taboo against incest protected the captive who was the future relative and the tribe as well as the individual was bound by the custom. Using violence to forcibly rape a captive would add more and greater dishonor. Of course this varied by tribe and some tribes thought otherwise.

Myths of Indian cruelty were likewise challenged by the captives. Indians were especially kind to children. The bonding between Indian parents and their adopted children was quick and deep. But first the captives had to be initiated into the tribe. Often the process involved three steps: "a purgative ceremony," a washing, and a clothing in Indian garb. The first, often a running of the gauntlet where tribe members beat them with sticks, appears to have served as "Revenge for their Relations who have been slain," and relieved their anger at the loss of family members in battle. The washing, often immersion, was a symbolic washing away of white blood. Clothing them as Indians marked their becoming Indian, members of the tribe and nation. They often replaced the dead relation in his or her place in their family, though sometimes genders or ages were mismatched, but that did not matter. The captives noted that the Indians treated them, enemies, as brothers. This further affected the younger captives, especially those whose own parents were dead. Not all captives wished to enter fully into Indian life, marrying and having children. Married captives were particularly unwilling to remarry. Their refusals were obviously disappointing to their Indian families, who urged them to change their minds, but force was not used. In this and most everything else, the captives, as full members of the tribe, had full choice.

Answer

1. Who was King Philip? What was his Wampanoag name? What is a sachem?
2. Why did hostilities develop between the New England colonists and the various Indian tribes?
3. Why did the Indians attack the English in June 1675?
4. What were the overall results of the conflict?
5. What type of fighting did each side employ during the conflict?
6. What happened to King Philip?
7. What was one notable difference in the way that the English and Indians treated their captives?
8. What were the 3 steps of initiating an English person into one of the Indian tribes?
9. Briefly describe each step.
10. How did marriage of an English person to an Indian take place? What happened if an English person was not willing to marry into a tribe?

Source

<http://colonialwarsct.org/1675.htm>

King Philip's War

1675-76, the most **terrible and destructive** war between the colonists and the Indians in New England. The war is named for King Philip, the son of Massasoit and chief of the Wampanoag. His Wampanoag name was Metacomb, Metacomb, or Pometacomb. Upon the death (1662) of his brother, Alexander (Wamsutta), whom the Indians suspected the English of murdering, Philip became sachem and maintained peace with the colonists for **some** years. **Hatred** eventually developed over the steady **series of** land sales forced on the Indians by their growing dependence on English goods.

Suspicious of Philip, the English colonists in 1671 questioned and fined him and demanded that the Wampanoag **(giving up in a fight)** their arms, which they did. In 1675 a Christian Indian who had been acting as an informer to the English was murdered, probably at Philip's **trouble-starting**. Three Wampanoags were tried for the murder and executed.

Made **very angry** by this act, the Indians in June, 1675, made a sudden **attack of/breaking** into the border settlement of Swansea. Other **sudden attacks** followed; towns were burned and many whites--men, women, and children--were **killed**. Unable to draw the Indians into a major **fight**, the colonists **chose to/chosen to (because there was no other choice)** almost the same methods of **war fighting** in **(revenge for something bad that was done)** and **teased and annoyed** other tribes.

The Wampanoag were joined by the Nipmuck and by the Narragansett (after **the last thing just mentioned** were attacked by the colonists), and soon all the New England **(groups of people or other living things)** were involved in the war. Philip's cause began to decline after he made a **long trip** west in an unsuccessful attempt to secure aid from the Mohawk. In 1676 the Narragansett were completely defeated and their chief, Canonchet, was killed in April of that year; the Wampanoag and Nipmuck were **slowly controlled/calmed**. Philip's wife and son were captured, and he was killed (Aug., 1676) by an Indian in the service of Capt. Benjamin Church after his hiding place at Mt. Hope (Bristol, R.I.) was betrayed. His body was drawn and quartered and his head exposed on a pole in Plymouth. The war, which was **very expensive** to the colonists in people and money, resulted in the virtual extermination of tribal Indian life in southern New England and the disappearance of the fur trade. The New England Confederation then had the way completely clear for white settlement.

The Indians were warrior **(communities of people)**. **(even though there is the existence of)** the **(too much of one thing and not enough of another)** of arms since they didn't have **cannon**, and depended upon the English or French for **guns and powder**, they were effective against European military **(arrangements of objects)**. Colonial **group of armed citizens**, which quickly adopted the Indian's style of combat, what we call **warrior** or **revolution war** fighting, were better able to deal with Indian **strategies**. Indian **war** fighting often involved surprise **attacks on (separated far from others)** settlements as a way of evening the odds. In King Philip's war (1675-1676), the Indian attacks left: "In Narragansett not one House left standing. "At Warwick, but one. At **Care (from God?)**, not above three. "At Potuxit, none left. ... "Besides particular Farms and **(large farms with crops)**, a great Number not be **counted/calculated up**, **completely** laid waste or very much damaged. "And as to **People**, it is generally thought that of the English there **has** been lost, in all, ..., above Eight Hundred." This is followed by a claim that **afraid/scary horrifying crimes** were worked on the survivors, and the women raped.

Captured, King Philip was "taken and destroyed, and there was he (like as Agag was **shaped** in piece

d before the Lord) cut into four quarters, and is now hanged up as a monument of revenging Justice, his head being cut off and carried away to Plymouth, his Hands were brought to Boston."

We should not be surprised that the colonists, often hard pressed to win these **total attacks**, developed not only a fear of Indians but a hatred **also**. Treating with the Indians as equals, or even as pseudo-equals was quite beyond their **understanding** or in most cases their abilities. This problem **fought with each other** with the general **(related to kings, queens, emperors, etc.)** policy to improve relations, especially in peace time.

- - - - Increase Mather

Indian Treatment of **Prisoners**

The

"bonds of attachment" between the adopted English and Indian adopters and their tribe, whether as children or adults, sometimes became very strong, even within months and were maintained on both sides for a lifetime if **facts or conditions (that surround someone)** at all permitted. Redeemed **prisoners over and over again** said in court/gave proof that **(even though there is the existence of)** being powerless **(captured in cages, jails, etc.)**, they were not subjected to sexual advances. The general Indian **(forbidden in society)** against **(sex with a close family member)** protected the **prisoner** who was the future relative and the tribe as well as the individual was bound by the custom. Using violence to forcibly rape a **prisoner** would add more and greater dishonor. **(definitely/as one would expect)** this varied by tribe and some tribes thought otherwise.

Very old stories/untrue stories of Indian **(great harm/desire to hurt others/act of hurting others)** were **also** challenged by the **prisoners**. Indians were especially kind to children. The bonding between Indian parents and their adopted children was quick and deep. But first the **prisoners** had to be **given deep understanding of, and made a part of,** the tribe. Often the process involved three steps: "a **(getting rid of bad things/drug that cleans your bowels)** **(formal, special event or series of actions)**," a washing, and a clothing in Indian **clothing**. The first, often a running of the **glove/(symbol for a fight)** where tribe members beat them with sticks, appears to have served as "Revenge for their Relatives who have been killed," and relieved their anger at the loss of family members in **fight**. The washing, often **(placing underwater/surrounding someone with something)**, was a symbolic washing away of white blood. Clothing them as Indians marked their becoming Indian, members of the tribe and nation. They often replaced the dead relation in his or her place in their family, though sometimes **(males or females)** or ages were **(not looking good together/not equal in size, power, etc.)**, but that did not matter. The **prisoners** noted that the Indians treated them, enemies, as brothers. This further affected the younger **prisoners**, especially those whose own parents were dead. Not all **prisoners** wished to enter fully into Indian life, marrying and having children. Married **prisoners** were especially unwilling to remarry. Their refusals were obviously disappointing to their Indian families, who **strongly encouraged** them to change their minds, but force was not used. In this and most everything else, the **prisoners**, as full members of the tribe, had full choice.

Answer

1. Who was King Philip? What was his Wampanoag name? What is a sachem?
2. Why did **angry feelings** develop between the New England colonists and the **different** Indian tribes?
3. Why did the Indians attack the English in June 1675?
4. What were the overall results of the conflict?
5. What type of fighting did each side employ during the conflict?

6. What happened to King Philip?
7. What was one **important/famous** difference in the way that the English and Indians treated their **prisoners**?
8. What were the 3 steps of **starting** an English person into one of the Indian tribes?
9. Briefly describe each step.
10. How did marriage of an English person to an Indian **happen**? What happened if an English person was not willing to marry into a tribe?