**1301 FALL 2020 EXAM 2 STUDY QUESTIONS**

* THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR/SEVEN YEARS WAR (EUROPE) ENDED 1763 AND THE START OF THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT EXERTING ITS AUTHORITY OVER THE COLONISTS
* THE FOUNDING OF JAMESTOWN IN 1607 TO THE END OF THE WAR IN 1763, THERE WAS NO ON-GOING ENGLISH PRESENCE IN THE COLONIES
* THE END-ALL/BE -ALL OF ENGLISH IDENTITY, CULTURE, AND SOCIALIZATION WAS TIED TO LIVING IN ENGLAND
* IF ONE DID NOT LIVE IN ENGLAND, THEY WERE CONSIDERED OUT OF THE "ENGLISH SCOIAL/CULTURAL UNIVERSE" AND TREATED AS AN "OTHER"
* THE ENGLISH WHO LIVED IN AMERICA WERE REFERRED TO AS "COLONIALS"
* HOW DID THE ENGLISH COLONISTS BECOME AMERICANS? THERE WERE FIVE INSTITUTIONS (GOVERNMENT, RELIGION, EDUCATION, FAMILY, AND THE ARTS) WHICH UNDERWENT CHANGE FOR THE COLOINISTS AWAY FROM THEIR ENGLISH ROOTS
* GOVERNMENT: PARLIAMENT-HOUSE OF LORDS CONSISTED OF MEMBERS OF HISTORIC WEALTHY POWERFUL FAMILIES WHOSE SEATS WERE PASSED DOWN IN THEIR FAMILIES
* HOUSE OF COMMONS IS THE DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTEDE HOUSE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING LAWS AND CHECKING THE WORK OF GOVERNMENT AND THE MONARCHY
* IN THE COLONIES, GOVERNMENT WAS LED BY REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLIES WHICH OPERATED UNDER THE SYSTEM SET BY PARLIAMENT WITH BICAMERAL (TWO HOUSES) OR UNICAMERAL (ONE HOUSE) LEGISLATIVE BODIES
* THE POLICYMAKERS IN ENGLAND (IN MOST CASES) HAD NEVER BEEN TO AMERICA
* RELGION-EVERYONE WENT TO THE STATE CHURCH THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND (ANGLICAN CHURCH) HEADED BY THE MONARCH
* IN THE COLONIES WERE DIFFERENT CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS, AS WELL AS, JEWS AND MUSLIMS
* IN EDUCATION, THE ENGLISH WERE EDUCATED TO AT LEAST TO BE ABLE TO READ THE BIBLE
* IN THE COLONIES, ONE WAS EDUCATED IN THE HOME AND SCHOOLS
* THE FAMILY IN ENGLAND WAS UNDER THE PRACTICE OF PATRIARCHY N (FATHER RULE)
* WIVES AND CHILDREN UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE FATHER INCLUDING THE USE OF PHYSICAL "CORRECTION"
* IN THE COLONIES, WOMEN RECEIVED SOME "FREEDOMS", PARTICULARLY AFTER THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR
* THE ARTS IN ENGLAND WERE INFLUENCED BY TRENDS IN EUROPE
* IN THE COLONIES, THE ARTS WERE A BLEND OF AFRICAN, NATIVE AMERICAN, AND EUROPEAN ART FORMS
* 10,000 MOUNTED SOLDIERS PATROLLED THE APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN REGION TO PREVENT THE COLONIST FROM GOING IN TO THE INTERIOR
* GEORGE II IS THE GRANDFATHER OF GEORGE III
* EARL OF BUTE was blamed
* 1607 FOUNDING OF JAMESTOWN AND END OF F AND I WAR/SEVEN YEARS WAR IN EUROPE 1763, THE COLONISTS HAD NO ON-GOING ENGLISH PRESENCE IN THE COLONIES
* #5, #12, AND #15 ALL POINT TO THE SUPREMACY OF PARLIAMENT
* FINGER SANDWICHES CUCUMBER AND SALMON , AS WELL AS , BISCUITS (COOKIES)
* 1845 PERFUME CREATED FOR QUEEN VICTORIA CALLED "FLEURS DE BULGARIE"BY CREED
* WOMEN IN THE COLONIES WERE KNOWN AS THE DAUGHTERS OF LIBERTY AND REFUSED TO BUY ENGLISH TEA FOR THEIR HOMES
* NEW ENGLAND COLONIES--RADICAL
* MIIDDLE AND SOUTHERN COLONIES-MODERATES
* 1845 PERFUME CREATED FOR QUEEN VICTORIA CALLED "FLEURS DE BULGARIE"BY CREED
* JEFFERSON--SUPPORTED FRANCE, ANTI-FEDERALIST, DEMOCRATIC-REPUBLICANS, AND JEFFERSONIANS
* HAMILTON---SUPPORTED ENGLAND, FEDERALISTS, FOLLOWERS WERE CALLED HAMILTONIANS

1. What are the goal of the Orders in Council and the Proclamation of 1763?—**As a result of the French and Indian War, the British government issued Orders in Council and the Proclamation of 1763. The Orders in Council placed British ships in American waters during peacetime to run down smugglers, thereby threatening highly profitable illegal trading activities. The Proclamation of 1763 denied the colonists with access to western lands with the purpose of avoiding frontier warfare with Native Americans, thereby frustrating land-hungry settlers searching for tillable farmland.**
2. What were the three goals of the Proclamation of 1763? **–(a.) Settlers were** **not to go west of the Appalachian Mountains; (b.) further purchases from Indians of land to the east of that line were prohibited; and (c.) the Indian territories west of the Proclamation line would be under the authority of the military.**
3. What type of relationship did George II have with Parliament? How did George III change it?—**The new monarch was determined to play an aggressive role in government. This decision caused considerable dismay among England’s political leaders. For decades, a powerful, though loosely associated group of men who called themselves WHIGS had set policy and controlled patronage. George II accepted this situation and so long as the Whigs in Parliament did not meddle with his beloved army, the king had let them rule the nation. In one stroke, George III (grandson of George II) destroyed this cozy relationship. He selected as his chief minister, the Earl of Bute, a Scot whose chief qualification for office appeared to be his friendship with the young king. The Whigs who dominated Parliament were outraged. Bute had no ties with the members of the House of Commons; he owed them no favors. It seemed to the Whigs that with the appointment of Bute, George was trying to turn the clock back to the time before the Glorious Revolution, in other words, attempting to reestablish a personal Stuart monarchy free from traditional constitutional restraints. The Whigs blamed for every wrong, real, or imagined. George III did not entertain such arbitrary ambitions, but his actions threw customary political practices into doubt.** EARL of BUTE
4. How did the leaving of the Earl of Bute affect the King’s ability to govern the colonies?—**By 1763 Bute, despairing of public life, left office. His departure, however, neither restored the Whigs to preeminence nor dampened the king’s enthusiasm for domestic politics. Everyone agreed George had the right to select whomever he desired for cabinet posts, but until 1770, no one seemed able to please the monarch. Ministers came and went, often for no other reason than George’s personal distaste. Because of this chronic instability, sub-ministers (minor bureaucrats who directed routine colonial affairs) did not know what was expected of them. In the absence of clear long-range policy, some ministers made narrowly based decisions; others did nothing. Most devoted their energies to finding a political patron capable of satisfying the fickle king. Talent played little part in the scramble for office. And incompetent hacks were advanced as frequently as were men of vision. With such turbulence surrounding him, the king showed little interest in the American colonies.**
5. What is parliamentary sovereignty?—**The king, however does not bear the sole responsibility for England’s loss of empire. The members of** **Parliament who actually drafted the statutes (laws) that gradually drove a wedge between the colonies and Britain must share the blame, for they failed to provide innovative answers to the explosive constitutional issues of the day. The problem was not in stupidity or even obstinacy (stubbornness), qualities found in equal measure among all peoples. In part the impasse (deadlock) resulted from sheer ignorance. Few Englishmen active in government had ever visited America. For those who attempted to follow colonial affairs, accurate information proved difficult to obtain. But failure of communication alone was not to blame for the widening gap between the colonies and England. Even when complete information was available, the two sides were often unable to understand each other’s position. The central element in this Anglo-American debate was a concept known as parliamentary sovereignty. The English ruling classes viewed the role of Parliament from a historical perspective that most colonists never shared. They insisted that Parliament was the dominant element within the constitution. Indeed, this elective body protected rights and property from an arbitrary monarch. Almost no one, including George III, would have dissented from a speech made in 1766 before the House of Commons, in which a representative declared , “The parliament hath, and must have, from the nature and essence of the constitution, has had, and ever will have a sovereign supreme power and jurisdiction over every part of the dominions of the state, to make laws in all cases whatsoever.”**
6. What is “salutary neglect?”—**The biggest role the imperial government played in colonial life through much of the colonial era was in providing military defense, primarily naval, and in Parliament’s attempts to trade for the benefit of England. The colonists often found that if they disliked a regulation, they could avoid it through ignoring it, bribing British officials, or evading enforcers. The colonies were tied to the English/British government by a loose and complex web of authority that was often only weakly asserted. Under this rule of “salutary neglect” the colonists became used to governing themselves in most matters.**
7. What happened to Native Americans as a result of Pontiac’s uprising? (hint: imperial reorganization)—**From the perspective of the Native Americans who inhabited the Ohio Valley the period following Pontiac’s uprising was a time of almost unmitigated disaster. In fact, more than any other group, the Indians suffered as a direct result of imperial reorganization. The defeat of the French (French and Indian War/Seven Years War) made it impossible for native peoples to play off one imperial power against European rivals, and the victorious British made it clear that they regarded their former Indian allies as little more than a nuisance. Diplomatic gifts stopped; humiliating restrictions were placed on trade. But even worse, Pontiac’s rising unloosed vicious racism along the colonial frontier, and American colonists often used any excuse to attack local Indians, peaceful or not. Whatever happened to the Indians, the colonists fully intended to settle the fertile region west of the Appalachian Mountains. After the issuance of the Proclamation of 1763, disappointed Americans viewed the 10,000 member British army patrolling the mountain range as an obstruction to legitimate economic development (a domestic police force that cost too much money).**
8. Who was responsible for the taxation of the colonists?—**To make sure that the settlers and Indians would not violate the Proclamation of 1763, George Grenville and his cabinet decided to station 10,000 British soldiers in North America. The problem with this idea involved the question of payment for these troops. Grenville, aware of the costs in administering the colonies, went before Parliament with plans to get the colonists to pay their fair share. Grenville consulted the colonial agents over provincial (local) interests and found that they did not have any suggestions on how to tax the colonists. He took his case before Parliament and proceeded with its assistance to levy taxes against the “colonials.”**
9. What was the purpose of the Sugar Act?—**The Sugar Act—and the acts that soon followed—redefined the relationship between America and Great Britain. Parliament now expected the colonies to generate revenue. The purpose of the Sugar Act was to discourage smuggling, bribery, and other illegalities that prevented the Navigation Acts from being profitable. Parliament reduced the duty on molasses from 6 to 3 pence per gallon. At so low a rate, Grenville reasoned, colonial merchants would have little incentive to bribe customs collectors. Much needed revenue would be diverted from the pockets of corrupt officials into the treasury so that it might be used to maintain the army.**
10. MATCHING: Acts Leading to War:

**-Sugar Act revised duties on sugar, coffee, tea, wine, other imports**

**-Stamp Act had printed documents (deeds, newspapers, marriage licenses, etc.) issued on special stamped paper purchased from stamp distributors.**

**-Currency Act prohibits colonial governments from issuing paper money.**

**-Quartering Act required colonists to supply British troops with housing, candles, firewood, etc.**

**-Townshend Revenue Acts placed new duties on glass, lead, paper, paints, and tea causing customs collection to tighten in America.**

1. Who replaced George Grenville? What did he want to do as his first order of business and how was he able to do it?—**George Grenville was replaced not because his policies were bad, but because King George III did not like him. His replacement as First Lord of the Treasury, Lord Rockingham, was young, inexperienced, and terrified of public speaking, a serious handicap to launching a brilliant parliamentary career. His followers, the Rockinghamites, envisioned a prosperous empire founded on an expanding commerce and local government under the gentle guidance of Parliament. In this unified structure, it seemed improbable that Parliament would ever be obliged to exercise control in a manner likely to offend the Americans. Rockingham wanted to repeal (void, or take back) the Stamp Act, but because of the shakiness of his own political coalition, he could not announce such a decision until it enjoyed broad national support. He, therefore, urged merchants and manufacturers throughout England to petition for repeal of the act, claiming that the American boycott would soon drive them into bankruptcy and spark urban riots.**
2. Why was the Declaratory Act passed?—**Grenville, now a member of Parliament, would tolerate no retreat on the issue of supremacy. He urged his colleagues to in the House of Commons to be tough to condemn “the outrageous tumults and insurrections which have been excited and carried on in North America.” But William Pitt, the architect of victory in the Seven Years’ War and a hero throughout America, eloquently defended the colonists’ position. After the Rockingham ministry gathered additional support from prominent figures like Benjamin Franklin (visiting England at this time), Parliament felt strong enough to recommend repeal. On March 18, 1766, the House of Commons voted 275 to 167 to rescind the Stamp Act. Lest its retreat on the Stamp Act be interpreted as weakness, the House of Commons passed the Declaratory Act (March 1766), a shrill defense of parliamentary supremacy over the Americans “in all cases whatsoever.” The colonists’ insistence on no taxation without representation failed to impress British rulers. England’s merchants, supposedly America’s allies, claimed sole responsibility for the Stamp Act repeal. The colonists had only complicated the task, the merchants lectured, and if the Americans knew what was good for them, they would keep quiet. Virginia political leader George Mason found such advice patronizing and “ridiculous!”**
3. What was Charles Townsend’s reason for taxing the colonists?—**Charles Townsend filled in for the aging William Pitt and made important policy decisions. Without thinking it through, he announced of a plan to obtain revenue from the Americans. The members of the House of Commons were so pleased with the news and promptly voted to lower English land taxes, an action that threatened fiscal chaos. A budgetary crisis forced Townsend to make good on his extraordinary boast, leading to the Townsend Revenue Acts (June-July 1767). \*He hoped to generate sufficient funds to pay the salaries of royal governors and other imperial officers, thus freeing them from dependence on the colonial assemblies. Colonists resisted and led to dissolving the colonial representative assemblies.**
4. Who was Crispus Attucks and how did he figure in the Boston Massacre?—**He was a mulatto runaway slave who was he first to die for freedom in America. He returned to Boston amid much social and political strife. He gave a speech that encouraged the citizens of Boston to fight the British soldiers in their midst. With Attucks leading them, the citizens confronted the soldiers armed with rocks, sticks, and slush/snowballs. One of the soldiers panicked and fired on the citizens, prompting more gunfire from the other soldiers. Attucks was the first to die for freedom in a country where he and his fellow Blacks were not free. Pamphleteers promptly labeled the incident a massacre. The five victims of the Boston Massacre were seen as martyrs and extravagantly memorialized. Confronted with such intense reaction and with the possibility of massive armed resistance, Crown officials wisely moved the army to an island in Boston Harbor.**
5. How did the Tea Act function and what was its ultimate goal?—**The death of Charles Townsend (1767) led to twelve years shared between his replacement, Lord North, and George III. During North’s tenure, the House of Commons repealed the Townsend duties with the notable exception of the tax on tea. The tax on tea was a reminder that England’s rulers still subscribed to the principles of the Declaratory Act to not compromise the supremacy of Parliament. The Tea Act was to save the East India Tea Company from possible bankruptcy. While the company imported Asian tea into England, the tea was subject to heavy duties to be paid by consumers, but the American tea drinkers preferred the cheaper tea smuggled in from Holland. \*The Tea Act changed the rules. Parliament not only allowed the company to sell directly to American retailers (cutting out intermediaries), but also eliminated the duties paid in England. If all had gone according to plan, the agents of the East India Company in America would have undersold their competitors, including the Dutch smugglers, and with the new profits would have saved the business.**
6. What was the purpose for convening the First Continental Congress?—**Parliament’s plan failed because the new act was seen by the colonists as taxation without representation. The act threatened to undercut powerful colonial merchants who did good business trading in smuggled Dutch tea. The colonial resistance to dealing with the East India Tea Company led to the Boston Tea Party: an act of vandalism against a company supported by Parliament. Parliament’s punishment was swift and pressed the colonies to convene the First Continental Congress. \*News of the Coercive Acts provoked an outburst of colonial activity resulting in the First Continental Congress. Gentlemen from all colonies except Georgia were in attendance, but Georgia agreed to go along with whatever decisions were made at the gathering. The core question was “how confrontational” the Congress should be. The more cautious delegates wanted to find some non-hostile means to settle differences with Britain, but the more radical delegates believed that only a well-organized resistance effort would induce home leaders to back down yet a third time.**
7. Why were the Moderates worried about British perceptions of their actions and American independence?—**The delegates created the “Association”, an intercolonial agreement to halt (stop) all commerce with Britain until Parliament repealed the Intolerable Acts. King George decided the colonists would have to be brought back under control with the use of the military enforcement. The colonists put up resistance to the annoyance of the King who professed use of the military to bring the colonists under control. \*The Moderates were concerned that British officials would misinterpret their army as a sign of aggression. The Moderates were deeply concerned about American rights, but feared independence. Like many other colonists of substantial wealth, they envisioned internal chaos in the colonies without the mobilizing influence of British rule. They also doubted whether a weak, independent American nation could long survive among aggressive European powers.**
8. What were some of the ways the British government provoked the colonists?—**The British government appeared intent on transforming colonial moderates into angry rebels. In December 1775, Parliament passed the Prohibitory Act, declaring war on American commerce. Until the colonists begged for pardon, they could not trade with the rest of the world. The British navy blockaded their ports and seized American ships on the high seas. Lord North hired German mercenaries (the Russians drove too hard a bargain) to put down the rebellion. And in America, Virginia’s royal governor Lord Dunmore further undermined the possibility of reconciliation by urging the colony’s slaves to take up arms against their masters. Few did so, but the effort to stir up Black rebellion infuriated the Virginia gentry.**
9. How many Blacks fought against the British during the American Revolutionary War? Know the place of origin of these units in the Continental Army. How many Blacks fought with the British? Where did these people relocate to after the American victory?—**For the half million African American colonists, most of them slaves, the fight for independence took on special meaning. After all, they wanted to achieve personal as well as political freedom, and many African Americans supported those who seemed most likely to deliver them from bondage. It is estimated that some five thousand African Americans took up arms to fight against the British. The Continental Army included two all-Black units, one from Massachusetts and the other from Rhode Island. In the South, especially in Georgia and South Carolina, more than ten thousand African Americans supported the British. After the Patriots (American colonists) won the war, these men and women left the United States, relocating to Nova Scotia, Florida, and Jamaica, with some eventually resettling in Africa.**
10. According to the Declaration of Independence, what was the role of government? What happens if government fails in its role to citizens? Know the three parts of the Declaration of Independence.—**The colonists were very traditional and needed a push to take on King George and his ministers in Parliament. Recent immigrant from England, Thomas Paine, provided such encouragement. His pamphlet, “Common Sense”, communicated a sense of urgency about moving toward independence. In it he attacked congressional moderates for not being bold enough to break with the past. He also denounced the British monarchy by claiming George III had surrendered his claim to the colonists’ obedience by his arbitrary behavior. \*Proceeding from the opening presentation of natural rights, the Declaration of Independence explains that government exists to ensure those rights. When a government violates those rights, the people can legitimately overthrow it and set up another that protects freedom. The three parts of the Declaration of Independence are: (a.) a preamble that states the philosophy of why the colonists should be free; (b.) twenty-seven reasons (grievances) against King George and Parliament, and (c.) the conclusion that was a formal declaration of war.**
11. By fighting the colonists in North America, how was the powerful British army placed at a disadvantage? (hint: three elements that neutralized the British advantage)—**Britain had become involved in an impossible military situation similar to that in which the United States would find itself in Vietnam some two hundred years later. \*Three separate elements neutralized advantages held by the larger power over its adversary. First, the British had to transport men and supplies across the Atlantic, a logistic challenge of unprecedented complexity. Second, America was too vast to be conquered by conventional military methods. And third, British strategists never appreciated the depth of the Americans’ commitment to a political ideology.**
12. Why did the French help the American colonists? How did they accomplish this mission?—**Even before the Americans declared their independence, agents of the government of Louis XVI began to explore ways to aid the colonists, not so much because the French monarchy favored the republican cause but because it hoped to embarrass the English. The French deeply resented the defeat they had sustained during the Seven Years’ War. During the early months of the Revolution, the French covertly sent tons of essential military supplies to the Americans. The negotiations for these arms involved secret agents and fictitious trading companies. But when American representatives, Benjamin Franklin for one, pleaded for official recognition of American independence or for outright military alliance, the French advised patience. The international stakes were too great for the king to openly back a cause that had little chance of success. French intervention instantly transformed British military strategy. What had been a colonial rebellion suddenly became a world conflict, a continuation of the great wars for empire of the late seventeenth century.**
13. Know the terms of the peace agreement of September 3, 1783.—**The Treaty of Amity and Commerce and the treaty of Alliance were public displays of French assistance to the American colonists. The Treaty of Amity and Commerce recognized American independence and encouraged the development of close trading ties. The Treaty of Alliance was an entangling agreement binding the young U.S. and France as “good and faithful” allies in the event of military hostilities. \*The preliminary agreement signed on September 3, 1783, not only guaranteed the independence of the United States; it also transferred all the territory east of the Mississippi River, except Spanish Florida, to the new republic. The treaty established generous boundaries on the north and south and gave the Americans important fishing rights in the North Atlantic. In exchange, Congress promised to help British merchants collect debt contracted before the Revolution and compensate Loyalists whose lands had been confiscated by the various state governments. Even though the Americans negotiated separately with the British, they did not sign a separate peace. The preliminary treaty did not become effective until France reached its own agreement with Great Britain. In this manner did the Americans honor the French alliance.**
14. What did the Articles of Confederation do for the young republic?—**The Articles of Confederation became the first national constitution. It provided for a loose confederation in which each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, as well as, all powers and rights not “expressly delegated” to the U.S. The Congress could: make war and agree to peace; assess the states to contribute men and funds to a national army, makes treaties and agreements; borrow money; set up an interstate post office; settle disputes between the states and limit state boundaries, and admit new states. \*Why were the Articles of Confederation not ratified until 1781?—Because of disputes over western lands, the Articles of Confederation were not ratified by all the states until 1781.**
15. What was the Confederation’s weakness and why?—**The Confederation’s weakness stemmed primarily from its limited fiscal (financial matters) powers. Lacking the authority to impose taxes, the Congress had to requisition funds from the state legislatures and hope they would pay which they usually failed to do.**
16. What did Shay’s rebellion demonstrate about the growing pains of the new republic?—**The lack of debtor-relief legislation in Massachusetts provoked the first armed uprising in the new nation. Merchants and creditors had persuaded the legislature to impose taxes to repay the state’s war debt rather than to issue more paper currency. When cash-strapped formers could not pay their debts, creditors hauled them into court, saddling them with high legal fees. In 1786, residents of the central and western counties called meeting to protest the taxes and property seizures, and bands of angry farmers closed the courts by force. The resistance grew into a full-scale revolt led by the former Continental army captain Daniel Shays.\* The collapsed rebellion provided graphic proof that the costs of war and the fruits of independence were not shared evenly. Many of those who had suffered while fighting for independence felt they had exchanged one tyranny for another.**
17. Who were the nationalists and how were they affected by Shay’s Rebellion—**The nationalists were a group of leaders who favored replacing the Articles of Confederation with a stronger national government.** **Nationalists throughout the United States were not so forgiving. From their perspective, Shay’s Rebellion symbolized the breakdown of law and order that they had long predicted. The time had come for sensible people to speak up for a strong national government. The unrest in Massachusetts persuaded persons who might otherwise have ignored the Philadelphia meeting to participate in drafting a new constitution.**
18. What type of men made up the delegation to the Philadelphia Convention of 1787? Know the two procedural decisions made by James Madison and the other nationalists.—**In the spring of 1787, fifty-five men representing twelve states traveled to Philadelphia. Rhode Island refused to take part in the proceedings. However much modern Americans revere the Constitution, they should remember that the individuals who wrote it did not possess divine insight into the nature of government. They were practical people—lawyers, merchants, and planters—many of whom had fought in the Revolution and served in the Congress of the Confederation. The majority were in their thirties and forties. As soon as the Constitutional Convention opened on May 25, the delegates made several procedural decisions of the utmost importance. First, they noted “that nothing in the House be printed, or communicated without leave.” In a second procedural move, the delegates decided to vote by state, but, in order to avoid the kinds of problems that had plagued the Confederation, they ruled that key proposals needed the support of only a majority instead of the nine states required under the Articles.**
19. How did southern delegates attending the Philadelphia Convention get around the use of the word “slave” in the Constitution?—**The delegates seemed embarrassed to call the institution by its true name, and in the Constitution itself, slaves were described as “other persons,” “such persons,” “persons held to Service or Labour,” in other words, as everything but slaves.**
20. How would the President be elected and why? How was the position of Vice-President determined? What happened if no one person received a majority of the vote?—**During these sessions, the members of the convention concluded that the president, as they now called the executive, should be selected by an electoral college, a body of prominent men in each state chosen by local voters. The number of “electoral” votes held by each state equaled its number of representatives. This awkward device guaranteed that the president would not be indebted to the Congress for his office. Whoever received the second largest number of votes in the electoral college automatically became vice-president. In the event that no person received a majority of the votes, the election would be decided by the lower house—the House of Representatives—with each state casting a single vote.**
21. Know the two privileges the chief executive received from the delegates.—**Delegates also armed the chief executive with veto power over legislation, as well as the right to nominate judges. Both privileges would have been unthinkable a decade earlier, but the state experiments revealed the importance of having an independent executive to maintain a balanced system of republican government.**
22. The delegates who signed the Constitution of 1787 knew there would be significant opposition because their plan cut so heavily into state authority. They agreed that only nine states would be needed to ratify the Constitution—through special state conventions rather than through state legislatures –to allow the new central government to commence operations.—Who were the Federalists?—**Supporters of the Constitution (nationalists) took on the name of “Federalists” suggesting they stood for a confederation of states rather than the creation of a strong centralized national government capable of fielding a formidable army**.—Who were the Anti-federalists?—**Anti-federalists were critics of the Constitution who tended to be somewhat poorer, less urban (rural), and less well-educated than their opponents. They wanted to continue the confederation of sovereign states.**
23. How did the nationalists help the effort to ratify the Constitution?—**The nationalists were also very effective in explaining the Convention’s work. The essence of their argumentation appeared in The Federalist Papers, a series of 85 remarkably cogent newspaper essays written by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay on behalf of ratification in New York. They discussed various aspects of the Constitution and tried to demonstrate how the document would ensure political stability and provide enlightened legislation.**
24. How did the Bill of Rights help with the acceptance of the passage of the Constitution?—**To strengthen popular support for the new government, Congress also approved a Bill of Rights in the form of ten amendments to the Constitution. These first amendments guaranteed the rights of free press, free speech, and free exercise of religion; the right to peaceful assembly; and the right to petition government. The Bill of Rights also ensured that the national government could not infringe on the right to trial by jury. In an effort to reassure Anti-federalists that the powers of the new government were limited, the tenth amendment “reserved to the states respectively, or to the people” all powers not specified in the Constitution.**
25. How did the French Revolution affect American foreign policy? (hint: neutrality)—**More cautious observers of the French Revolution expressed horror at the cataclysm sweeping France. They feared that the Revolution was not merely a rebellion against royal authority, but a mass assault against property and Christianity. Conservatives urged Washington to support England in its war against France. Washington believed that involvement in the European war would weaken the new nation before it firmly established its own independence. He took the position that while the U.S. should continue to make payments on its war debts to France, it should refrain from directly supporting the new French republic. In April 1793 Washington issued a proclamation of neutrality.**
26. How did the Citizen Genet Affair affect the relationship of Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton?—**The Citizen Genet Affair caused an even bigger rift between Jefferson and Hamilton. Hamilton suspected that the Democratic-Republican clubs existed to stir up grass-roots opposition to the Washington administration. Jefferson hotly denied these accusations. Hamilton encouraged Washington’s position of neutrality, while Jefferson reminded the President of America’s obligation to honor the treaty agreement made with France during the American Revolution. Their views and conflict divided their supporters (Jeffersonians and Hamiltonians).**
27. What happened to Native Americans after the American Revolution?—**The end of the American Revolution unleashed a mad rush of white settlers into frontier Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, and western New York. To allow whites to occupy land in central Georgia, the U.S. bribed a Creek leader, Alexander McGilvray, to sign a peace treaty in 1790. In New York, following the Revolution, large-scale land acquisitions by whites forced Native Americans to migrate or to settle on small, impoverished, and unproductive reservations. In Kentucky and Tennessee, clashes between Cherokees, Chickasaws, Shawnees, and frontier settlers between 1784 and 1790 left some 1500 whites dead or captured, but ultimately warfare forced many Native Americans to migrate north of the Ohio River.**
28. What is the Jay Treaty and why was it controversial?—**The Jay Treaty was an attempt to rid America of the British presence as promised in the treaty ending the Revolution. Chief Justice John Jay went to London to seek a negotiated settlement with the British. Jay persuaded Britain to evacuate its forts on American soil. He also got the British negotiators to agree to cease harassing American shipping (provided the ships did not carry contraband to Britain’s enemies). In addition, Britain agreed to pay damages for the ships it had seized and to permit the U.S. to trade with India and to carry on restricted trade with the British West Indies. But Jay failed to win concessions on a host of other American grievances. The treaty said nothing at all about British incitement of Native Americans, British searching of American ships for escaping deserters, or compensation for slaves carried off by the British during the Revolution.**
29. What was the XYZ Affair?—**France was upset over the Jay Treaty which they felt favored Britain and their American ally, Thomas Jefferson, did not become President. France suspended diplomatic relations with the U.S. in 1796 and began to attack American merchant ships. To settle this dispute with France regarding American shipping interests, President John Adams sent three commissioners to France to meet with foreign minister, Charles Maurice Talleyrand. The three emissaries of the French minister (identified as X, Y, and Z) informed the Americans that they only way they could see Talleyrand was by paying them $250,000 and providing a $10,000,000 loan to France. The American refused and anti-French sentiment engulfed the country. In 1798, the U.S. and France fought an undeclared naval war (known as the Quasi-War).**
30. What was the purpose of the Alien and Sedition Acts?—**During the quasi-war, President Adams and his fellow Federalists in Congress attempted to suppress political opposition and sympathy for revolutionary France by passing the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. The Naturalization Act lengthened the time immigrants became citizens from 5 to 14 years. The Alien Act gave the President the power to imprison or deport any foreigner believed to be dangerous to the United States. The Alien Enemies Act allows the President to deport enemy aliens in time of war. The Sedition Act made it a crime to attack the government with false, scandalous, or malicious statements or writings.**