

Daniel David, Braja Owens-Virdure

Prof. James Prahlow

ACC US History

September 18, 2016

Northern Clash

The Pequot War was one that could've been avoided. It did not require the extermination of the entire tribe. After reading John Mason's accounts of the Pequot War, I realized that John Mason wrote this without properly assigning blame, the story was presented objectively, and historians in general are objective.

John Mason set out to make the Pequot tribe look like the bad guys in this confrontation. Mason wrote that the Pequots were terrorizing the neighboring tribes and they were known for their potent and warlike nature. What John Mason failed to mention was what the English did to provoke the Pequot into attacking a bunch of the settlers. Mason didn't include how the Native Americans were there first then the English barged in and eventually tried to take things over. The Pequots most likely didn't attack the English for no specific reason. These reasons are just not stated in Mason's account. I'm not saying the Pequot tribe was innocent in the whole situation, but you have to take into consideration the part you played. Which brings me to this: Mason's account was objectively told.

I think Mason's account was influenced by his personal feelings. He continually bashed the Pequot tribe but placed no blame upon the English. I believe this is because Mason was a

captain of the Connecticut militia and he lead the attack on the Pequot's Fort Mystic. It's pretty hard to give an unbiased opinion when your on the other team. This makes me wonder if this is a trustworthy recollection on what happened during that time or would we have to compare it to a Pequot's account? What does that say about the rest of history and it's historians?

Historians can be very objective in their writing, but only because most of the evidence they have to base their research off of are accounts that are already objective. Take Mason's account for example. We were told the story from one side of the fight so of course his account is going to favor that one side. Unless we have accounts from both sides, can we ever have an unbiased and accurate history. Historians do their best to provide an authentic past, but to them this past is somehow their imagination.

Without knowing where the Pequot tribe stood during all of this, I will never truly know who was at fault for this war, but I do know it did not require the extinction of a tribe. John Mason's accounts did not justly assign fault, it was objective, and historians are objective.