=The Significance of Land Tenure.=--The way in which land may be

acquired, held, divided among heirs, and bought and sold exercises a

deep influence on the life and culture of a people. The feudal and

aristocratic societies of Europe were founded on a system of landlordism

which was characterized by two distinct features. In the first place,

the land was nearly all held in great estates, each owned by a single

proprietor. In the second place, every estate was kept intact under the

law of primogeniture, which at the death of a lord transferred all his

landed property to his eldest son. This prevented the subdivision of

estates and the growth of a large body of small farmers or freeholders

owning their own land. It made a form of tenantry or servitude

inevitable for the mass of those who labored on the land. It also

enabled the landlords to maintain themselves in power as a governing

class and kept the tenants and laborers subject to their economic and

political control. If land tenure was so significant in Europe, it was

equally important in the development of America, where practically all

the first immigrants were forced by circumstances to derive their

livelihood from the soil.

=Experiments in Common Tillage.=--In the New World, with its broad

extent of land awaiting the white man's plow, it was impossible to

introduce in its entirety and over the whole area the system of lords

and tenants that existed across the sea. So it happened that almost

every kind of experiment in land tenure, from communism to feudalism,

was tried. In the early days of the Jamestown colony, the land, though

owned by the London Company, was tilled in common by the settlers. No

man had a separate plot of his own. The motto of the community was:

"Labor and share alike." All were supposed to work in the fields and

receive an equal share of the produce. At Plymouth, the Pilgrims

attempted a similar experiment, laying out the fields in common and

distributing the joint produce of their labor with rough equality among

the workers.

In both colonies the communistic experiments were failures. Angry at the

lazy men in Jamestown who idled their time away and yet expected regular

meals, Captain John Smith issued a manifesto: "Everyone that gathereth

not every day as much as I do, the next day shall be set beyond the

river and forever banished from the fort and live there or starve." Even

this terrible threat did not bring a change in production. Not until

each man was given a plot of his own to till, not until each gathered

the fruits of his own labor, did the colony prosper. In Plymouth, where

the communal experiment lasted for five years, the results were similar

to those in Virginia, and the system was given up for one of separate

fields in which every person could "set corn for his own particular."

Some other New England towns, refusing to profit by the experience of

their Plymouth neighbor, also made excursions into common ownership and

labor, only to abandon the idea and go in for individual ownership of

the land. "By degrees it was seen that even the Lord's people could not

carry the complicated communist legislation into perfect and wholesome

practice."

=Feudal Elements in the Colonies--Quit Rents, Manors, and

Plantations.=--At the other end of the scale were the feudal elements of

land tenure found in the proprietary colonies, in the seaboard regions

of the South, and to some extent in New York. The proprietor was in fact

a powerful feudal lord, owning land granted to him by royal charter. He

could retain any part of it for his personal use or dispose of it all in

large or small lots. While he generally kept for himself an estate of

baronial proportions, it was impossible for him to manage directly any

considerable part of the land in his dominion. Consequently he either

sold it in parcels for lump sums or granted it to individuals on

condition that they make to him an annual payment in money, known as

"quit rent." In Maryland, the proprietor sometimes collected as high as

$9000 (equal to about $500,000 to-day) in a single year from this

source. In Pennsylvania, the quit rents brought a handsome annual

tribute into the exchequer of the Penn family. In the royal provinces,

the king of England claimed all revenues collected in this form from the

land, a sum amounting to $19,000 at the time of the Revolution. The quit

rent,--"really a feudal payment from freeholders,"--was thus a material

source of income for the crown as well as for the proprietors. Wherever

it was laid, however, it proved to be a burden, a source of constant

irritation; and it became a formidable item in the long list of

grievances which led to the American Revolution.

Something still more like the feudal system of the Old World appeared in

the numerous manors or the huge landed estates granted by the crown, the

companies, or the proprietors. In the colony of Maryland alone there

were sixty manors of three thousand acres each, owned by wealthy men and

tilled by tenants holding small plots under certain restrictions of

tenure. In New York also there were many manors of wide extent, most of

which originated in the days of the Dutch West India Company, when

extensive concessions were made to patroons to induce them to bring over

settlers. The Van Rensselaer, the Van Cortlandt, and the Livingston

manors were so large and populous that each was entitled to send a

representative to the provincial legislature. The tenants on the New

York manors were in somewhat the same position as serfs on old European

estates. They were bound to pay the owner a rent in money and kind; they

ground their grain at his mill; and they were subject to his judicial

power because he held court and meted out justice, in some instances

extending to capital punishment.

The manors of New York or Maryland were, however, of slight consequence

as compared with the vast plantations of the Southern seaboard--huge

estates, far wider in expanse than many a European barony and tilled by

slaves more servile than any feudal tenants. It must not be forgotten

that this system of land tenure became the dominant feature of a large

section and gave a decided bent to the economic and political life of

America.
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=The Small Freehold.=--In the upland regions of the South, however, and

throughout most of the North, the drift was against all forms of

servitude and tenantry and in the direction of the freehold; that is,

the small farm owned outright and tilled by the possessor and his

family. This was favored by natural circumstances and the spirit of the

immigrants. For one thing, the abundance of land and the scarcity of

labor made it impossible for the companies, the proprietors, or the

crown to develop over the whole continent a network of vast estates. In

many sections, particularly in New England, the climate, the stony soil,

the hills, and the narrow valleys conspired to keep the farms within a

moderate compass. For another thing, the English, Scotch-Irish, and

German peasants, even if they had been tenants in the Old World, did not

propose to accept permanent dependency of any kind in the New. If they

could not get freeholds, they would not settle at all; thus they forced

proprietors and companies to bid for their enterprise by selling land in

small lots. So it happened that the freehold of modest proportions

became the cherished unit of American farmers. The people who tilled the

farms were drawn from every quarter of western Europe; but the freehold

system gave a uniform cast to their economic and social life in America.
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=Social Effects of Land Tenure.=--Land tenure and the process of western

settlement thus developed two distinct types of people engaged in the

same pursuit--agriculture. They had a common tie in that they both

cultivated the soil and possessed the local interest and independence

which arise from that occupation. Their methods and their culture,

however, differed widely.

The Southern planter, on his broad acres tilled by slaves, resembled the

English landlord on his estates more than he did the colonial farmer who

labored with his own hands in the fields and forests. He sold his rice

and tobacco in large amounts directly to English factors, who took his

entire crop in exchange for goods and cash. His fine clothes,

silverware, china, and cutlery he bought in English markets. Loving the

ripe old culture of the mother country, he often sent his sons to Oxford

or Cambridge for their education. In short, he depended very largely for

his prosperity and his enjoyment of life upon close relations with the

Old World. He did not even need market towns in which to buy native

goods, for they were made on his own plantation by his own artisans who

were usually gifted slaves.

The economic condition of the small farmer was totally different. His

crops were not big enough to warrant direct connection with English

factors or the personal maintenance of a corps of artisans. He needed

local markets, and they sprang up to meet the need. Smiths, hatters,

weavers, wagon-makers, and potters at neighboring towns supplied him

with the rough products of their native skill. The finer goods, bought

by the rich planter in England, the small farmer ordinarily could not

buy. His wants were restricted to staples like tea and sugar, and

between him and the European market stood the merchant. His community

was therefore more self-sufficient than the seaboard line of great

plantations. It was more isolated, more provincial, more independent,

more American. The planter faced the Old East. The farmer faced the New

West.

=The Westward Movement.=--Yeoman and planter nevertheless were alike in

one respect. Their land hunger was never appeased. Each had the eye of

an expert for new and fertile soil; and so, north and south, as soon as

a foothold was secured on the Atlantic coast, the current of migration

set in westward, creeping through forests, across rivers, and over

mountains. Many of the later immigrants, in their search for cheap

lands, were compelled to go to the border; but in a large part the path

breakers to the West were native Americans of the second and third

generations. Explorers, fired by curiosity and the lure of the

mysterious unknown, and hunters, fur traders, and squatters, following

their own sweet wills, blazed the trail, opening paths and sending back

stories of the new regions they traversed. Then came the regular

settlers with lawful titles to the lands they had purchased, sometimes

singly and sometimes in companies.

In Massachusetts, the westward movement is recorded in the founding of

Springfield in 1636 and Great Barrington in 1725. By the opening of the

eighteenth century the pioneers of Connecticut had pushed north and west

until their outpost towns adjoined the Hudson Valley settlements. In New

York, the inland movement was directed by the Hudson River to Albany,

and from that old Dutch center it radiated in every direction,

particularly westward through the Mohawk Valley. New Jersey was early

filled to its borders, the beginnings of the present city of New

Brunswick being made in 1681 and those of Trenton in 1685. In

Pennsylvania, as in New York, the waterways determined the main lines of

advance. Pioneers, pushing up through the valley of the Schuylkill,

spread over the fertile lands of Berks and Lancaster counties, laying

out Reading in 1748. Another current of migration was directed by the

Susquehanna, and, in 1726, the first farmhouse was built on the bank

where Harrisburg was later founded. Along the southern tier of counties

a thin line of settlements stretched westward to Pittsburgh, reaching

the upper waters of the Ohio while the colony was still under the Penn

family.

In the South the westward march was equally swift. The seaboard was

quickly occupied by large planters and their slaves engaged in the

cultivation of tobacco and rice. The Piedmont Plateau, lying back from

the coast all the way from Maryland to Georgia, was fed by two streams

of migration, one westward from the sea and the other southward from the

other colonies--Germans from Pennsylvania and Scotch-Irish furnishing

the main supply. "By 1770, tide-water Virginia was full to overflowing

and the 'back country' of the Blue Ridge and the Shenandoah was fully

occupied. Even the mountain valleys ... were claimed by sturdy pioneers.

Before the Declaration of Independence, the oncoming tide of

home-seekers had reached the crest of the Alleghanies."
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Beyond the mountains pioneers had already ventured, harbingers of an

invasion that was about to break in upon Kentucky and Tennessee. As

early as 1769 that mighty Nimrod, Daniel Boone, curious to hunt

buffaloes, of which he had heard weird reports, passed through the

Cumberland Gap and brought back news of a wonderful country awaiting the

plow. A hint was sufficient. Singly, in pairs, and in groups, settlers

followed the trail he had blazed. A great land corporation, the

Transylvania Company, emulating the merchant adventurers of earlier

times, secured a huge grant of territory and sought profits in quit

rents from lands sold to farmers. By the outbreak of the Revolution

there were several hundred people in the Kentucky region. Like the older

colonists, they did not relish quit rents, and their opposition wrecked

the Transylvania Company. They even carried their protests into the

Continental Congress in 1776, for by that time they were our "embryo

fourteenth colony."

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Though the labor of the colonists was mainly spent in farming, there was

a steady growth in industrial and commercial pursuits. Most of the

staple industries of to-day, not omitting iron and textiles, have their

beginnings in colonial times. Manufacturing and trade soon gave rise to

towns which enjoyed an importance all out of proportion to their

numbers. The great centers of commerce and finance on the seaboard

originated in the days when the king of England was "lord of these

dominions."
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=Textile Manufacture as a Domestic Industry.=--Colonial women, in

addition to sharing every hardship of pioneering, often the heavy labor

of the open field, developed in the course of time a national industry

which was almost exclusively their own. Wool and flax were raised in

abundance in the North and South. "Every farm house," says Coman, the

economic historian, "was a workshop where the women spun and wove the

serges, kerseys, and linsey-woolseys which served for the common wear."

By the close of the seventeenth century, New England manufactured cloth

in sufficient quantities to export it to the Southern colonies and to

the West Indies. As the industry developed, mills were erected for the

more difficult process of dyeing, weaving, and fulling, but carding and

spinning continued to be done in the home. The Dutch of New Netherland,

the Swedes of Delaware, and the Scotch-Irish of the interior "were not

one whit behind their Yankee neighbors."

The importance of this enterprise to British economic life can hardly be

overestimated. For many a century the English had employed their fine

woolen cloth as the chief staple in a lucrative foreign trade, and the

government had come to look upon it as an object of special interest and

protection. When the colonies were established, both merchants and

statesmen naturally expected to maintain a monopoly of increasing value;

but before long the Americans, instead of buying cloth, especially of

the coarser varieties, were making it to sell. In the place of

customers, here were rivals. In the place of helpless reliance upon

English markets, here was the germ of economic independence.

If British merchants had not discovered it in the ordinary course of

trade, observant officers in the provinces would have conveyed the news

to them. Even in the early years of the eighteenth century the royal

governor of New York wrote of the industrious Americans to his home

government: "The consequence will be that if they can clothe themselves

once, not only comfortably, but handsomely too, without the help of

England, they who already are not very fond of submitting to government

will soon think of putting in execution designs they have long harboured

in their breasts. This will not seem strange when you consider what sort

of people this country is inhabited by."

=The Iron Industry.=--Almost equally widespread was the art of iron

working--one of the earliest and most picturesque of colonial

industries. Lynn, Massachusetts, had a forge and skilled artisans within

fifteen years after the founding of Boston. The smelting of iron began

at New London and New Haven about 1658; in Litchfield county,

Connecticut, a few years later; at Great Barrington, Massachusetts, in

1731; and near by at Lenox some thirty years after that. New Jersey had

iron works at Shrewsbury within ten years after the founding of the

colony in 1665. Iron forges appeared in the valleys of the Delaware and

the Susquehanna early in the following century, and iron masters then

laid the foundations of fortunes in a region destined to become one of

the great iron centers of the world. Virginia began iron working in the

year that saw the introduction of slavery. Although the industry soon

lapsed, it was renewed and flourished in the eighteenth century.

Governor Spotswood was called the "Tubal Cain" of the Old Dominion

because he placed the industry on a firm foundation. Indeed it seems

that every colony, except Georgia, had its iron foundry. Nails, wire,

metallic ware, chains, anchors, bar and pig iron were made in large

quantities; and Great Britain, by an act in 1750, encouraged the

colonists to export rough iron to the British Islands.

=Shipbuilding.=--Of all the specialized industries in the colonies,

shipbuilding was the most important. The abundance of fir for masts, oak

for timbers and boards, pitch for tar and turpentine, and hemp for rope

made the way of the shipbuilder easy. Early in the seventeenth century a

ship was built at New Amsterdam, and by the middle of that century

shipyards were scattered along the New England coast at Newburyport,

Salem, New Bedford, Newport, Providence, New London, and New Haven.

Yards at Albany and Poughkeepsie in New York built ships for the trade

of that colony with England and the Indies. Wilmington and Philadelphia

soon entered the race and outdistanced New York, though unable to equal

the pace set by New England. While Maryland, Virginia, and South

Carolina also built ships, Southern interest was mainly confined to the

lucrative business of producing ship materials: fir, cedar, hemp, and

tar.

=Fishing.=--The greatest single economic resource of New England outside

of agriculture was the fisheries. This industry, started by hardy

sailors from Europe, long before the landing of the Pilgrims, flourished

under the indomitable seamanship of the Puritans, who labored with the

net and the harpoon in almost every quarter of the Atlantic. "Look,"

exclaimed Edmund Burke, in the House of Commons, "at the manner in

which the people of New England have of late carried on the whale

fishery. Whilst we follow them among the tumbling mountains of ice and

behold them penetrating into the deepest frozen recesses of Hudson's Bay

and Davis's Straits, while we are looking for them beneath the arctic

circle, we hear that they have pierced into the opposite region of polar

cold, that they are at the antipodes and engaged under the frozen

serpent of the south.... Nor is the equinoctial heat more discouraging

to them than the accumulated winter of both poles. We know that, whilst

some of them draw the line and strike the harpoon on the coast of

Africa, others run the longitude and pursue their gigantic game along

the coast of Brazil. No sea but what is vexed by their fisheries. No

climate that is not witness to their toils. Neither the perseverance of

Holland nor the activity of France nor the dexterous and firm sagacity

of English enterprise ever carried this most perilous mode of hard

industry to the extent to which it has been pushed by this recent

people."

The influence of the business was widespread. A large and lucrative

European trade was built upon it. The better quality of the fish caught

for food was sold in the markets of Spain, Portugal, and Italy, or

exchanged for salt, lemons, and raisins for the American market. The

lower grades of fish were carried to the West Indies for slave

consumption, and in part traded for sugar and molasses, which furnished

the raw materials for the thriving rum industry of New England. These

activities, in turn, stimulated shipbuilding, steadily enlarging the

demand for fishing and merchant craft of every kind and thus keeping the

shipwrights, calkers, rope makers, and other artisans of the seaport

towns rushed with work. They also increased trade with the mother

country for, out of the cash collected in the fish markets of Europe and

the West Indies, the colonists paid for English manufactures. So an

ever-widening circle of American enterprise centered around this single

industry, the nursery of seamanship and the maritime spirit.

=Oceanic Commerce and American Merchants.=--All through the eighteenth

century, the commerce of the American colonies spread in every direction

until it rivaled in the number of people employed, the capital engaged,

and the profits gleaned, the commerce of European nations. A modern

historian has said: "The enterprising merchants of New England developed

a network of trade routes that covered well-nigh half the world." This

commerce, destined to be of such significance in the conflict with the

mother country, presented, broadly speaking, two aspects.

On the one side, it involved the export of raw materials and

agricultural produce. The Southern colonies produced for shipping,

tobacco, rice, tar, pitch, and pine; the Middle colonies, grain, flour,

furs, lumber, and salt pork; New England, fish, flour, rum, furs, shoes,

and small articles of manufacture. The variety of products was in fact

astounding. A sarcastic writer, while sneering at the idea of an

American union, once remarked of colonial trade: "What sort of dish will

you make? New England will throw in fish and onions. The middle states,

flax-seed and flour. Maryland and Virginia will add tobacco. North

Carolina, pitch, tar, and turpentine. South Carolina, rice and indigo,

and Georgia will sprinkle the whole composition with sawdust. Such an

absurd jumble will you make if you attempt to form a union among such

discordant materials as the thirteen British provinces."

On the other side, American commerce involved the import trade,

consisting principally of English and continental manufactures, tea, and

"India goods." Sugar and molasses, brought from the West Indies,

supplied the flourishing distilleries of Massachusetts, Rhode Island,

and Connecticut. The carriage of slaves from Africa to the Southern

colonies engaged hundreds of New England's sailors and thousands of

pounds of her capital.

The disposition of imported goods in the colonies, though in part

controlled by English factors located in America, employed also a large

and important body of American merchants like the Willings and Morrises

of Philadelphia; the Amorys, Hancocks, and Faneuils of Boston; and the

Livingstons and Lows of New York. In their zeal and enterprise, they

were worthy rivals of their English competitors, so celebrated for

world-wide commercial operations. Though fully aware of the advantages

they enjoyed in British markets and under the protection of the British

navy, the American merchants were high-spirited and mettlesome, ready to

contend with royal officers in order to shield American interests

against outside interference.
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Measured against the immense business of modern times, colonial commerce

seems perhaps trivial. That, however, is not the test of its

significance. It must be considered in relation to the growth of English

colonial trade in its entirety--a relation which can be shown by a few

startling figures. The whole export trade of England, including that to

the colonies, was, in 1704, $6,509,000. On the eve of the American

Revolution, namely, in 1772, English exports to the American colonies

alone amounted to $6,024,000; in other words, almost as much as the

whole foreign business of England two generations before. At the first

date, colonial trade was but one-twelfth of the English export business;

at the second date, it was considerably more than one-third. In 1704,

Pennsylvania bought in English markets goods to the value of $11,459; in

1772 the purchases of the same colony amounted to $507,909. In short,

Pennsylvania imports increased fifty times within sixty-eight years,

amounting in 1772 to almost the entire export trade of England to the

colonies at the opening of the century. The American colonies were

indeed a great source of wealth to English merchants.

=Intercolonial Commerce.=--Although the bad roads of colonial times made

overland transportation difficult and costly, the many rivers and

harbors along the coast favored a lively water-borne trade among the

colonies. The Connecticut, Hudson, Delaware, and Susquehanna rivers in

the North and the many smaller rivers in the South made it possible for

goods to be brought from, and carried to, the interior regions in little

sailing vessels with comparative ease. Sloops laden with manufactures,

domestic and foreign, collected at some city like Providence, New York,

or Philadelphia, skirted the coasts, visited small ports, and sailed up

the navigable rivers to trade with local merchants who had for exchange

the raw materials which they had gathered in from neighboring farms.

Larger ships carried the grain, live stock, cloth, and hardware of New

England to the Southern colonies, where they were traded for tobacco,

leather, tar, and ship timber. From the harbors along the Connecticut

shores there were frequent sailings down through Long Island Sound to

Maryland, Virginia, and the distant Carolinas.

=Growth of Towns.=--In connection with this thriving trade and industry

there grew up along the coast a number of prosperous commercial centers

which were soon reckoned among the first commercial towns of the whole

British empire, comparing favorably in numbers and wealth with such

ports as Liverpool and Bristol. The statistical records of that time are

mainly guesses; but we know that Philadelphia stood first in size among

these towns. Serving as the port of entry for Pennsylvania, Delaware,

and western Jersey, it had drawn within its borders, just before the

Revolution, about 25,000 inhabitants. Boston was second in rank, with

somewhat more than 20,000 people. New York, the "commercial capital of

Connecticut and old East Jersey," was slightly smaller than Boston, but

growing at a steady rate. The fourth town in size was Charleston, South

Carolina, with about 10,000 inhabitants. Newport in Rhode Island, a

center of rum manufacture and shipping, stood fifth, with a population

of about 7000. Baltimore and Norfolk were counted as "considerable

towns." In the interior, Hartford in Connecticut, Lancaster and York in

Pennsylvania, and Albany in New York, with growing populations and

increasing trade, gave prophecy of an urban America away from the

seaboard. The other towns were straggling villages. Williamsburg,

Virginia, for example, had about two hundred houses, in which dwelt a

dozen families of the gentry and a few score of tradesmen. Inland county

seats often consisted of nothing more than a log courthouse, a prison,

and one wretched inn to house judges, lawyers, and litigants during the

sessions of the court.

The leading towns exercised an influence on colonial opinion all out of

proportion to their population. They were the centers of wealth, for one

thing; of the press and political activity, for another. Merchants and

artisans could readily take concerted action on public questions arising

from their commercial operations. The towns were also centers for news,

gossip, religious controversy, and political discussion. In the market

places the farmers from the countryside learned of British policies and

laws, and so, mingling with the townsmen, were drawn into the main

currents of opinion which set in toward colonial nationalism and

independence.
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=Questions=

1. Is land in your community parceled out into small farms? Contrast the

system in your community with the feudal system of land tenure.

2. Are any things owned and used in common in your community? Why did

common tillage fail in colonial times?

3. Describe the elements akin to feudalism which were introduced in the

colonies.

4. Explain the success of freehold tillage.

5. Compare the life of the planter with that of the farmer.

6. How far had the western frontier advanced by 1776?

7. What colonial industry was mainly developed by women? Why was it very

important both to the Americans and to the English?

8. What were the centers for iron working? Ship building?

9. Explain how the fisheries affected many branches of trade and

industry.

10. Show how American trade formed a vital part of English business.

11. How was interstate commerce mainly carried on?

12. What were the leading towns? Did they compare in importance with

British towns of the same period?
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Chapter III

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PROGRESS

Colonial life, crowded as it was with hard and unremitting toil, left

scant leisure for the cultivation of the arts and sciences. There was

little money in private purses or public treasuries to be dedicated to

schools, libraries, and museums. Few there were with time to read long

and widely, and fewer still who could devote their lives to things that

delight the eye and the mind. And yet, poor and meager as the

intellectual life of the colonists may seem by way of comparison, heroic

efforts were made in every community to lift the people above the plane

of mere existence. After the first clearings were opened in the forests

those efforts were redoubled, and with lengthening years told upon the

thought and spirit of the land. The appearance, during the struggle with

England, of an extraordinary group of leaders familiar with history,

political philosophy, and the arts of war, government, and diplomacy

itself bore eloquent testimony to the high quality of the American

intellect. No one, not even the most critical, can run through the

writings of distinguished Americans scattered from Massachusetts to

Georgia--the Adamses, Ellsworth, the Morrises, the Livingstons,

Hamilton, Franklin, Washington, Madison, Marshall, Henry, the Randolphs,

and the Pinckneys--without coming to the conclusion that there was

something in American colonial life which fostered minds of depth and

power. Women surmounted even greater difficulties than the men in the

process of self-education, and their keen interest in public issues is

evident in many a record like the \_Letters\_ of Mrs. John Adams to her

husband during the Revolution; the writings of Mrs. Mercy Otis Warren,

the sister of James Otis, who measured her pen with the British

propagandists; and the patriot newspapers founded and managed by women.

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHURCHES

In the intellectual life of America, the churches assumed a role of high

importance. There were abundant reasons for this. In many of the

colonies--Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New England--the religious impulse

had been one of the impelling motives in stimulating immigration. In all

the colonies, the clergy, at least in the beginning, formed the only

class with any leisure to devote to matters of the spirit. They preached

on Sundays and taught school on week days. They led in the discussion of

local problems and in the formation of political opinion, so much of

which was concerned with the relation between church and state. They

wrote books and pamphlets. They filled most of the chairs in the

colleges; under clerical guidance, intellectual and spiritual, the

Americans received their formal education. In several of the provinces

the Anglican Church was established by law. In New England the Puritans

were supreme, notwithstanding the efforts of the crown to overbear their

authority. In the Middle colonies, particularly, the multiplication of

sects made the dominance of any single denomination impossible; and in

all of them there was a growing diversity of faith, which promised in

time a separation of church and state and freedom of opinion.

=The Church of England.=--Virginia was the stronghold of the English

system of church and state. The Anglican faith and worship were

prescribed by law, sustained by taxes imposed on all, and favored by the

governor, the provincial councilors, and the richest planters. "The

Established Church," says Lodge, "was one of the appendages of the

Virginia aristocracy. They controlled the vestries and the ministers,

and the parish church stood not infrequently on the estate of the

planter who built and managed it." As in England, Catholics and

Protestant Dissenters were at first laid under heavy disabilities. Only

slowly and on sufferance were they admitted to the province; but when

once they were even covertly tolerated, they pressed steadily in, until,

by the Revolution, they outnumbered the adherents of the established

order.

The Church was also sanctioned by law and supported by taxes in the

Carolinas after 1704, and in Georgia after that colony passed directly

under the crown in 1754--this in spite of the fact that the majority of

the inhabitants were Dissenters. Against the protests of the Catholics

it was likewise established in Maryland. In New York, too,

notwithstanding the resistance of the Dutch, the Established Church was

fostered by the provincial officials, and the Anglicans, embracing about

one-fifteenth of the population, exerted an influence all out of

proportion to their numbers.

Many factors helped to enhance the power of the English Church in the

colonies. It was supported by the British government and the official

class sent out to the provinces. Its bishops and archbishops in England

were appointed by the king, and its faith and service were set forth by

acts of Parliament. Having its seat of power in the English monarchy, it

could hold its clergy and missionaries loyal to the crown and so

counteract to some extent the independent spirit that was growing up in

America. The Church, always a strong bulwark of the state, therefore had

a political role to play here as in England. Able bishops and far-seeing

leaders firmly grasped this fact about the middle of the eighteenth

century and redoubled their efforts to augment the influence of the

Church in provincial affairs. Unhappily for their plans they failed to

calculate in advance the effect of their methods upon dissenting

Protestants, who still cherished memories of bitter religious conflicts

in the mother country.

=Puritanism in New England.=--If the established faith made for imperial

unity, the same could not be said of Puritanism. The Plymouth Pilgrims

had cast off all allegiance to the Anglican Church and established a

separate and independent congregation before they came to America. The

Puritans, essaying at first the task of reformers within the Church,

soon after their arrival in Massachusetts, likewise flung off their yoke

of union with the Anglicans. In each town a separate congregation was

organized, the male members choosing the pastor, the teachers, and the

other officers. They also composed the voters in the town meeting, where

secular matters were determined. The union of church and government was

thus complete, and uniformity of faith and life prescribed by law and

enforced by civil authorities; but this worked for local autonomy

instead of imperial unity.

The clergy became a powerful class, dominant through their learning and

their fearful denunciations of the faithless. They wrote the books for

the people to read--the famous Cotton Mather having three hundred and

eighty-three books and pamphlets to his credit. In cooperation with the

civil officers they enforced a strict observance of the Puritan

Sabbath--a day of rest that began at six o'clock on Saturday evening and

lasted until sunset on Sunday. All work, all trading, all amusement, and

all worldly conversation were absolutely prohibited during those hours.

A thoughtless maid servant who for some earthly reason smiled in church

was in danger of being banished as a vagabond. Robert Pike, a devout

Puritan, thinking the sun had gone to rest, ventured forth on horseback

one Sunday evening and was luckless enough to have a ray of light strike

him through a rift in the clouds. The next day he was brought into court

and fined for "his ungodly conduct." With persons accused of witchcraft

the Puritans were still more ruthless. When a mania of persecution swept

over Massachusetts in 1692, eighteen people were hanged, one was pressed

to death, many suffered imprisonment, and two died in jail.

Just about this time, however, there came a break in the uniformity of

Puritan rule. The crown and church in England had long looked upon it

with disfavor, and in 1684 King Charles II annulled the old charter of

the Massachusetts Bay Company. A new document issued seven years later

wrested from the Puritans of the colony the right to elect their own

governor and reserved the power of appointment to the king. It also

abolished the rule limiting the suffrage to church members, substituting

for it a simple property qualification. Thus a royal governor and an

official family, certain to be Episcopalian in faith and monarchist in

sympathies, were forced upon Massachusetts; and members of all religious

denominations, if they had the required amount of property, were

permitted to take part in elections. By this act in the name of the

crown, the Puritan monopoly was broken down in Massachusetts, and that

province was brought into line with Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New

Hampshire, where property, not religious faith, was the test for the

suffrage.

=Growth of Religious Toleration.=--Though neither the Anglicans of

Virginia nor the Puritans of Massachusetts believed in toleration for

other denominations, that principle was strictly applied in Rhode

Island. There, under the leadership of Roger Williams, liberty in

matters of conscience was established in the beginning. Maryland, by

granting in 1649 freedom to those who professed to believe in Jesus

Christ, opened its gates to all Christians; and Pennsylvania, true to

the tenets of the Friends, gave freedom of conscience to those "who

confess and acknowledge the one Almighty and Eternal God to be the

creator, upholder, and ruler of the World." By one circumstance or

another, the Middle colonies were thus early characterized by diversity

rather than uniformity of opinion. Dutch Protestants, Huguenots,

Quakers, Baptists, Presbyterians, New Lights, Moravians, Lutherans,

Catholics, and other denominations became too strongly intrenched and

too widely scattered to permit any one of them to rule, if it had

desired to do so. There were communities and indeed whole sections where

one or another church prevailed, but in no colony was a legislature

steadily controlled by a single group. Toleration encouraged diversity,

and diversity, in turn, worked for greater toleration.

The government and faith of the dissenting denominations conspired with

economic and political tendencies to draw America away from the English

state. Presbyterians, Quakers, Baptists, and Puritans had no hierarchy

of bishops and archbishops to bind them to the seat of power in London.

Neither did they look to that metropolis for guidance in interpreting

articles of faith. Local self-government in matters ecclesiastical

helped to train them for local self-government in matters political. The

spirit of independence which led Dissenters to revolt in the Old World,

nourished as it was amid favorable circumstances in the New World, made

them all the more zealous in the defense of every right against

authority imposed from without.

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

=Religion and Local Schools.=--One of the first cares of each Protestant

denomination was the education of the children in the faith. In this

work the Bible became the center of interest. The English version was

indeed the one book of the people. Farmers, shopkeepers, and artisans,

whose life had once been bounded by the daily routine of labor, found in

the Scriptures not only an inspiration to religious conduct, but also a

book of romance, travel, and history. "Legend and annal," says John

Richard Green, "war-song and psalm, state-roll and biography, the mighty

voices of prophets, the parables of Evangelists, stories of mission

journeys, of perils by sea and among the heathen, philosophic arguments,

apocalyptic visions, all were flung broadcast over minds unoccupied for

the most part by any rival learning.... As a mere literary monument, the

English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English

tongue." It was the King James version just from the press that the

Pilgrims brought across the sea with them.

For the authority of the Established Church was substituted the

authority of the Scriptures. The Puritans devised a catechism based upon

their interpretation of the Bible, and, very soon after their arrival in

America, they ordered all parents and masters of servants to be diligent

in seeing that their children and wards were taught to read religious

works and give answers to the religious questions. Massachusetts was

scarcely twenty years old before education of this character was

declared to be compulsory, and provision was made for public schools

where those not taught at home could receive instruction in reading and

writing.
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A In ADAM'S Fall

We sinned all.

B Heaven to find,

The Bible Mind.

C Christ crucify'd

For sinners dy'd.

D The Deluge drown'd

The Earth around.

E ELIJAH hid

by Ravens fed.

F The judgment made

FELIX afraid.]

Outside of New England the idea of compulsory education was not regarded

with the same favor; but the whole land was nevertheless dotted with

little schools kept by "dames, itinerant teachers, or local parsons."

Whether we turn to the life of Franklin in the North or Washington in

the South, we read of tiny schoolhouses, where boys, and sometimes

girls, were taught to read and write. Where there were no schools,

fathers and mothers of the better kind gave their children the rudiments

of learning. Though illiteracy was widespread, there is evidence to show

that the diffusion of knowledge among the masses was making steady

progress all through the eighteenth century.

=Religion and Higher Learning.=--Religious motives entered into the

establishment of colleges as well as local schools. Harvard, founded in

1636, and Yale, opened in 1718, were intended primarily to train

"learned and godly ministers" for the Puritan churches of New England.

To the far North, Dartmouth, chartered in 1769, was designed first as a

mission to the Indians and then as a college for the sons of New England

farmers preparing to preach, teach, or practice law. The College of New

Jersey, organized in 1746 and removed to Princeton eleven years later,

was sustained by the Presbyterians. Two colleges looked to the

Established Church as their source of inspiration and support: William

and Mary, founded in Virginia in 1693, and King's College, now Columbia

University, chartered by King George II in 1754, on an appeal from the

New York Anglicans, alarmed at the growth of religious dissent and the

"republican tendencies" of the age. Two colleges revealed a drift away

from sectarianism. Brown, established in Rhode Island in 1764, and the

Philadelphia Academy, forerunner of the University of Pennsylvania,

organized by Benjamin Franklin, reflected the spirit of toleration by

giving representation on the board of trustees to several religious

sects. It was Franklin's idea that his college should prepare young men

to serve in public office as leaders of the people and ornaments to

their country.

=Self-education in America.=--Important as were these institutions of

learning, higher education was by no means confined within their walls.

Many well-to-do families sent their sons to Oxford or Cambridge in

England. Private tutoring in the home was common. In still more families

there were intelligent children who grew up in the great colonial school

of adversity and who trained themselves until, in every contest of mind

and wit, they could vie with the sons of Harvard or William and Mary or

any other college. Such, for example, was Benjamin Franklin, whose

charming autobiography, in addition to being an American classic, is a

fine record of self-education. His formal training in the classroom was

limited to a few years at a local school in Boston; but his

self-education continued throughout his life. He early manifested a zeal

for reading, and devoured, he tells us, his father's dry library on

theology, Bunyan's works, Defoe's writings, Plutarch's \_Lives\_, Locke's

\_On the Human Understanding\_, and innumerable volumes dealing with

secular subjects. His literary style, perhaps the best of his time,

Franklin acquired by the diligent and repeated analysis of the

\_Spectator\_. In a life crowded with labors, he found time to read widely

in natural science and to win single-handed recognition at the hands of

European savants for his discoveries in electricity. By his own efforts

he "attained an acquaintance" with Latin, Italian, French, and Spanish,

thus unconsciously preparing himself for the day when he was to speak

for all America at the court of the king of France.

Lesser lights than Franklin, educated by the same process, were found

all over colonial America. From this fruitful source of native ability,

self-educated, the American cause drew great strength in the trials of

the Revolution.

THE COLONIAL PRESS

=The Rise of the Newspaper.=--The evolution of American democracy into a

government by public opinion, enlightened by the open discussion of

political questions, was in no small measure aided by a free press. That

too, like education, was a matter of slow growth. A printing press was

brought to Massachusetts in 1639, but it was put in charge of an

official censor and limited to the publication of religious works. Forty

years elapsed before the first newspaper appeared, bearing the curious

title, \_Public Occurrences Both Foreign and Domestic\_, and it had not

been running very long before the government of Massachusetts suppressed

it for discussing a political question.

Publishing, indeed, seemed to be a precarious business; but in 1704

there came a second venture in journalism, \_The Boston News-Letter\_,

which proved to be a more lasting enterprise because it refrained from

criticizing the authorities. Still the public interest languished. When

Franklin's brother, James, began to issue his \_New England Courant\_

about 1720, his friends sought to dissuade him, saying that one

newspaper was enough for America. Nevertheless he continued it; and his

confidence in the future was rewarded. In nearly every colony a gazette

or chronicle appeared within the next thirty years or more. Benjamin

Franklin was able to record in 1771 that America had twenty-five

newspapers. Boston led with five. Philadelphia had three: two in English

and one in German.

=Censorship and Restraints on the Press.=--The idea of printing,

unlicensed by the government and uncontrolled by the church, was,

however, slow in taking form. The founders of the American colonies had

never known what it was to have the free and open publication of books,

pamphlets, broadsides, and newspapers. When the art of printing was

first discovered, the control of publishing was vested in clerical

authorities. After the establishment of the State Church in England in

the reign of Elizabeth, censorship of the press became a part of royal

prerogative. Printing was restricted to Oxford, Cambridge, and London;

and no one could publish anything without previous approval of the

official censor. When the Puritans were in power, the popular party,

with a zeal which rivaled that of the crown, sought, in turn, to silence

royalist and clerical writers by a vigorous censorship. After the

restoration of the monarchy, control of the press was once more placed

in royal hands, where it remained until 1695, when Parliament, by

failing to renew the licensing act, did away entirely with the official

censorship. By that time political parties were so powerful and so

active and printing presses were so numerous that official review of all

published matter became a sheer impossibility.

In America, likewise, some troublesome questions arose in connection

with freedom of the press. The Puritans of Massachusetts were no less

anxious than King Charles or the Archbishop of London to shut out from

the prying eyes of the people all literature "not mete for them to

read"; and so they established a system of official licensing for

presses, which lasted until 1755. In the other colonies where there was

more diversity of opinion and publishers could set up in business with

impunity, they were nevertheless constantly liable to arrest for

printing anything displeasing to the colonial governments. In 1721 the

editor of the \_Mercury\_ in Philadelphia was called before the

proprietary council and ordered to apologize for a political article,

and for a later offense of a similar character he was thrown into jail.

A still more famous case was that of Peter Zenger, a New York publisher,

who was arrested in 1735 for criticising the administration. Lawyers who

ventured to defend the unlucky editor were deprived of their licenses to

practice, and it became necessary to bring an attorney all the way from

Philadelphia. By this time the tension of feeling was high, and the

approbation of the public was forthcoming when the lawyer for the

defense exclaimed to the jury that the very cause of liberty itself, not

that of the poor printer, was on trial! The verdict for Zenger, when it

finally came, was the signal for an outburst of popular rejoicing.

Already the people of King George's province knew how precious a thing

is the freedom of the press.

Thanks to the schools, few and scattered as they were, and to the

vigilance of parents, a very large portion, perhaps nearly one-half, of

the colonists could read. Through the newspapers, pamphlets, and

almanacs that streamed from the types, the people could follow the

course of public events and grasp the significance of political

arguments. An American opinion was in the process of making--an

independent opinion nourished by the press and enriched by discussions

around the fireside and at the taverns. When the day of resistance to

British rule came, government by opinion was at hand. For every person

who could hear the voice of Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams, there were a

thousand who could see their appeals on the printed page. Men who had

spelled out their letters while poring over Franklin's \_Poor Richard's

Almanac\_ lived to read Thomas Paine's thrilling call to arms.

THE EVOLUTION IN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

Two very distinct lines of development appeared in colonial politics.

The one, exalting royal rights and aristocratic privileges, was the

drift toward provincial government through royal officers appointed in

England. The other, leading toward democracy and self-government, was

the growth in the power of the popular legislative assembly. Each

movement gave impetus to the other, with increasing force during the

passing years, until at last the final collision between the two ideals

of government came in the war of independence.

=The Royal Provinces.=--Of the thirteen English colonies eight were

royal provinces in 1776, with governors appointed by the king. Virginia

passed under the direct rule of the crown in 1624, when the charter of

the London Company was annulled. The Massachusetts Bay corporation lost

its charter in 1684, and the new instrument granted seven years later

stripped the colonists of the right to choose their chief executive. In

the early decades of the eighteenth century both the Carolinas were

given the provincial instead of the proprietary form. New Hampshire,

severed from Massachusetts in 1679, and Georgia, surrendered by the

trustees in 1752, went into the hands of the crown. New York,

transferred to the Duke of York on its capture from the Dutch in 1664,

became a province when he took the title of James II in 1685. New

Jersey, after remaining for nearly forty years under proprietors, was

brought directly under the king in 1702. Maryland, Pennsylvania, and

Delaware, although they retained their proprietary character until the

Revolution, were in some respects like the royal colonies, for their

governors were as independent of popular choice as were the appointees

of King George. Only two colonies, Rhode Island and Connecticut,

retained full self-government on the eve of the Revolution. They alone

had governors and legislatures entirely of their own choosing.

The chief officer of the royal province was the governor, who enjoyed

high and important powers which he naturally sought to augment at every

turn. He enforced the laws and, usually with the consent of a council,

appointed the civil and military officers. He granted pardons and

reprieves; he was head of the highest court; he was commander-in-chief

of the militia; he levied troops for defense and enforced martial law in

time of invasion, war, and rebellion. In all the provinces, except

Massachusetts, he named the councilors who composed the upper house of

the legislature and was likely to choose those who favored his claims.

He summoned, adjourned, and dissolved the popular assembly, or the lower

house; he laid before it the projects of law desired by the crown; and

he vetoed measures which he thought objectionable. Here were in America

all the elements of royal prerogative against which Hampden had

protested and Cromwell had battled in England.

[Illustration: THE ROYAL GOVERNOR'S PALACE AT NEW BERNE]

The colonial governors were generally surrounded by a body of

office-seekers and hunters for land grants. Some of them were noblemen

of broken estates who had come to America to improve their fortunes. The

pretensions of this circle grated on colonial nerves, and privileges

granted to them, often at the expense of colonists, did much to deepen

popular antipathy to the British government. Favors extended to

adherents of the Established Church displeased Dissenters. The

reappearance of this formidable union of church and state, from which

they had fled, stirred anew the ancient wrath against that combination.

=The Colonial Assembly.=--Coincident with the drift toward

administration through royal governors was the second and opposite

tendency, namely, a steady growth in the practice of self-government.

The voters of England had long been accustomed to share in taxation and

law-making through representatives in Parliament, and the idea was early

introduced in America. Virginia was only twelve years old (1619) when

its first representative assembly appeared. As the towns of

Massachusetts multiplied and it became impossible for all the members of

the corporation to meet at one place, the representative idea was

adopted, in 1633. The river towns of Connecticut formed a representative

system under their "Fundamental Orders" of 1639, and the entire colony

was given a royal charter in 1662. Generosity, as well as practical

considerations, induced such proprietors as Lord Baltimore and William

Penn to invite their colonists to share in the government as soon as any

considerable settlements were made. Thus by one process or another every

one of the colonies secured a popular assembly.

It is true that in the provision for popular elections, the suffrage was

finally restricted to property owners or taxpayers, with a leaning

toward the freehold qualification. In Virginia, the rural voter had to

be a freeholder owning at least fifty acres of land, if there was no

house on it, or twenty-five acres with a house twenty-five feet square.

In Massachusetts, the voter for member of the assembly under the charter

of 1691 had to be a freeholder of an estate worth forty shillings a year

at least or of other property to the value of forty pounds sterling. In

Pennsylvania, the suffrage was granted to freeholders owning fifty acres

or more of land well seated, twelve acres cleared, and to other persons

worth at least fifty pounds in lawful money.

Restrictions like these undoubtedly excluded from the suffrage a very

considerable number of men, particularly the mechanics and artisans of

the towns, who were by no means content with their position.

Nevertheless, it was relatively easy for any man to acquire a small

freehold, so cheap and abundant was land; and in fact a large proportion

of the colonists were land owners. Thus the assemblies, in spite of the

limited suffrage, acquired a democratic tone.

The popular character of the assemblies increased as they became engaged

in battles with the royal and proprietary governors. When called upon by

the executive to make provision for the support of the administration,

the legislature took advantage of the opportunity to make terms in the

interest of the taxpayers. It made annual, not permanent, grants of

money to pay official salaries and then insisted upon electing a

treasurer to dole it out. Thus the colonists learned some of the

mysteries of public finance, as well as the management of rapacious

officials. The legislature also used its power over money grants to

force the governor to sign bills which he would otherwise have vetoed.

=Contests between Legislatures and Governors.=--As may be imagined, many

and bitter were the contests between the royal and proprietary governors

and the colonial assemblies. Franklin relates an amusing story of how

the Pennsylvania assembly held in one hand a bill for the executive to

sign and, in the other hand, the money to pay his salary. Then, with sly

humor, Franklin adds: "Do not, my courteous reader, take pet at our

proprietary constitution for these our bargain and sale proceedings in

legislation. It is a happy country where justice and what was your own

before can be had for ready money. It is another addition to the value

of money and of course another spur to industry. Every land is not so

blessed."

It must not be thought, however, that every governor got off as easily

as Franklin's tale implies. On the contrary, the legislatures, like

Caesar, fed upon meat that made them great and steadily encroached upon

executive prerogatives as they tried out and found their strength. If

we may believe contemporary laments, the power of the crown in America

was diminishing when it was struck down altogether. In New York, the

friends of the governor complained in 1747 that "the inhabitants of

plantations are generally educated in republican principles; upon

republican principles all is conducted. Little more than a shadow of

royal authority remains in the Northern colonies." "Here," echoed the

governor of South Carolina, the following year, "levelling principles

prevail; the frame of the civil government is unhinged; a governor, if

he would be idolized, must betray his trust; the people have got their

whole administration in their hands; the election of the members of the

assembly is by ballot; not civil posts only, but all ecclesiastical

preferments, are in the disposal or election of the people."

Though baffled by the "levelling principles" of the colonial assemblies,

the governors did not give up the case as hopeless. Instead they evolved

a system of policy and action which they thought could bring the

obstinate provincials to terms. That system, traceable in their letters

to the government in London, consisted of three parts: (1) the royal

officers in the colonies were to be made independent of the legislatures

by taxes imposed by acts of Parliament; (2) a British standing army was

to be maintained in America; (3) the remaining colonial charters were to

be revoked and government by direct royal authority was to be enlarged.

Such a system seemed plausible enough to King George III and to many

ministers of the crown in London. With governors, courts, and an army

independent of the colonists, they imagined it would be easy to carry

out both royal orders and acts of Parliament. This reasoning seemed both

practical and logical. Nor was it founded on theory, for it came fresh

from the governors themselves. It was wanting in one respect only. It

failed to take account of the fact that the American people were growing

strong in the practice of self-government and could dispense with the

tutelage of the British ministry, no matter how excellent it might be or

how benevolent its intentions.
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1. Why is leisure necessary for the production of art and literature?

How may leisure be secured?

2. Explain the position of the church in colonial life.

3. Contrast the political roles of Puritanism and the Established

Church.

4. How did diversity of opinion work for toleration?

5. Show the connection between religion and learning in colonial times.

6. Why is a "free press" such an important thing to American democracy?

7. Relate some of the troubles of early American publishers.

8. Give the undemocratic features of provincial government.

9. How did the colonial assemblies help to create an independent

American spirit, in spite of a restricted suffrage?

10. Explain the nature of the contests between the governors and the

legislatures.
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CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COLONIAL NATIONALISM

It is one of the well-known facts of history that a people loosely

united by domestic ties of a political and economic nature, even a

people torn by domestic strife, may be welded into a solid and compact

body by an attack from a foreign power. The imperative call to common

defense, the habit of sharing common burdens, the fusing force of common

service--these things, induced by the necessity of resisting outside

interference, act as an amalgam drawing together all elements, except,

perhaps, the most discordant. The presence of the enemy allays the most

virulent of quarrels, temporarily at least. "Politics," runs an old

saying, "stops at the water's edge."

This ancient political principle, so well understood in diplomatic

circles, applied nearly as well to the original thirteen American

colonies as to the countries of Europe. The necessity for common

defense, if not equally great, was certainly always pressing. Though it

has long been the practice to speak of the early settlements as founded

in "a wilderness," this was not actually the case. From the earliest

days of Jamestown on through the years, the American people were

confronted by dangers from without. All about their tiny settlements

were Indians, growing more and more hostile as the frontier advanced and

as sharp conflicts over land aroused angry passions. To the south and

west was the power of Spain, humiliated, it is true, by the disaster to

the Armada, but still presenting an imposing front to the British

empire. To the north and west were the French, ambitious, energetic,

imperial in temper, and prepared to contest on land and water the

advance of British dominion in America.

RELATIONS WITH THE INDIANS AND THE FRENCH

=Indian Affairs.=--It is difficult to make general statements about the

relations of the colonists to the Indians. The problem was presented in

different shape in different sections of America. It was not handled

according to any coherent or uniform plan by the British government,

which alone could speak for all the provinces at the same time. Neither

did the proprietors and the governors who succeeded one another, in an

irregular train, have the consistent policy or the matured experience

necessary for dealing wisely with Indian matters. As the difficulties

arose mainly on the frontiers, where the restless and pushing pioneers

were making their way with gun and ax, nearly everything that happened

was the result of chance rather than of calculation. A personal quarrel

between traders and an Indian, a jug of whisky, a keg of gunpowder, the

exchange of guns for furs, personal treachery, or a flash of bad temper

often set in motion destructive forces of the most terrible character.

On one side of the ledger may be set innumerable generous records--of

Squanto and Samoset teaching the Pilgrims the ways of the wilds; of

Roger Williams buying his lands from the friendly natives; or of William

Penn treating with them on his arrival in America. On the other side of

the ledger must be recorded many a cruel and bloody conflict as the

frontier rolled westward with deadly precision. The Pequots on the

Connecticut border, sensing their doom, fell upon the tiny settlements

with awful fury in 1637 only to meet with equally terrible punishment. A

generation later, King Philip, son of Massasoit, the friend of the

Pilgrims, called his tribesmen to a war of extermination which brought

the strength of all New England to the field and ended in his own

destruction. In New York, the relations with the Indians, especially

with the Algonquins and the Mohawks, were marked by periodic and

desperate wars. Virginia and her Southern neighbors suffered as did New

England. In 1622 Opecacano, a brother of Powhatan, the friend of the

Jamestown settlers, launched a general massacre; and in 1644 he

attempted a war of extermination. In 1675 the whole frontier was ablaze.

Nathaniel Bacon vainly attempted to stir the colonial governor to put up

an adequate defense and, failing in that plea, himself headed a revolt

and a successful expedition against the Indians. As the Virginia

outposts advanced into the Kentucky country, the strife with the natives

was transferred to that "dark and bloody ground"; while to the

southeast, a desperate struggle with the Tuscaroras called forth the

combined forces of the two Carolinas and Virginia.

[Illustration: \_From an old print.\_

VIRGINIANS DEFENDING THEMSELVES AGAINST THE INDIANS]

From such horrors New Jersey and Delaware were saved on account of their

geographical location. Pennsylvania, consistently following a policy of

conciliation, was likewise spared until her western vanguard came into

full conflict with the allied French and Indians. Georgia, by clever

negotiations and treaties of alliance, managed to keep on fair terms

with her belligerent Cherokees and Creeks. But neither diplomacy nor

generosity could stay the inevitable conflict as the frontier advanced,

especially after the French soldiers enlisted the Indians in their

imperial enterprises. It was then that desultory fighting became general

warfare.

[Illustration: ENGLISH, FRENCH, AND SPANISH POSSESSIONS IN AMERICA,

1750]

=Early Relations with the French.=--During the first decades of French

exploration and settlement in the St. Lawrence country, the English

colonies, engrossed with their own problems, gave little or no thought

to their distant neighbors. Quebec, founded in 1608, and Montreal, in

1642, were too far away, too small in population, and too slight in

strength to be much of a menace to Boston, Hartford, or New York. It was

the statesmen in France and England, rather than the colonists in

America, who first grasped the significance of the slowly converging

empires in North America. It was the ambition of Louis XIV of France,

rather than the labors of Jesuit missionaries and French rangers, that

sounded the first note of colonial alarm.

Evidence of this lies in the fact that three conflicts between the

English and the French occurred before their advancing frontiers met on

the Pennsylvania border. King William's War (1689-1697), Queen Anne's

War (1701-1713), and King George's War (1744-1748) owed their origins

and their endings mainly to the intrigues and rivalries of European

powers, although they all involved the American colonies in struggles

with the French and their savage allies.

=The Clash in the Ohio Valley.=--The second of these wars had hardly

closed, however, before the English colonists themselves began to be

seriously alarmed about the rapidly expanding French dominion in the

West. Marquette and Joliet, who opened the Lake region, and La Salle,

who in 1682 had gone down the Mississippi to the Gulf, had been followed

by the builders of forts. In 1718, the French founded New Orleans, thus

taking possession of the gateway to the Mississippi as well as the St.

Lawrence. A few years later they built Fort Niagara; in 1731 they

occupied Crown Point; in 1749 they formally announced their dominion

over all the territory drained by the Ohio River. Having asserted this

lofty claim, they set out to make it good by constructing in the years

1752-1754 Fort Le Boeuf near Lake Erie, Fort Venango on the upper

waters of the Allegheny, and Fort Duquesne at the junction of the

streams forming the Ohio. Though they were warned by George Washington,

in the name of the governor of Virginia, to keep out of territory "so

notoriously known to be property of the crown of Great Britain," the

French showed no signs of relinquishing their pretensions.

[Illustration: \_From an old print\_

BRADDOCK'S RETREAT]

=The Final Phase--the French and Indian War.=--Thus it happened that the

shot which opened the Seven Years' War, known in America as the French

and Indian War, was fired in the wilds of Pennsylvania. There began the

conflict that spread to Europe and even Asia and finally involved

England and Prussia, on the one side, and France, Austria, Spain, and

minor powers on the other. On American soil, the defeat of Braddock in

1755 and Wolfe's exploit in capturing Quebec four years later were the

dramatic features. On the continent of Europe, England subsidized

Prussian arms to hold France at bay. In India, on the banks of the

Ganges, as on the banks of the St. Lawrence, British arms were

triumphant. Well could the historian write: "Conquests equaling in

rapidity and far surpassing in magnitude those of Cortes and Pizarro had

been achieved in the East." Well could the merchants of London declare

that under the administration of William Pitt, the imperial genius of

this world-wide conflict, commerce had been "united with and made to

flourish by war."

From the point of view of the British empire, the results of the war

were momentous. By the peace of 1763, Canada and the territory east of

the Mississippi, except New Orleans, passed under the British flag. The

remainder of the Louisiana territory was transferred to Spain and French

imperial ambitions on the American continent were laid to rest. In

exchange for Havana, which the British had seized during the war, Spain

ceded to King George the colony of Florida. Not without warrant did

Macaulay write in after years that Pitt "was the first Englishman of his

time; and he had made England the first country in the world."

THE EFFECTS OF WARFARE ON THE COLONIES

The various wars with the French and the Indians, trivial in detail as

they seem to-day, had a profound influence on colonial life and on the

destiny of America. Circumstances beyond the control of popular

assemblies, jealous of their individual powers, compelled cooperation

among them, grudging and stingy no doubt, but still cooperation. The

American people, more eager to be busy in their fields or at their

trades, were simply forced to raise and support armies, to learn the

arts of warfare, and to practice, if in a small theater, the science of

statecraft. These forces, all cumulative, drove the colonists, so

tenaciously provincial in their habits, in the direction of nationalism.

=The New England Confederation.=--It was in their efforts to deal with

the problems presented by the Indian and French menace that the

Americans took the first steps toward union. Though there were many

common ties among the settlers of New England, it required a deadly

fear of the Indians to produce in 1643 the New England Confederation,

composed of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven. The

colonies so united were bound together in "a firm and perpetual league

of friendship and amity for offense and defense, mutual service and

succor, upon all just occasions." They made provision for distributing

the burdens of wars among the members and provided for a congress of

commissioners from each colony to determine upon common policies. For

some twenty years the Confederation was active and it continued to hold

meetings until after the extinction of the Indian peril on the immediate

border.

Virginia, no less than Massachusetts, was aware of the importance of

intercolonial cooperation. In the middle of the seventeenth century, the

Old Dominion began treaties of commerce and amity with New York and the

colonies of New England. In 1684 delegates from Virginia met at Albany

with the agents of New York and Massachusetts to discuss problems of

mutual defense. A few years later the Old Dominion cooperated loyally

with the Carolinas in defending their borders against Indian forays.

=The Albany Plan of Union.=--An attempt at a general colonial union was

made in 1754. On the suggestion of the Lords of Trade in England, a

conference was held at Albany to consider Indian relations, to devise

measures of defense against the French, and to enter into "articles of

union and confederation for the general defense of his Majesty's

subjects and interests in North America as well in time of peace as of

war." New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York,

Pennsylvania, and Maryland were represented. After a long discussion, a

plan of union, drafted mainly, it seems, by Benjamin Franklin, was

adopted and sent to the colonies and the crown for approval. The

colonies, jealous of their individual rights, refused to accept the

scheme and the king disapproved it for the reason, Franklin said, that

it had "too much weight in the democratic part of the constitution."

Though the Albany union failed, the document is still worthy of study

because it forecast many of the perplexing problems that were not solved

until thirty-three years afterward, when another convention of which

also Franklin was a member drafted the Constitution of the United

States.

[Illustration: BENJAMIN FRANKLIN]

=The Military Education of the Colonists.=--The same wars that showed

the provincials the meaning of union likewise instructed them in the art

of defending their institutions. Particularly was this true of the last

French and Indian conflict, which stretched all the way from Maine to

the Carolinas and made heavy calls upon them all for troops. The answer,

it is admitted, was far from satisfactory to the British government and

the conduct of the militiamen was far from professional; but thousands

of Americans got a taste, a strong taste, of actual fighting in the

field. Men like George Washington and Daniel Morgan learned lessons that

were not forgotten in after years. They saw what American militiamen

could do under favorable circumstances and they watched British regulars

operating on American soil. "This whole transaction," shrewdly remarked

Franklin of Braddock's campaign, "gave us Americans the first suspicion

that our exalted ideas of the prowess of British regular troops had not

been well founded." It was no mere accident that the Virginia colonel

who drew his sword under the elm at Cambridge and took command of the

army of the Revolution was the brave officer who had "spurned the

whistle of bullets" at the memorable battle in western Pennsylvania.

=Financial Burdens and Commercial Disorder.=--While the provincials were

learning lessons in warfare they were also paying the bills. All the

conflicts were costly in treasure as in blood. King Philip's war left

New England weak and almost bankrupt. The French and Indian struggle was

especially expensive. The twenty-five thousand men put in the field by

the colonies were sustained only by huge outlays of money. Paper

currency streamed from the press and debts were accumulated. Commerce

was driven from its usual channels and prices were enhanced. When the

end came, both England and America were staggering under heavy

liabilities, and to make matters worse there was a fall of prices

accompanied by a commercial depression which extended over a period of

ten years. It was in the midst of this crisis that measures of taxation

had to be devised to pay the cost of the war, precipitating the quarrel

which led to American independence.

=The Expulsion of French Power from North America.=--The effects of the

defeat administered to France, as time proved, were difficult to

estimate. Some British statesmen regarded it as a happy circumstance

that the colonists, already restive under their administration, had no

foreign power at hand to aid them in case they struck for independence.

American leaders, on the other hand, now that the soldiers of King Louis

were driven from the continent, thought that they had no other country

to fear if they cast off British sovereignty. At all events, France,

though defeated, was not out of the sphere of American influence; for,

as events proved, it was the fortunate French alliance negotiated by

Franklin that assured the triumph of American arms in the War of the

Revolution.

COLONIAL RELATIONS WITH THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

It was neither the Indian wars nor the French wars that finally brought

forth American nationality. That was the product of the long strife

with the mother country which culminated in union for the war of

independence. The forces that created this nation did not operate in the

colonies alone. The character of the English sovereigns, the course of

events in English domestic politics, and English measures of control

over the colonies--executive, legislative, and judicial--must all be

taken into account.

=The Last of the Stuarts.=--The struggles between Charles I (1625-49)

and the parliamentary party and the turmoil of the Puritan regime

(1649-60) so engrossed the attention of Englishmen at home that they had

little time to think of colonial policies or to interfere with colonial

affairs. The restoration of the monarchy in 1660, accompanied by

internal peace and the increasing power of the mercantile classes in the

House of Commons, changed all that. In the reign of Charles II

(1660-85), himself an easy-going person, the policy of regulating trade

by act of Parliament was developed into a closely knit system and

powerful agencies to supervise the colonies were created. At the same

time a system of stricter control over the dominions was ushered in by

the annulment of the old charter of Massachusetts which conferred so

much self-government on the Puritans.

Charles' successor, James II, a man of sterner stuff and jealous of his

authority in the colonies as well as at home, continued the policy thus

inaugurated and enlarged upon it. If he could have kept his throne, he

would have bent the Americans under a harsh rule or brought on in his

dominions a revolution like that which he precipitated at home in 1688.

He determined to unite the Northern colonies and introduce a more

efficient administration based on the pattern of the royal provinces. He

made a martinet, Sir Edmund Andros, governor of all New England, New

York, and New Jersey. The charter of Massachusetts, annulled in the last

days of his brother's reign, he continued to ignore, and that of

Connecticut would have been seized if it had not been spirited away and

hidden, according to tradition, in a hollow oak.

For several months, Andros gave the Northern colonies a taste of

ill-tempered despotism. He wrung quit rents from land owners not

accustomed to feudal dues; he abrogated titles to land where, in his

opinion, they were unlawful; he forced the Episcopal service upon the

Old South Church in Boston; and he denied the writ of \_habeas corpus\_ to

a preacher who denounced taxation without representation. In the middle

of his arbitrary course, however, his hand was stayed. The news came

that King James had been dethroned by his angry subjects, and the people

of Boston, kindling a fire on Beacon Hill, summoned the countryside to

dispose of Andros. The response was prompt and hearty. The hated

governor was arrested, imprisoned, and sent back across the sea under

guard.

The overthrow of James, followed by the accession of William and Mary

and by assured parliamentary supremacy, had an immediate effect in the

colonies. The new order was greeted with thanksgiving. Massachusetts was

given another charter which, though not so liberal as the first,

restored the spirit if not the entire letter of self-government. In the

other colonies where Andros had been operating, the old course of

affairs was resumed.

=The Indifference of the First Two Georges.=--On the death in 1714 of

Queen Anne, the successor of King William, the throne passed to a

Hanoverian prince who, though grateful for English honors and revenues,

was more interested in Hanover than in England. George I and George II,

whose combined reigns extended from 1714 to 1760, never even learned to

speak the English language, at least without an accent. The necessity of

taking thought about colonial affairs bored both of them so that the

stoutest defender of popular privileges in Boston or Charleston had no

ground to complain of the exercise of personal prerogatives by the king.

Moreover, during a large part of this period, the direction of affairs

was in the hands of an astute leader, Sir Robert Walpole, who betrayed

his somewhat cynical view of politics by adopting as his motto: "Let

sleeping dogs lie." He revealed his appreciation of popular sentiment

by exclaiming: "I will not be the minister to enforce taxes at the

expense of blood." Such kings and such ministers were not likely to

arouse the slumbering resistance of the thirteen colonies across the

sea.

=Control of the Crown over the Colonies.=--While no English ruler from

James II to George III ventured to interfere with colonial matters

personally, constant control over the colonies was exercised by royal

officers acting under the authority of the crown. Systematic supervision

began in 1660, when there was created by royal order a committee of the

king's council to meet on Mondays and Thursdays of each week to consider

petitions, memorials, and addresses respecting the plantations. In 1696

a regular board was established, known as the "Lords of Trade and

Plantations," which continued, until the American Revolution, to

scrutinize closely colonial business. The chief duties of the board were

to examine acts of colonial legislatures, to recommend measures to those

assemblies for adoption, and to hear memorials and petitions from the

colonies relative to their affairs.

The methods employed by this board were varied. All laws passed by

American legislatures came before it for review as a matter of routine.

If it found an act unsatisfactory, it recommended to the king the

exercise of his veto power, known as the royal disallowance. Any person

who believed his personal or property rights injured by a colonial law

could be heard by the board in person or by attorney; in such cases it

was the practice to hear at the same time the agent of the colony so

involved. The royal veto power over colonial legislation was not,

therefore, a formal affair, but was constantly employed on the

suggestion of a highly efficient agency of the crown. All this was in

addition to the powers exercised by the governors in the royal

provinces.

=Judicial Control.=--Supplementing this administrative control over the

colonies was a constant supervision by the English courts of law. The

king, by virtue of his inherent authority, claimed and exercised high

appellate powers over all judicial tribunals in the empire. The right

of appeal from local courts, expressly set forth in some charters, was,

on the eve of the Revolution, maintained in every colony. Any subject in

England or America, who, in the regular legal course, was aggrieved by

any act of a colonial legislature or any decision of a colonial court,

had the right, subject to certain regulations, to carry his case to the

king in council, forcing his opponent to follow him across the sea. In

the exercise of appellate power, the king in council acting as a court

could, and frequently did, declare acts of colonial legislatures duly

enacted and approved, null and void, on the ground that they were

contrary to English law.

=Imperial Control in Operation.=--Day after day, week after week, year

after year, the machinery for political and judicial control over

colonial affairs was in operation. At one time the British governors in

the colonies were ordered not to approve any colonial law imposing a

duty on European goods imported in English vessels. Again, when North

Carolina laid a tax on peddlers, the council objected to it as

"restrictive upon the trade and dispersion of English manufactures

throughout the continent." At other times, Indian trade was regulated in

the interests of the whole empire or grants of lands by a colonial

legislature were set aside. Virginia was forbidden to close her ports to

North Carolina lest there should be retaliation.

In short, foreign and intercolonial trade were subjected to a control

higher than that of the colony, foreshadowing a day when the

Constitution of the United States was to commit to Congress the power to

regulate interstate and foreign commerce and commerce with the Indians.

A superior judicial power, towering above that of the colonies, as the

Supreme Court at Washington now towers above the states, kept the

colonial legislatures within the metes and bounds of established law. In

the thousands of appeals, memorials, petitions, and complaints, and the

rulings and decisions upon them, were written the real history of

British imperial control over the American colonies.

So great was the business before the Lords of Trade that the colonies

had to keep skilled agents in London to protect their interests. As

common grievances against the operation of this machinery of control

arose, there appeared in each colony a considerable body of men, with

the merchants in the lead, who chafed at the restraints imposed on their

enterprise. Only a powerful blow was needed to weld these bodies into a

common mass nourishing the spirit of colonial nationalism. When to the

repeated minor irritations were added general and sweeping measures of

Parliament applying to every colony, the rebound came in the Revolution.

=Parliamentary Control over Colonial Affairs.=--As soon as Parliament

gained in power at the expense of the king, it reached out to bring the

American colonies under its sway as well. Between the execution of

Charles I and the accession of George III, there was enacted an immense

body of legislation regulating the shipping, trade, and manufactures of

America. All of it, based on the "mercantile" theory then prevalent in

all countries of Europe, was designed to control the overseas

plantations in such a way as to foster the commercial and business

interests of the mother country, where merchants and men of finance had

got the upper hand. According to this theory, the colonies of the

British empire should be confined to agriculture and the production of

raw materials, and forced to buy their manufactured goods of England.

\_The Navigation Acts.\_--In the first rank among these measures of

British colonial policy must be placed the navigation laws framed for

the purpose of building up the British merchant marine and navy--arms so

essential in defending the colonies against the Spanish, Dutch, and

French. The beginning of this type of legislation was made in 1651 and

it was worked out into a system early in the reign of Charles II

(1660-85).

The Navigation Acts, in effect, gave a monopoly of colonial commerce to

British ships. No trade could be carried on between Great Britain and

her dominions save in vessels built and manned by British subjects. No

European goods could be brought to America save in the ships of the

country that produced them or in English ships. These laws, which were

almost fatal to Dutch shipping in America, fell with severity upon the

colonists, compelling them to pay higher freight rates. The adverse

effect, however, was short-lived, for the measures stimulated

shipbuilding in the colonies, where the abundance of raw materials gave

the master builders of America an advantage over those of the mother

country. Thus the colonists in the end profited from the restrictive

policy written into the Navigation Acts.

\_The Acts against Manufactures.\_--The second group of laws was

deliberately aimed to prevent colonial industries from competing too

sharply with those of England. Among the earliest of these measures may

be counted the Woolen Act of 1699, forbidding the exportation of woolen

goods from the colonies and even the woolen trade between towns and

colonies. When Parliament learned, as the result of an inquiry, that New

England and New York were making thousands of hats a year and sending

large numbers annually to the Southern colonies and to Ireland, Spain,

and Portugal, it enacted in 1732 a law declaring that "no hats or felts,

dyed or undyed, finished or unfinished" should be "put upon any vessel

or laden upon any horse or cart with intent to export to any place

whatever." The effect of this measure upon the hat industry was almost

ruinous. A few years later a similar blow was given to the iron

industry. By an act of 1750, pig and bar iron from the colonies were

given free entry to England to encourage the production of the raw

material; but at the same time the law provided that "no mill or other

engine for slitting or rolling of iron, no plating forge to work with a

tilt hammer, and no furnace for making steel" should be built in the

colonies. As for those already built, they were declared public

nuisances and ordered closed. Thus three important economic interests of

the colonists, the woolen, hat, and iron industries, were laid under the

ban.

\_The Trade Laws.\_--The third group of restrictive measures passed by the

British Parliament related to the sale of colonial produce. An act of

1663 required the colonies to export certain articles to Great Britain

or to her dominions alone; while sugar, tobacco, and ginger consigned to

the continent of Europe had to pass through a British port paying custom

duties and through a British merchant's hands paying the usual

commission. At first tobacco was the only one of the "enumerated

articles" which seriously concerned the American colonies, the rest

coming mainly from the British West Indies. In the course of time,

however, other commodities were added to the list of enumerated

articles, until by 1764 it embraced rice, naval stores, copper, furs,

hides, iron, lumber, and pearl ashes. This was not all. The colonies

were compelled to bring their European purchases back through English

ports, paying duties to the government and commissions to merchants

again.

\_The Molasses Act.\_--Not content with laws enacted in the interest of

English merchants and manufacturers, Parliament sought to protect the

British West Indies against competition from their French and Dutch

neighbors. New England merchants had long carried on a lucrative trade

with the French islands in the West Indies and Dutch Guiana, where sugar

and molasses could be obtained in large quantities at low prices. Acting

on the protests of English planters in the Barbadoes and Jamaica,

Parliament, in 1733, passed the famous Molasses Act imposing duties on

sugar and molasses imported into the colonies from foreign

countries--rates which would have destroyed the American trade with the

French and Dutch if the law had been enforced. The duties, however, were

not collected. The molasses and sugar trade with the foreigners went on

merrily, smuggling taking the place of lawful traffic.

=Effect of the Laws in America.=--As compared with the strict monopoly

of her colonial trade which Spain consistently sought to maintain, the

policy of England was both moderate and liberal. Furthermore, the

restrictive laws were supplemented by many measures intended to be

favorable to colonial prosperity. The Navigation Acts, for example,

redounded to the advantage of American shipbuilders and the producers

of hemp, tar, lumber, and ship stores in general. Favors in British

ports were granted to colonial producers as against foreign competitors

and in some instances bounties were paid by England to encourage

colonial enterprise. Taken all in all, there is much justification in

the argument advanced by some modern scholars to the effect that the

colonists gained more than they lost by British trade and industrial

legislation. Certainly after the establishment of independence, when

free from these old restrictions, the Americans found themselves

handicapped by being treated as foreigners rather than favored traders

and the recipients of bounties in English markets.

Be that as it may, it appears that the colonists felt little irritation

against the mother country on account of the trade and navigation laws

enacted previous to the close of the French and Indian war. Relatively

few were engaged in the hat and iron industries as compared with those

in farming and planting, so that England's policy of restricting America

to agriculture did not conflict with the interests of the majority of

the inhabitants. The woolen industry was largely in the hands of women

and carried on in connection with their domestic duties, so that it was

not the sole support of any considerable number of people.

As a matter of fact, moreover, the restrictive laws, especially those

relating to trade, were not rigidly enforced. Cargoes of tobacco were

boldly sent to continental ports without even so much as a bow to the

English government, to which duties should have been paid. Sugar and

molasses from the French and Dutch colonies were shipped into New

England in spite of the law. Royal officers sometimes protested against

smuggling and sometimes connived at it; but at no time did they succeed

in stopping it. Taken all in all, very little was heard of "the galling

restraints of trade" until after the French war, when the British

government suddenly entered upon a new course.

SUMMARY OF THE COLONIAL PERIOD

In the period between the landing of the English at Jamestown, Virginia,

in 1607, and the close of the French and Indian war in 1763--a period of

a century and a half--a new nation was being prepared on this continent

to take its place among the powers of the earth. It was an epoch of

migration. Western Europe contributed emigrants of many races and

nationalities. The English led the way. Next to them in numerical

importance were the Scotch-Irish and the Germans. Into the melting pot

were also cast Dutch, Swedes, French, Jews, Welsh, and Irish. Thousands

of negroes were brought from Africa to till Southern fields or labor as

domestic servants in the North.

Why did they come? The reasons are various. Some of them, the Pilgrims

and Puritans of New England, the French Huguenots, Scotch-Irish and

Irish, and the Catholics of Maryland, fled from intolerant governments

that denied them the right to worship God according to the dictates of

their consciences. Thousands came to escape the bondage of poverty in

the Old World and to find free homes in America. Thousands, like the

negroes from Africa, were dragged here against their will. The lure of

adventure appealed to the restless and the lure of profits to the

enterprising merchants.

How did they come? In some cases religious brotherhoods banded together

and borrowed or furnished the funds necessary to pay the way. In other

cases great trading companies were organized to found colonies. Again it

was the wealthy proprietor, like Lord Baltimore or William Penn, who

undertook to plant settlements. Many immigrants were able to pay their

own way across the sea. Others bound themselves out for a term of years

in exchange for the cost of the passage. Negroes were brought on account

of the profits derived from their sale as slaves.

Whatever the motive for their coming, however, they managed to get

across the sea. The immigrants set to work with a will. They cut down

forests, built houses, and laid out fields. They founded churches,

schools, and colleges. They set up forges and workshops. They spun and

wove. They fashioned ships and sailed the seas. They bartered and

traded. Here and there on favorable harbors they established centers of

commerce--Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and

Charleston. As soon as a firm foothold was secured on the shore line

they pressed westward until, by the close of the colonial period, they

were already on the crest of the Alleghanies.

Though they were widely scattered along a thousand miles of seacoast,

the colonists were united in spirit by many common ties. The major

portion of them were Protestants. The language, the law, and the

literature of England furnished the basis of national unity. Most of the

colonists were engaged in the same hard task; that of conquering a

wilderness. To ties of kinship and language were added ties created by

necessity. They had to unite in defense; first, against the Indians and

later against the French. They were all subjects of the same

sovereign--the king of England. The English Parliament made laws for

them and the English government supervised their local affairs, their

trade, and their manufactures. Common forces assailed them. Common

grievances vexed them. Common hopes inspired them.

Many of the things which tended to unite them likewise tended to throw

them into opposition to the British Crown and Parliament. Most of them

were freeholders; that is, farmers who owned their own land and tilled

it with their own hands. A free soil nourished the spirit of freedom.

The majority of them were Dissenters, critics, not friends, of the

Church of England, that stanch defender of the British monarchy. Each

colony in time developed its own legislature elected by the voters; it

grew accustomed to making laws and laying taxes for itself. Here was a

people learning self-reliance and self-government. The attempts to

strengthen the Church of England in America and the transformation of

colonies into royal provinces only fanned the spirit of independence

which they were designed to quench.

Nevertheless, the Americans owed much of their prosperity to the

assistance of the government that irritated them. It was the protection

of the British navy that prevented Holland, Spain, and France from

wiping out their settlements. Though their manufacture and trade were

controlled in the interests of the mother country, they also enjoyed

great advantages in her markets. Free trade existed nowhere upon the

earth; but the broad empire of Britain was open to American ships and

merchandise. It could be said, with good reason, that the disadvantages

which the colonists suffered through British regulation of their

industry and trade were more than offset by the privileges they enjoyed.

Still that is somewhat beside the point, for mere economic advantage is

not necessarily the determining factor in the fate of peoples. A

thousand circumstances had helped to develop on this continent a nation,

to inspire it with a passion for independence, and to prepare it for a

destiny greater than that of a prosperous dominion of the British

empire. The economists, who tried to prove by logic unassailable that

America would be richer under the British flag, could not change the

spirit of Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams, Benjamin Franklin, or George

Washington.

=References=

G.L. Beer, \_Origin of the British Colonial System\_ and \_The Old Colonial

System\_.

A. Bradley, \_The Fight for Canada in North America\_.

C.M. Andrews, \_Colonial Self-Government\_ (American Nation Series).

H. Egerton, \_Short History of British Colonial Policy\_.

F. Parkman, \_France and England in North America\_ (12 vols.).

R. Thwaites, \_France in America\_ (American Nation Series).

J. Winsor, \_The Mississippi Valley\_ and \_Cartier to Frontenac\_.

=Questions=

1. How would you define "nationalism"?

2. Can you give any illustrations of the way that war promotes

nationalism?

3. Why was it impossible to establish and maintain a uniform policy in

dealing with the Indians?

4. What was the outcome of the final clash with the French?

5. Enumerate the five chief results of the wars with the French and the

Indians. Discuss each in detail.

6. Explain why it was that the character of the English king mattered to

the colonists.

7. Contrast England under the Stuarts with England under the

Hanoverians.

8. Explain how the English Crown, Courts, and Parliament controlled the

colonies.

9. Name the three important classes of English legislation affecting the

colonies. Explain each.

10. Do you think the English legislation was beneficial or injurious to

the colonies? Why?

=Research Topics=

=Rise of French Power in North America.=--Special reference: Francis

Parkman, \_Struggle for a Continent\_.

=The French and Indian Wars.=--Special reference: W.M. Sloane, \_French

War and the Revolution\_, Chaps. VI-IX. Parkman, \_Montcalm and Wolfe\_,

Vol. II, pp. 195-299. Elson, \_History of the United States\_, pp.

171-196.

=English Navigation Acts.=--Macdonald, \_Documentary Source Book\_, pp.

55, 72, 78, 90, 103. Coman, \_Industrial History\_, pp. 79-85.

=British Colonial Policy.=--Callender, \_Economic History of the United

States\_, pp. 102-108.

=The New England Confederation.=--Analyze the document in Macdonald,

\_Source Book\_, p. 45. Special reference: Fiske, \_Beginnings of New

England\_, pp. 140-198.

=The Administration of Andros.=--Fiske, \_Beginnings\_, pp. 242-278.

=Biographical Studies.=--William Pitt and Sir Robert Walpole. Consult

Green, \_Short History of England\_, on their policies, using the index.

PART II. CONFLICT AND INDEPENDENCE

CHAPTER V

THE NEW COURSE IN BRITISH IMPERIAL POLICY

On October 25, 1760, King George II died and the British crown passed to

his young grandson. The first George, the son of the Elector of Hanover

and Sophia the granddaughter of James I, was a thorough German who never

even learned to speak the language of the land over which he reigned.

The second George never saw England until he was a man. He spoke English

with an accent and until his death preferred his German home. During

their reign, the principle had become well established that the king did

not govern but acted only through ministers representing the majority in

Parliament.

GEORGE III AND HIS SYSTEM

=The Character of the New King.=--The third George rudely broke the

German tradition of his family. He resented the imputation that he was a

foreigner and on all occasions made a display of his British sympathies.

To the draft of his first speech to Parliament, he added the popular

phrase: "Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of

Briton." Macaulay, the English historian, certainly of no liking for

high royal prerogative, said of George: "The young king was a born

Englishman. All his tastes and habits, good and bad, were English. No

portion of his subjects had anything to reproach him with.... His age,

his appearance, and all that was known of his character conciliated

public favor. He was in the bloom of youth; his person and address were

pleasing; scandal imputed to him no vice; and flattery might without

glaring absurdity ascribe to him many princely virtues."

Nevertheless George III had been spoiled by his mother, his tutors, and

his courtiers. Under their influence he developed high and mighty

notions about the sacredness of royal authority and his duty to check

the pretensions of Parliament and the ministers dependent upon it. His

mother had dinned into his ears the slogan: "George, be king!" Lord

Bute, his teacher and adviser, had told him that his honor required him

to take an active part in the shaping of public policy and the making of

laws. Thus educated, he surrounded himself with courtiers who encouraged

him in the determination to rule as well as reign, to subdue all

parties, and to place himself at the head of the nation and empire.
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=Political Parties and George III.=--The state of the political parties

favored the plans of the king to restore some of the ancient luster of

the crown. The Whigs, who were composed mainly of the smaller

freeholders, merchants, inhabitants of towns, and Protestant

non-conformists, had grown haughty and overbearing through long

continuance in power and had as a consequence raised up many enemies in

their own ranks. Their opponents, the Tories, had by this time given up

all hope of restoring to the throne the direct Stuart line; but they

still cherished their old notions about divine right. With the

accession of George III the coveted opportunity came to them to rally

around the throne again. George received his Tory friends with open

arms, gave them offices, and bought them seats in the House of Commons.

=The British Parliamentary System.=--The peculiarities of the British

Parliament at the time made smooth the way for the king and his allies

with their designs for controlling the entire government. In the first

place, the House of Lords was composed mainly of hereditary nobles whose

number the king could increase by the appointment of his favorites, as

of old. Though the members of the House of Commons were elected by

popular vote, they did not speak for the mass of English people. Great

towns like Leeds, Manchester, and Birmingham, for example, had no

representatives at all. While there were about eight million inhabitants

in Great Britain, there were in 1768 only about 160,000 voters; that is

to say, only about one in every ten adult males had a voice in the

government. Many boroughs returned one or more members to the Commons

although they had merely a handful of voters or in some instances no

voters at all. Furthermore, these tiny boroughs were often controlled by

lords who openly sold the right of representation to the highest bidder.

The "rotten-boroughs," as they were called by reformers, were a public

scandal, but George III readily made use of them to get his friends into

the House of Commons.

GEORGE III'S MINISTERS AND THEIR COLONIAL POLICIES

=Grenville and the War Debt.=--Within a year after the accession of

George III, William Pitt was turned out of office, the king treating him

with "gross incivility" and the crowds shouting "Pitt forever!" The

direction of affairs was entrusted to men enjoying the king's

confidence. Leadership in the House of Commons fell to George Grenville,

a grave and laborious man who for years had groaned over the increasing

cost of government.

The first task after the conclusion of peace in 1763 was the adjustment

of the disordered finances of the kingdom. The debt stood at the highest

point in the history of the country. More revenue was absolutely

necessary and Grenville began to search for it, turning his attention

finally to the American colonies. In this quest he had the aid of a

zealous colleague, Charles Townshend, who had long been in public

service and was familiar with the difficulties encountered by royal

governors in America. These two men, with the support of the entire

ministry, inaugurated in February, 1763, "a new system of colonial

government. It was announced by authority that there were to be no more

requisitions from the king to the colonial assemblies for supplies, but

that the colonies were to be taxed instead by act of Parliament.

Colonial governors and judges were to be paid by the Crown; they were to

be supported by a standing army of twenty regiments; and all the

expenses of this force were to be met by parliamentary taxation."

=Restriction of Paper Money (1763).=--Among the many complaints filed

before the board of trade were vigorous protests against the issuance of

paper money by the colonial legislatures. The new ministry provided a

remedy in the act of 1763, which declared void all colonial laws

authorizing paper money or extending the life of outstanding bills. This

law was aimed at the "cheap money" which the Americans were fond of

making when specie was scarce--money which they tried to force on their

English creditors in return for goods and in payment of the interest and

principal of debts. Thus the first chapter was written in the long

battle over sound money on this continent.

=Limitation on Western Land Sales.=--Later in the same year (1763)

George III issued a royal proclamation providing, among other things,

for the government of the territory recently acquired by the treaty of

Paris from the French. One of the provisions in this royal decree

touched frontiersmen to the quick. The contests between the king's

officers and the colonists over the disposition of western lands had

been long and sharp. The Americans chafed at restrictions on

settlement. The more adventurous were continually moving west and

"squatting" on land purchased from the Indians or simply seized without

authority. To put an end to this, the king forbade all further purchases

from the Indians, reserving to the crown the right to acquire such lands

and dispose of them for settlement. A second provision in the same

proclamation vested the power of licensing trade with the Indians,

including the lucrative fur business, in the hands of royal officers in

the colonies. These two limitations on American freedom and enterprise

were declared to be in the interest of the crown and for the

preservation of the rights of the Indians against fraud and abuses.

=The Sugar Act of 1764.=--King George's ministers next turned their

attention to measures of taxation and trade. Since the heavy debt under

which England was laboring had been largely incurred in the defense of

America, nothing seemed more reasonable to them than the proposition

that the colonies should help to bear the burden which fell so heavily

upon the English taxpayer. The Sugar Act of 1764 was the result of this

reasoning. There was no doubt about the purpose of this law, for it was

set forth clearly in the title: "An act for granting certain duties in

the British colonies and plantations in America ... for applying the

produce of such duties ... towards defraying the expenses of defending,

protecting and securing the said colonies and plantations ... and for

more effectually preventing the clandestine conveyance of goods to and

from the said colonies and plantations and improving and securing the

trade between the same and Great Britain." The old Molasses Act had been

prohibitive; the Sugar Act of 1764 was clearly intended as a revenue

measure. Specified duties were laid upon sugar, indigo, calico, silks,

and many other commodities imported into the colonies. The enforcement

of the Molasses Act had been utterly neglected; but this Sugar Act had

"teeth in it." Special precautions as to bonds, security, and

registration of ship masters, accompanied by heavy penalties, promised

a vigorous execution of the new revenue law.

The strict terms of the Sugar Act were strengthened by administrative

measures. Under a law of the previous year the commanders of armed

vessels stationed along the American coast were authorized to stop,

search, and, on suspicion, seize merchant ships approaching colonial

ports. By supplementary orders, the entire British official force in

America was instructed to be diligent in the execution of all trade and

navigation laws. Revenue collectors, officers of the army and navy, and

royal governors were curtly ordered to the front to do their full duty

in the matter of law enforcement. The ordinary motives for the discharge

of official obligations were sharpened by an appeal to avarice, for

naval officers who seized offenders against the law were rewarded by

large prizes out of the forfeitures and penalties.

=The Stamp Act (1765).=--The Grenville-Townshend combination moved

steadily towards its goal. While the Sugar Act was under consideration

in Parliament, Grenville announced a plan for a stamp bill. The next

year it went through both Houses with a speed that must have astounded

its authors. The vote in the Commons stood 205 in favor to 49 against;

while in the Lords it was not even necessary to go through the formality

of a count. As George III was temporarily insane, the measure received

royal assent by a commission acting as a board of regency. Protests of

colonial agents in London were futile. "We might as well have hindered

the sun's progress!" exclaimed Franklin. Protests of a few opponents in

the Commons were equally vain. The ministry was firm in its course and

from all appearances the Stamp Act hardly roused as much as a languid

interest in the city of London. In fact, it is recorded that the fateful

measure attracted less notice than a bill providing for a commission to

act for the king when he was incapacitated.

The Stamp Act, like the Sugar Act, declared the purpose of the British

government to raise revenue in America "towards defraying the expenses

of defending, protecting, and securing the British colonies and

plantations in America." It was a long measure of more than fifty

sections, carefully planned and skillfully drawn. By its provisions

duties were imposed on practically all papers used in legal

transactions,--deeds, mortgages, inventories, writs, bail bonds,--on

licenses to practice law and sell liquor, on college diplomas, playing

cards, dice, pamphlets, newspapers, almanacs, calendars, and

advertisements. The drag net was closely knit, for scarcely anything

escaped.

=The Quartering Act (1765).=--The ministers were aware that the Stamp

Act would rouse opposition in America--how great they could not

conjecture. While the measure was being debated, a friend of General

Wolfe, Colonel Barre, who knew America well, gave them an ominous

warning in the Commons. "Believe me--remember I this day told you so--"

he exclaimed, "the same spirit of freedom which actuated that people at

first will accompany them still ... a people jealous of their liberties

and who will vindicate them, if ever they should be violated." The

answer of the ministry to a prophecy of force was a threat of force.

Preparations were accordingly made to dispatch a larger number of

soldiers than usual to the colonies, and the ink was hardly dry on the

Stamp Act when Parliament passed the Quartering Act ordering the

colonists to provide accommodations for the soldiers who were to enforce

the new laws. "We have the power to tax them," said one of the ministry,

"and we will tax them."

COLONIAL RESISTANCE FORCES REPEAL

=Popular Opposition.=--The Stamp Act was greeted in America by an

outburst of denunciation. The merchants of the seaboard cities took the

lead in making a dignified but unmistakable protest, agreeing not to

import British goods while the hated law stood upon the books. Lawyers,

some of them incensed at the heavy taxes on their operations and others

intimidated by patriots who refused to permit them to use stamped

papers, joined with the merchants. Aristocratic colonial Whigs, who had

long grumbled at the administration of royal governors, protested

against taxation without their consent, as the Whigs had done in old

England. There were Tories, however, in the colonies as in England--many

of them of the official class--who denounced the merchants, lawyers, and

Whig aristocrats as "seditious, factious and republican." Yet the

opposition to the Stamp Act and its accompanying measure, the Quartering

Act, grew steadily all through the summer of 1765.

In a little while it was taken up in the streets and along the

countryside. All through the North and in some of the Southern colonies,

there sprang up, as if by magic, committees and societies pledged to

resist the Stamp Act to the bitter end. These popular societies were

known as Sons of Liberty and Daughters of Liberty: the former including

artisans, mechanics, and laborers; and the latter, patriotic women. Both

groups were alike in that they had as yet taken little part in public

affairs. Many artisans, as well as all the women, were excluded from the

right to vote for colonial assemblymen.

While the merchants and Whig gentlemen confined their efforts chiefly to

drafting well-phrased protests against British measures, the Sons of

Liberty operated in the streets and chose rougher measures. They stirred

up riots in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston when attempts

were made to sell the stamps. They sacked and burned the residences of

high royal officers. They organized committees of inquisition who by

threats and intimidation curtailed the sale of British goods and the use

of stamped papers. In fact, the Sons of Liberty carried their operations

to such excesses that many mild opponents of the stamp tax were

frightened and drew back in astonishment at the forces they had

unloosed. The Daughters of Liberty in a quieter way were making a very

effective resistance to the sale of the hated goods by spurring on

domestic industries, their own particular province being the manufacture

of clothing, and devising substitutes for taxed foods. They helped to

feed and clothe their families without buying British goods.

=Legislative Action against the Stamp Act.=--Leaders in the colonial

assemblies, accustomed to battle against British policies, supported the

popular protest. The Stamp Act was signed on March 22, 1765. On May 30,

the Virginia House of Burgesses passed a set of resolutions declaring

that the General Assembly of the colony alone had the right to lay taxes

upon the inhabitants and that attempts to impose them otherwise were

"illegal, unconstitutional, and unjust." It was in support of these

resolutions that Patrick Henry uttered the immortal challenge: "Caesar

had his Brutus, Charles I his Cromwell, and George III...." Cries of

"Treason" were calmly met by the orator who finished: "George III may

profit by their example. If that be treason, make the most of it."
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=The Stamp Act Congress.=--The Massachusetts Assembly answered the call

of Virginia by inviting the colonies to elect delegates to a Congress to

be held in New York to discuss the situation. Nine colonies responded

and sent representatives. The delegates, while professing the warmest

affection for the king's person and government, firmly spread on record

a series of resolutions that admitted of no double meaning. They

declared that taxes could not be imposed without their consent, given

through their respective colonial assemblies; that the Stamp Act showed

a tendency to subvert their rights and liberties; that the recent trade

acts were burdensome and grievous; and that the right to petition the

king and Parliament was their heritage. They thereupon made "humble

supplication" for the repeal of the Stamp Act.

The Stamp Act Congress was more than an assembly of protest. It marked

the rise of a new agency of government to express the will of America.

It was the germ of a government which in time was to supersede the

government of George III in the colonies. It foreshadowed the Congress

of the United States under the Constitution. It was a successful attempt

at union. "There ought to be no New England men," declared Christopher

Gadsden, in the Stamp Act Congress, "no New Yorkers known on the

Continent, but all of us Americans."

=The Repeal of the Stamp Act and the Sugar Act.=--The effect of American

resistance on opinion in England was telling. Commerce with the colonies

had been effectively boycotted by the Americans; ships lay idly swinging

at the wharves; bankruptcy threatened hundreds of merchants in London,

Bristol, and Liverpool. Workingmen in the manufacturing towns of England

were thrown out of employment. The government had sown folly and was

reaping, in place of the coveted revenue, rebellion.

Perplexed by the storm they had raised, the ministers summoned to the

bar of the House of Commons, Benjamin Franklin, the agent for

Pennsylvania, who was in London. "Do you think it right," asked

Grenville, "that America should be protected by this country and pay no

part of the expenses?" The answer was brief: "That is not the case; the

colonies raised, clothed, and paid during the last war twenty-five

thousand men and spent many millions." Then came an inquiry whether the

colonists would accept a modified stamp act. "No, never," replied

Franklin, "never! They will never submit to it!" It was next suggested

that military force might compel obedience to law. Franklin had a ready

answer. "They cannot force a man to take stamps.... They may not find a

rebellion; they may, indeed, make one."

The repeal of the Stamp Act was moved in the House of Commons a few days

later. The sponsor for the repeal spoke of commerce interrupted, debts

due British merchants placed in jeopardy, Manchester industries closed,

workingmen unemployed, oppression instituted, and the loss of the

colonies threatened. Pitt and Edmund Burke, the former near the close

of his career, the latter just beginning his, argued cogently in favor

of retracing the steps taken the year before. Grenville refused.

"America must learn," he wailed, "that prayers are not to be brought to

Caesar through riot and sedition." His protests were idle. The Commons

agreed to the repeal on February 22, 1766, amid the cheers of the

victorious majority. It was carried through the Lords in the face of

strong opposition and, on March 18, reluctantly signed by the king, now

restored to his right mind.

In rescinding the Stamp Act, Parliament did not admit the contention of

the Americans that it was without power to tax them. On the contrary, it

accompanied the repeal with a Declaratory Act. It announced that the

colonies were subordinate to the crown and Parliament of Great Britain;

that the king and Parliament therefore had undoubted authority to make

laws binding the colonies in all cases whatsoever; and that the

resolutions and proceedings of the colonists denying such authority were

null and void.

The repeal was greeted by the colonists with great popular

demonstrations. Bells were rung; toasts to the king were drunk; and

trade resumed its normal course. The Declaratory Act, as a mere paper

resolution, did not disturb the good humor of those who again cheered

the name of King George. Their confidence was soon strengthened by the

news that even the Sugar Act had been repealed, thus practically

restoring the condition of affairs before Grenville and Townshend

inaugurated their policy of "thoroughness."

RESUMPTION OF BRITISH REVENUE AND COMMERCIAL POLICIES

=The Townshend Acts (1767).=--The triumph of the colonists was brief.

Though Pitt, the friend of America, was once more prime minister, and

seated in the House of Lords as the Earl of Chatham, his severe illness

gave to Townshend and the Tory party practical control over Parliament.

Unconvinced by the experience with the Stamp Act, Townshend brought

forward and pushed through both Houses of Parliament three measures,

which to this day are associated with his name. First among his

restrictive laws was that of June 29, 1767, which placed the enforcement

of the collection of duties and customs on colonial imports and exports

in the hands of British commissioners appointed by the king, resident in

the colonies, paid from the British treasury, and independent of all

control by the colonists. The second measure of the same date imposed a

tax on lead, glass, paint, tea, and a few other articles imported into

the colonies, the revenue derived from the duties to be applied toward

the payment of the salaries and other expenses of royal colonial

officials. A third measure was the Tea Act of July 2, 1767, aimed at the

tea trade which the Americans carried on illegally with foreigners. This

law abolished the duty which the East India Company had to pay in

England on tea exported to America, for it was thought that English tea

merchants might thus find it possible to undersell American tea

smugglers.

=Writs of Assistance Legalized by Parliament.=--Had Parliament been

content with laying duties, just as a manifestation of power and right,

and neglected their collection, perhaps little would have been heard of

the Townshend Acts. It provided, however, for the strict, even the

harsh, enforcement of the law. It ordered customs officers to remain at

their posts and put an end to smuggling. In the revenue act of June 29,

1767, it expressly authorized the superior courts of the colonies to

issue "writs of assistance," empowering customs officers to enter "any

house, warehouse, shop, cellar, or other place in the British colonies

or plantations in America to search for and seize" prohibited or

smuggled goods.

The writ of assistance, which was a general search warrant issued to

revenue officers, was an ancient device hateful to a people who

cherished the spirit of personal independence and who had made actual

gains in the practice of civil liberty. To allow a "minion of the law"

to enter a man's house and search his papers and premises, was too much

for the emotions of people who had fled to America in a quest for

self-government and free homes, who had braved such hardships to

establish them, and who wanted to trade without official interference.

The writ of assistance had been used in Massachusetts in 1755 to prevent

illicit trade with Canada and had aroused a violent hostility at that

time. In 1761 it was again the subject of a bitter controversy which

arose in connection with the application of a customs officer to a

Massachusetts court for writs of assistance "as usual." This application

was vainly opposed by James Otis in a speech of five hours' duration--a

speech of such fire and eloquence that it sent every man who heard it

away "ready to take up arms against writs of assistance." Otis denounced

the practice as an exercise of arbitrary power which had cost one king

his head and another his throne, a tyrant's device which placed the

liberty of every man in jeopardy, enabling any petty officer to work

possible malice on any innocent citizen on the merest suspicion, and to

spread terror and desolation through the land. "What a scene," he

exclaimed, "does this open! Every man, prompted by revenge, ill-humor,

or wantonness to inspect the inside of his neighbor's house, may get a

writ of assistance. Others will ask it from self-defense; one arbitrary

exertion will provoke another until society is involved in tumult and

blood." He did more than attack the writ itself. He said that Parliament

could not establish it because it was against the British constitution.

This was an assertion resting on slender foundation, but it was quickly

echoed by the people. Then and there James Otis sounded the call to

America to resist the exercise of arbitrary power by royal officers.

"Then and there," wrote John Adams, "the child Independence was born."

Such was the hated writ that Townshend proposed to put into the hands of

customs officers in his grim determination to enforce the law.

=The New York Assembly Suspended.=--In the very month that Townshend's

Acts were signed by the king, Parliament took a still more drastic step.

The assembly of New York, protesting against the "ruinous and

insupportable" expense involved, had failed to make provision for the

care of British troops in accordance with the terms of the Quartering

Act. Parliament therefore suspended the assembly until it promised to

obey the law. It was not until a third election was held that compliance

with the Quartering Act was wrung from the reluctant province. In the

meantime, all the colonies had learned on how frail a foundation their

representative bodies rested.

RENEWED RESISTANCE IN AMERICA

=The Massachusetts Circular (1768).=--Massachusetts, under the

leadership of Samuel Adams, resolved to resist the policy of renewed

intervention in America. At his suggestion the assembly adopted a

Circular Letter addressed to the assemblies of the other colonies

informing them of the state of affairs in Massachusetts and roundly

condemning the whole British program. The Circular Letter declared that

Parliament had no right to lay taxes on Americans without their consent

and that the colonists could not, from the nature of the case, be

represented in Parliament. It went on shrewdly to submit to

consideration the question as to whether any people could be called free

who were subjected to governors and judges appointed by the crown and

paid out of funds raised independently. It invited the other colonies,

in the most temperate tones, to take thought about the common

predicament in which they were all placed.

[Illustration: \_From an old print.\_
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=The Dissolution of Assemblies.=--The governor of Massachusetts, hearing

of the Circular Letter, ordered the assembly to rescind its appeal. On

meeting refusal, he promptly dissolved it. The Maryland, Georgia, and

South Carolina assemblies indorsed the Circular Letter and were also

dissolved at once. The Virginia House of Burgesses, thoroughly aroused,

passed resolutions on May 16, 1769, declaring that the sole right of

imposing taxes in Virginia was vested in its legislature, asserting anew

the right of petition to the crown, condemning the transportation of

persons accused of crimes or trial beyond the seas, and beseeching the

king for a redress of the general grievances. The immediate dissolution

of the Virginia assembly, in its turn, was the answer of the royal

governor.

=The Boston Massacre.=--American opposition to the British authorities

kept steadily rising as assemblies were dissolved, the houses of

citizens searched, and troops distributed in increasing numbers among

the centers of discontent. Merchants again agreed not to import British

goods, the Sons of Liberty renewed their agitation, and women set about

the patronage of home products still more loyally.

On the night of March 5, 1770, a crowd on the streets of Boston began to

jostle and tease some British regulars stationed in the town. Things

went from bad to worse until some "boys and young fellows" began to

throw snowballs and stones. Then the exasperated soldiers fired into the

crowd, killing five and wounding half a dozen more. The day after the

"massacre," a mass meeting was held in the town and Samuel Adams was

sent to demand the withdrawal of the soldiers. The governor hesitated

and tried to compromise. Finding Adams relentless, the governor yielded

and ordered the regulars away.

The Boston Massacre stirred the country from New Hampshire to Georgia.

Popular passions ran high. The guilty soldiers were charged with murder.

Their defense was undertaken, in spite of the wrath of the populace, by

John Adams and Josiah Quincy, who as lawyers thought even the worst

offenders entitled to their full rights in law. In his speech to the

jury, however, Adams warned the British government against its course,

saying, that "from the nature of things soldiers quartered in a populous

town will always occasion two mobs where they will prevent one." Two of

the soldiers were convicted and lightly punished.

=Resistance in the South.=--The year following the Boston Massacre some

citizens of North Carolina, goaded by the conduct of the royal governor,

openly resisted his authority. Many were killed as a result and seven

who were taken prisoners were hanged as traitors. A little later royal

troops and local militia met in a pitched battle near Alamance River,

called the "Lexington of the South."

=The \_Gaspee\_ Affair and the Virginia Resolutions of 1773.=--On sea as

well as on land, friction between the royal officers and the colonists

broke out into overt acts. While patrolling Narragansett Bay looking for

smugglers one day in 1772, the armed ship, \_Gaspee\_, ran ashore and was

caught fast. During the night several men from Providence boarded the

vessel and, after seizing the crew, set it on fire. A royal commission,

sent to Rhode Island to discover the offenders and bring them to

account, failed because it could not find a single informer. The very

appointment of such a commission aroused the patriots of Virginia to

action; and in March, 1773, the House of Burgesses passed a resolution

creating a standing committee of correspondence to develop cooperation

among the colonies in resistance to British measures.

=The Boston Tea Party.=--Although the British government, finding the

Townshend revenue act a failure, repealed in 1770 all the duties except

that on tea, it in no way relaxed its resolve to enforce the other

commercial regulations it had imposed on the colonies. Moreover,

Parliament decided to relieve the British East India Company of the

financial difficulties into which it had fallen partly by reason of the

Tea Act and the colonial boycott that followed. In 1773 it agreed to

return to the Company the regular import duties, levied in England, on

all tea transshipped to America. A small impost of three pence, to be

collected in America, was left as a reminder of the principle laid down

in the Declaratory Act that Parliament had the right to tax the

colonists.

This arrangement with the East India Company was obnoxious to the

colonists for several reasons. It was an act of favoritism for one

thing, in the interest of a great monopoly. For another thing, it

promised to dump on the American market, suddenly, an immense amount of

cheap tea and so cause heavy losses to American merchants who had large

stocks on hand. It threatened with ruin the business of all those who

were engaged in clandestine trade with the Dutch. It carried with it an

irritating tax of three pence on imports. In Charleston, Annapolis, New

York, and Boston, captains of ships who brought tea under this act were

roughly handled. One night in December, 1773, a band of Boston citizens,

disguised as Indians, boarded the hated tea ships and dumped the cargo

into the harbor. This was serious business, for it was open, flagrant,

determined violation of the law. As such the British government viewed

it.

RETALIATION BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

=Reception of the News of the Tea Riot.=--The news of the tea riot in

Boston confirmed King George in his conviction that there should be no

soft policy in dealing with his American subjects. "The die is cast," he

stated with evident satisfaction. "The colonies must either triumph or

submit.... If we take the resolute part, they will undoubtedly be very

meek." Lord George Germain characterized the tea party as "the

proceedings of a tumultuous and riotous rabble who ought, if they had

the least prudence, to follow their mercantile employments and not

trouble themselves with politics and government, which they do not

understand." This expressed, in concise form, exactly the sentiments of

Lord North, who had then for three years been the king's chief minister.

Even Pitt, Lord Chatham, was prepared to support the government in

upholding its authority.

=The Five Intolerable Acts.=--Parliament, beginning on March 31, 1774,

passed five stringent measures, known in American history as the five

"intolerable acts." They were aimed at curing the unrest in America. The

\_first\_ of them was a bill absolutely shutting the port of Boston to

commerce with the outside world. The \_second\_, following closely,

revoked the Massachusetts charter of 1691 and provided furthermore that

the councilors should be appointed by the king, that all judges should

be named by the royal governor, and that town meetings (except to elect

certain officers) could not be held without the governor's consent. A

\_third\_ measure, after denouncing the "utter subversion of all lawful

government" in the provinces, authorized royal agents to transfer to

Great Britain or to other colonies the trials of officers or other

persons accused of murder in connection with the enforcement of the law.

The \_fourth\_ act legalized the quartering of troops in Massachusetts

towns. The \_fifth\_ of the measures was the Quebec Act, which granted

religious toleration to the Catholics in Canada, extended the boundaries

of Quebec southward to the Ohio River, and established, in this western

region, government by a viceroy.

The intolerable acts went through Parliament with extraordinary

celerity. There was an opposition, alert and informed; but it was

ineffective. Burke spoke eloquently against the Boston port bill,

condemning it roundly for punishing the innocent with the guilty, and

showing how likely it was to bring grave consequences in its train. He

was heard with respect and his pleas were rejected. The bill passed both

houses without a division, the entry "unanimous" being made upon their

journals although it did not accurately represent the state of opinion.

The law destroying the charter of Massachusetts passed the Commons by a

vote of three to one; and the third intolerable act by a vote of four to

one. The triumph of the ministry was complete. "What passed in Boston,"

exclaimed the great jurist, Lord Mansfield, "is the overt act of High

Treason proceeding from our over lenity and want of foresight." The

crown and Parliament were united in resorting to punitive measures.

In the colonies the laws were received with consternation. To the

American Protestants, the Quebec Act was the most offensive. That

project they viewed not as an act of grace or of mercy but as a direct

attempt to enlist French Canadians on the side of Great Britain. The

British government did not grant religious toleration to Catholics

either at home or in Ireland and the Americans could see no good motive

in granting it in North America. The act was also offensive because

Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Virginia had, under their charters,

large claims in the territory thus annexed to Quebec.

To enforce these intolerable acts the military arm of the British

government was brought into play. The commander-in-chief of the armed

forces in America, General Gage, was appointed governor of

Massachusetts. Reinforcements were brought to the colonies, for now King

George was to give "the rebels," as he called them, a taste of strong

medicine. The majesty of his law was to be vindicated by force.

FROM REFORM TO REVOLUTION IN AMERICA

=The Doctrine of Natural Rights.=--The dissolution of assemblies, the

destruction of charters, and the use of troops produced in the colonies

a new phase in the struggle. In the early days of the contest with the

British ministry, the Americans spoke of their "rights as Englishmen"

and condemned the acts of Parliament as unlawful, as violating the

principles of the English constitution under which they all lived. When

they saw that such arguments had no effect on Parliament, they turned

for support to their "natural rights." The latter doctrine, in the form

in which it was employed by the colonists, was as English as the

constitutional argument. John Locke had used it with good effect in

defense of the English revolution in the seventeenth century. American

leaders, familiar with the writings of Locke, also took up his thesis in

the hour of their distress. They openly declared that their rights did

not rest after all upon the English constitution or a charter from the

crown. "Old Magna Carta was not the beginning of all things," retorted

Otis when the constitutional argument failed. "A time may come when

Parliament shall declare every American charter void, but the natural,

inherent, and inseparable rights of the colonists as men and as citizens

would remain and whatever became of charters can never be abolished

until the general conflagration." Of the same opinion was the young and

impetuous Alexander Hamilton. "The sacred rights of mankind," he

exclaimed, "are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty

records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human

destiny by the hand of divinity itself, and can never be erased or

obscured by mortal power."

Firm as the American leaders were in the statement and defense of their

rights, there is every reason for believing that in the beginning they

hoped to confine the conflict to the realm of opinion. They constantly

avowed that they were loyal to the king when protesting in the strongest

language against his policies. Even Otis, regarded by the loyalists as a

firebrand, was in fact attempting to avert revolution by winning

concessions from England. "I argue this cause with the greater

pleasure," he solemnly urged in his speech against the writs of

assistance, "as it is in favor of British liberty ... and as it is in

opposition to a kind of power, the exercise of which in former periods

cost one king of England his head and another his throne."

=Burke Offers the Doctrine of Conciliation.=--The flooding tide of

American sentiment was correctly measured by one Englishman at least,

Edmund Burke, who quickly saw that attempts to restrain the rise of

American democracy were efforts to reverse the processes of nature. He

saw how fixed and rooted in the nature of things was the American

spirit--how inevitable, how irresistible. He warned his countrymen that

there were three ways of handling the delicate situation--and only

three. One was to remove the cause of friction by changing the spirit of

the colonists--an utter impossibility because that spirit was grounded

in the essential circumstances of American life. The second was to

prosecute American leaders as criminals; of this he begged his

countrymen to beware lest the colonists declare that "a government

against which a claim of liberty is tantamount to high treason is a

government to which submission is equivalent to slavery." The third and

right way to meet the problem, Burke concluded, was to accept the

American spirit, repeal the obnoxious measures, and receive the colonies

into equal partnership.

=Events Produce the Great Decision.=--The right way, indicated by Burke,

was equally impossible to George III and the majority in Parliament. To

their narrow minds, American opinion was contemptible and American

resistance unlawful, riotous, and treasonable. The correct way, in their

view, was to dispatch more troops to crush the "rebels"; and that very

act took the contest from the realm of opinion. As John Adams said:

"Facts are stubborn things." Opinions were unseen, but marching soldiers

were visible to the veriest street urchin. "Now," said Gouverneur

Morris, "the sheep, simple as they are, cannot be gulled as heretofore."

It was too late to talk about the excellence of the British

constitution. If any one is bewildered by the controversies of modern

historians as to why the crisis came at last, he can clarify his

understanding by reading again Edmund Burke's stately oration, \_On

Conciliation with America\_.
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=Questions=

1. Show how the character of George III made for trouble with the

colonies.

2. Explain why the party and parliamentary systems of England favored

the plans of George III.

3. How did the state of English finances affect English policy?

4. Enumerate five important measures of the English government affecting

the colonies between 1763 and 1765. Explain each in detail.

5. Describe American resistance to the Stamp Act. What was the outcome?

6. Show how England renewed her policy of regulation in 1767.

7. Summarize the events connected with American resistance.

8. With what measures did Great Britain retaliate?

9. Contrast "constitutional" with "natural" rights.

10. What solution did Burke offer? Why was it rejected?

=Research Topics=

=Powers Conferred on Revenue Officers by Writs of Assistance.=--See a

writ in Macdonald, \_Source Book\_, p. 109.

=The Acts of Parliament Respecting America.=--Macdonald, pp. 117-146.

Assign one to each student for report and comment.

=Source Studies on the Stamp Act.=--Hart, \_American History Told by

Contemporaries\_, Vol. II, pp. 394-412.

=Source Studies of the Townshend Acts.=--Hart, Vol. II, pp. 413-433.

=American Principles.=--Prepare a table of them from the Resolutions of

the Stamp Act Congress and the Massachusetts Circular. Macdonald, pp.

136-146.

=An English Historian's View of the Period.=--Green, \_Short History of

England\_, Chap. X.

=English Policy Not Injurious to America.=--Callender, \_Economic

History\_, pp. 85-121.

=A Review of English Policy.=--Woodrow Wilson, \_History of the American

People\_, Vol. II, pp. 129-170.

=The Opening of the Revolution.=--Elson, \_History of the United States\_,

pp. 220-235.

CHAPTER VI

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

RESISTANCE AND RETALIATION

=The Continental Congress.=--When the news of the "intolerable acts"

reached America, every one knew what strong medicine Parliament was

prepared to administer to all those who resisted its authority. The

cause of Massachusetts became the cause of all the colonies. Opposition

to British policy, hitherto local and spasmodic, now took on a national

character. To local committees and provincial conventions was added a

Continental Congress, appropriately called by Massachusetts on June 17,

1774, at the instigation of Samuel Adams. The response to the summons

was electric. By hurried and irregular methods delegates were elected

during the summer, and on September 5 the Congress duly assembled in

Carpenter's Hall in Philadelphia. Many of the greatest men in America

were there--George Washington and Patrick Henry from Virginia and John

and Samuel Adams from Massachusetts. Every shade of opinion was

represented. Some were impatient with mild devices; the majority favored

moderation.

The Congress drew up a declaration of American rights and stated in

clear and dignified language the grievances of the colonists. It

approved the resistance to British measures offered by Massachusetts and

promised the united support of all sections. It prepared an address to

King George and another to the people of England, disavowing the idea of

independence but firmly attacking the policies pursued by the British

government.

=The Non-Importation Agreement.=--The Congress was not content, however,

with professions of faith and with petitions. It took one revolutionary

step. It agreed to stop the importation of British goods into America,

and the enforcement of this agreement it placed in the hands of local

"committees of safety and inspection," to be elected by the qualified

voters. The significance of this action is obvious. Congress threw

itself athwart British law. It made a rule to bind American citizens and

to be carried into effect by American officers. It set up a state within

the British state and laid down a test of allegiance to the new order.

The colonists, who up to this moment had been wavering, had to choose

one authority or the other. They were for the enforcement of the

non-importation agreement or they were against it. They either bought

English goods or they did not. In the spirit of the toast--"May Britain

be wise and America be free"--the first Continental Congress adjourned

in October, having appointed the tenth of May following for the meeting

of a second Congress, should necessity require.

=Lord North's "Olive Branch."=--When the news of the action of the

American Congress reached England, Pitt and Burke warmly urged a repeal

of the obnoxious laws, but in vain. All they could wring from the prime

minister, Lord North, was a set of "conciliatory resolutions" proposing

to relieve from taxation any colony that would assume its share of

imperial defense and make provision for supporting the local officers of

the crown. This "olive branch" was accompanied by a resolution assuring

the king of support at all hazards in suppressing the rebellion and by

the restraining act of March 30, 1775, which in effect destroyed the

commerce of New England.

=Bloodshed at Lexington and Concord (April 19, 1775).=--Meanwhile the

British authorities in Massachusetts relaxed none of their efforts in

upholding British sovereignty. General Gage, hearing that military

stores had been collected at Concord, dispatched a small force to seize

them. By this act he precipitated the conflict he had sought to avoid.

At Lexington, on the road to Concord, occurred "the little thing" that

produced "the great event." An unexpected collision beyond the thought

or purpose of any man had transferred the contest from the forum to the

battle field.

=The Second Continental Congress.=--Though blood had been shed and war

was actually at hand, the second Continental Congress, which met at

Philadelphia in May, 1775, was not yet convinced that conciliation was

beyond human power. It petitioned the king to interpose on behalf of the

colonists in order that the empire might avoid the calamities of civil

war. On the last day of July, it made a temperate but firm answer to

Lord North's offer of conciliation, stating that the proposal was

unsatisfactory because it did not renounce the right to tax or repeal

the offensive acts of Parliament.

=Force, the British Answer.=--Just as the representatives of America

were about to present the last petition of Congress to the king on

August 23, 1775, George III issued a proclamation of rebellion. This

announcement declared that the colonists, "misled by dangerous and

ill-designing men," were in a state of insurrection; it called on the

civil and military powers to bring "the traitors to justice"; and it

threatened with "condign punishment the authors, perpetrators, and

abettors of such traitorous designs." It closed with the usual prayer:

"God, save the king." Later in the year, Parliament passed a sweeping

act destroying all trade and intercourse with America. Congress was

silent at last. Force was also America's answer.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

=Drifting into War.=--Although the Congress had not given up all hope of

reconciliation in the spring and summer of 1775, it had firmly resolved

to defend American rights by arms if necessary. It transformed the

militiamen who had assembled near Boston, after the battle of Lexington,

into a Continental army and selected Washington as commander-in-chief.

It assumed the powers of a government and prepared to raise money, wage

war, and carry on diplomatic relations with foreign countries.

[Illustration: \_From an old print\_
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Events followed thick and fast. On June 17, the American militia, by

the stubborn defense of Bunker Hill, showed that it could make British

regulars pay dearly for all they got. On July 3, Washington took command

of the army at Cambridge. In January, 1776, after bitter disappointments

in drumming up recruits for its army in England, Scotland, and Ireland,

the British government concluded a treaty with the Landgrave of

Hesse-Cassel in Germany contracting, at a handsome figure, for thousands

of soldiers and many pieces of cannon. This was the crowning insult to

America. Such was the view of all friends of the colonies on both sides

of the water. Such was, long afterward, the judgment of the conservative

historian Lecky: "The conduct of England in hiring German mercenaries to

subdue the essentially English population beyond the Atlantic made

reconciliation hopeless and independence inevitable." The news of this

wretched transaction in German soldiers had hardly reached America

before there ran all down the coast the thrilling story that Washington

had taken Boston, on March 17, 1776, compelling Lord Howe to sail with

his entire army for Halifax.

=The Growth of Public Sentiment in Favor of Independence.=--Events were

bearing the Americans away from their old position under the British

constitution toward a final separation. Slowly and against their

desires, prudent and honorable men, who cherished the ties that united

them to the old order and dreaded with genuine horror all thought of

revolution, were drawn into the path that led to the great decision. In

all parts of the country and among all classes, the question of the hour

was being debated. "American independence," as the historian Bancroft

says, "was not an act of sudden passion nor the work of one man or one

assembly. It had been discussed in every part of the country by farmers

and merchants, by mechanics and planters, by the fishermen along the

coast and the backwoodsmen of the West; in town meetings and from the

pulpit; at social gatherings and around the camp fires; in county

conventions and conferences or committees; in colonial congresses and

assemblies."

[Illustration: \_From an old print\_
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=Paine's "Commonsense."=--In the midst of this ferment of American

opinion, a bold and eloquent pamphleteer broke in upon the hesitating

public with a program for absolute independence, without fears and

without apologies. In the early days of 1776, Thomas Paine issued the

first of his famous tracts, "Commonsense," a passionate attack upon the

British monarchy and an equally passionate plea for American liberty.

Casting aside the language of petition with which Americans had hitherto

addressed George III, Paine went to the other extreme and assailed him

with many a violent epithet. He condemned monarchy itself as a system

which had laid the world "in blood and ashes." Instead of praising the

British constitution under which colonists had been claiming their

rights, he brushed it aside as ridiculous, protesting that it was "owing

to the constitution of the people, not to the constitution of the

government, that the Crown is not as oppressive in England as in

Turkey."

Having thus summarily swept away the grounds of allegiance to the old

order, Paine proceeded relentlessly to an argument for immediate

separation from Great Britain. There was nothing in the sphere of

practical interest, he insisted, which should bind the colonies to the

mother country. Allegiance to her had been responsible for the many wars

in which they had been involved. Reasons of trade were not less weighty

in behalf of independence. "Our corn will fetch its price in any market

in Europe and our imported goods must be paid for, buy them where we

will." As to matters of government, "it is not in the power of Britain

to do this continent justice; the business of it will soon be too

weighty and intricate to be managed with any tolerable degree of

convenience by a power so distant from us and so very ignorant of us."

There is accordingly no alternative to independence for America.

"Everything that is right or natural pleads for separation. The blood of

the slain, the weeping voice of nature cries ''tis time to part.' ...

Arms, the last resort, must decide the contest; the appeal was the

choice of the king and the continent hath accepted the challenge.... The

sun never shone on a cause of greater worth. 'Tis not the affair of a

city, a county, a province or a kingdom, but of a continent.... 'Tis not

the concern of a day, a year or an age; posterity is involved in the

contest and will be more or less affected to the end of time by the

proceedings now. Now is the seed-time of Continental union, faith, and

honor.... O! ye that love mankind! Ye that dare oppose not only the

tyranny, but the tyrant, stand forth.... Let names of Whig and Tory be

extinct. Let none other be heard among us than those of a good citizen,

an open and resolute friend, and a virtuous supporter of the rights of

mankind and of the free and independent states of America." As more than

100,000 copies were scattered broadcast over the country, patriots

exclaimed with Washington: "Sound doctrine and unanswerable reason!"

=The Drift of Events toward Independence.=--Official support for the

idea of independence began to come from many quarters. On the tenth of

February, 1776, Gadsden, in the provincial convention of South Carolina,

advocated a new constitution for the colony and absolute independence

for all America. The convention balked at the latter but went half way

by abolishing the system of royal administration and establishing a

complete plan of self-government. A month later, on April 12, the

neighboring state of North Carolina uttered the daring phrase from which

others shrank. It empowered its representatives in the Congress to

concur with the delegates of the other colonies in declaring

independence. Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Virginia quickly

responded to the challenge. The convention of the Old Dominion, on May

15, instructed its delegates at Philadelphia to propose the independence

of the United Colonies and to give the assent of Virginia to the act of

separation. When the resolution was carried the British flag on the

state house was lowered for all time.

Meanwhile the Continental Congress was alive to the course of events

outside. The subject of independence was constantly being raised. "Are

we rebels?" exclaimed Wyeth of Virginia during a debate in February.

"No: we must declare ourselves a free people." Others hesitated and

spoke of waiting for the arrival of commissioners of conciliation. "Is

not America already independent?" asked Samuel Adams a few weeks later.

"Why not then declare it?" Still there was uncertainty and delegates

avoided the direct word. A few more weeks elapsed. At last, on May 10,

Congress declared that the authority of the British crown in America

must be suppressed and advised the colonies to set up governments of

their own.

[Illustration: \_From an old print\_
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=Independence Declared.=--The way was fully prepared, therefore, when,

on June 7, the Virginia delegation in the Congress moved that "these

united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent

states." A committee was immediately appointed to draft a formal

document setting forth the reasons for the act, and on July 2 all the

states save New York went on record in favor of severing their political

connection with Great Britain. Two days later, July 4, Jefferson's draft

of the Declaration of Independence, changed in some slight particulars,

was adopted. The old bell in Independence Hall, as it is now known, rang

out the glad tidings; couriers swiftly carried the news to the uttermost

hamlet and farm. A new nation announced its will to have a place among

the powers of the world.

To some documents is given immortality. The Declaration of Independence

is one of them. American patriotism is forever associated with it; but

patriotism alone does not make it immortal. Neither does the vigor of

its language or the severity of its indictment give it a secure place in

the records of time. The secret of its greatness lies in the simple fact

that it is one of the memorable landmarks in the history of a political

ideal which for three centuries has been taking form and spreading

throughout the earth, challenging kings and potentates, shaking down

thrones and aristocracies, breaking the armies of irresponsible power on

battle fields as far apart as Marston Moor and Chateau-Thierry. That

ideal, now so familiar, then so novel, is summed up in the simple

sentence: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the

governed."

Written in a "decent respect for the opinions of mankind," to set forth

the causes which impelled the American colonists to separate from

Britain, the Declaration contained a long list of "abuses and

usurpations" which had induced them to throw off the government of King

George. That section of the Declaration has passed into "ancient"

history and is seldom read. It is the part laying down a new basis for

government and giving a new dignity to the common man that has become a

household phrase in the Old World as in the New.

In the more enduring passages there are four fundamental ideas which,

from the standpoint of the old system of government, were the essence of

revolution: (1) all men are created equal and are endowed by their

Creator with certain unalienable rights including life, liberty, and the

pursuit of happiness; (2) the purpose of government is to secure these

rights; (3) governments derive their just powers from the consent of the

governed; (4) whenever any form of government becomes destructive of

these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and

institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and

organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to

effect their safety and happiness. Here was the prelude to the historic

drama of democracy--a challenge to every form of government and every

privilege not founded on popular assent.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND THE NEW ALLEGIANCE

=The Committees of Correspondence.=--As soon as debate had passed into

armed resistance, the patriots found it necessary to consolidate their

forces by organizing civil government. This was readily effected, for

the means were at hand in town meetings, provincial legislatures, and

committees of correspondence. The working tools of the Revolution were

in fact the committees of correspondence--small, local, unofficial

groups of patriots formed to exchange views and create public sentiment.

As early as November, 1772, such a committee had been created in Boston

under the leadership of Samuel Adams. It held regular meetings, sent

emissaries to neighboring towns, and carried on a campaign of education

in the doctrines of liberty.

[Illustration: THE COLONIES OF NORTH AMERICA AT THE TIME OF THE

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE]

Upon local organizations similar in character to the Boston committee

were built county committees and then the larger colonial committees,

congresses, and conventions, all unofficial and representing the

revolutionary elements. Ordinarily the provincial convention was merely

the old legislative assembly freed from all royalist sympathizers and

controlled by patriots. Finally, upon these colonial assemblies was

built the Continental Congress, the precursor of union under the

Articles of Confederation and ultimately under the Constitution of the

United States. This was the revolutionary government set up within the

British empire in America.

=State Constitutions Framed.=--With the rise of these new assemblies of

the people, the old colonial governments broke down. From the royal

provinces the governor, the judges, and the high officers fled in haste,

and it became necessary to substitute patriot authorities. The appeal to

the colonies advising them to adopt a new form of government for

themselves, issued by the Congress in May, 1776, was quickly acted upon.

Before the expiration of a year, Virginia, New Jersey, Pennsylvania,

Delaware, Maryland, Georgia, and New York had drafted new constitutions

as states, not as colonies uncertain of their destinies. Connecticut and

Rhode Island, holding that their ancient charters were equal to their

needs, merely renounced their allegiance to the king and went on as

before so far as the form of government was concerned. South Carolina,

which had drafted a temporary plan early in 1776, drew up a new and more

complete constitution in 1778. Two years later Massachusetts with much

deliberation put into force its fundamental law, which in most of its

essential features remains unchanged to-day.

The new state constitutions in their broad outlines followed colonial

models. For the royal governor was substituted a governor or president

chosen usually by the legislature; but in two instances, New York and

Massachusetts, by popular vote. For the provincial council there was

substituted, except in Georgia, a senate; while the lower house, or

assembly, was continued virtually without change. The old property

restriction on the suffrage, though lowered slightly in some states, was

continued in full force to the great discontent of the mechanics thus

deprived of the ballot. The special qualifications, laid down in several

constitutions, for governors, senators, and representatives, indicated

that the revolutionary leaders were not prepared for any radical

experiments in democracy. The protests of a few women, like Mrs. John

Adams of Massachusetts and Mrs. Henry Corbin of Virginia, against a

government which excluded them from political rights were treated as

mild curiosities of no significance, although in New Jersey women were

allowed to vote for many years on the same terms as men.

By the new state constitutions the signs and symbols of royal power, of

authority derived from any source save "the people," were swept aside

and republican governments on an imposing scale presented for the first

time to the modern world. Copies of these remarkable documents prepared

by plain citizens were translated into French and widely circulated in

Europe. There they were destined to serve as a guide and inspiration to

a generation of constitution-makers whose mission it was to begin the

democratic revolution in the Old World.

=The Articles of Confederation.=--The formation of state constitutions

was an easy task for the revolutionary leaders. They had only to build

on foundations already laid. The establishment of a national system of

government was another matter. There had always been, it must be

remembered, a system of central control over the colonies, but Americans

had had little experience in its operation. When the supervision of the

crown of Great Britain was suddenly broken, the patriot leaders,

accustomed merely to provincial statesmanship, were poorly trained for

action on a national stage.

Many forces worked against those who, like Franklin, had a vision of

national destiny. There were differences in economic interest--commerce

and industry in the North and the planting system of the South. There

were contests over the apportionment of taxes and the quotas of troops

for common defense. To these practical difficulties were added local

pride, the vested rights of state and village politicians in their

provincial dignity, and the scarcity of men with a large outlook upon

the common enterprise.

Nevertheless, necessity compelled them to consider some sort of

federation. The second Continental Congress had hardly opened its work

before the most sagacious leaders began to urge the desirability of a

permanent connection. As early as July, 1775, Congress resolved to go

into a committee of the whole on the state of the union, and Franklin,

undaunted by the fate of his Albany plan of twenty years before, again

presented a draft of a constitution. Long and desultory debates followed

and it was not until late in 1777 that Congress presented to the states

the Articles of Confederation. Provincial jealousies delayed

ratification, and it was the spring of 1781, a few months before the

surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, when Maryland, the last of the

states, approved the Articles. This plan of union, though it was all

that could be wrung from the reluctant states, provided for neither a

chief executive nor a system of federal courts. It created simply a

Congress of delegates in which each state had an equal voice and gave it

the right to call upon the state legislatures for the sinews of

government--money and soldiers.

=The Application of Tests of Allegiance.=--As the successive steps were

taken in the direction of independent government, the patriots devised

and applied tests designed to discover who were for and who were against

the new nation in the process of making. When the first Continental

Congress agreed not to allow the importation of British goods, it

provided for the creation of local committees to enforce the rules. Such

agencies were duly formed by the choice of men favoring the scheme, all

opponents being excluded from the elections. Before these bodies those

who persisted in buying British goods were summoned and warned or

punished according to circumstances. As soon as the new state

constitutions were put into effect, local committees set to work in the

same way to ferret out all who were not outspoken in their support of

the new order of things.

[Illustration: MOBBING THE TORIES]

These patriot agencies, bearing different names in different sections,

were sometimes ruthless in their methods. They called upon all men to

sign the test of loyalty, frequently known as the "association test."

Those who refused were promptly branded as outlaws, while some of the

more dangerous were thrown into jail. The prison camp in Connecticut at

one time held the former governor of New Jersey and the mayor of New

York. Thousands were black-listed and subjected to espionage. The

black-list of Pennsylvania contained the names of nearly five hundred

persons of prominence who were under suspicion. Loyalists or Tories who

were bold enough to speak and write against the Revolution were

suppressed and their pamphlets burned. In many places, particularly in

the North, the property of the loyalists was confiscated and the

proceeds applied to the cause of the Revolution.

The work of the official agencies for suppression of opposition was

sometimes supplemented by mob violence. A few Tories were hanged without

trial, and others were tarred and feathered. One was placed upon a cake

of ice and held there "until his loyalty to King George might cool."

Whole families were driven out of their homes to find their way as best

they could within the British lines or into Canada, where the British

government gave them lands. Such excesses were deplored by Washington,

but they were defended on the ground that in effect a civil war, as well

as a war for independence, was being waged.

=The Patriots and Tories.=--Thus, by one process or another, those who

were to be citizens of the new republic were separated from those who

preferred to be subjects of King George. Just what proportion of the

Americans favored independence and what share remained loyal to the

British monarchy there is no way of knowing. The question of revolution

was not submitted to popular vote, and on the point of numbers we have

conflicting evidence. On the patriot side, there is the testimony of a

careful and informed observer, John Adams, who asserted that two-thirds

of the people were for the American cause and not more than one-third

opposed the Revolution at all stages.

On behalf of the loyalists, or Tories as they were popularly known,

extravagant claims were made. Joseph Galloway, who had been a member of

the first Continental Congress and had fled to England when he saw its

temper, testified before a committee of Parliament in 1779 that not

one-fifth of the American people supported the insurrection and that

"many more than four-fifths of the people prefer a union with Great

Britain upon constitutional principles to independence." At the same

time General Robertson, who had lived in America twenty-four years,

declared that "more than two-thirds of the people would prefer the

king's government to the Congress' tyranny." In an address to the king

in that year a committee of American loyalists asserted that "the number

of Americans in his Majesty's army exceeded the number of troops

enlisted by Congress to oppose them."

=The Character of the Loyalists.=--When General Howe evacuated Boston,

more than a thousand people fled with him. This great company, according

to a careful historian, "formed the aristocracy of the province by

virtue of their official rank; of their dignified callings and

professions; of their hereditary wealth and of their culture." The act

of banishment passed by Massachusetts in 1778, listing over 300 Tories,

"reads like the social register of the oldest and noblest families of

New England," more than one out of five being graduates of Harvard

College. The same was true of New York and Philadelphia; namely, that

the leading loyalists were prominent officials of the old order,

clergymen and wealthy merchants. With passion the loyalists fought

against the inevitable or with anguish of heart they left as refugees

for a life of uncertainty in Canada or the mother country.

=Tories Assail the Patriots.=--The Tories who remained in America joined

the British army by the thousands or in other ways aided the royal

cause. Those who were skillful with the pen assailed the patriots in

editorials, rhymes, satires, and political catechisms. They declared

that the members of Congress were "obscure, pettifogging attorneys,

bankrupt shopkeepers, outlawed smugglers, etc." The people and their

leaders they characterized as "wretched banditti ... the refuse and

dregs of mankind." The generals in the army they sneered at as "men of

rank and honor nearly on a par with those of the Congress."

=Patriot Writers Arouse the National Spirit.=--Stung by Tory taunts,

patriot writers devoted themselves to creating and sustaining a public

opinion favorable to the American cause. Moreover, they had to combat

the depression that grew out of the misfortunes in the early days of the

war. A terrible disaster befell Generals Arnold and Montgomery in the

winter of 1775 as they attempted to bring Canada into the revolution--a

disaster that cost 5000 men; repeated calamities harassed Washington in

1776 as he was defeated on Long Island, driven out of New York City, and

beaten at Harlem Heights and White Plains. These reverses were almost

too great for the stoutest patriots.

Pamphleteers, preachers, and publicists rose, however, to meet the needs

of the hour. John Witherspoon, provost of the College of New Jersey,

forsook the classroom for the field of political controversy. The poet,

Philip Freneau, flung taunts of cowardice at the Tories and celebrated

the spirit of liberty in many a stirring poem. Songs, ballads, plays,

and satires flowed from the press in an unending stream. Fast days,

battle anniversaries, celebrations of important steps taken by Congress

afforded to patriotic clergymen abundant opportunities for sermons.

"Does Mr. Wiberd preach against oppression?" anxiously inquired John

Adams in a letter to his wife. The answer was decisive. "The clergy of

every denomination, not excepting the Episcopalian, thunder and lighten

every Sabbath. They pray for Boston and Massachusetts. They thank God

most explicitly and fervently for our remarkable successes. They pray

for the American army."

Thomas Paine never let his pen rest. He had been with the forces of

Washington when they retreated from Fort Lee and were harried from New

Jersey into Pennsylvania. He knew the effect of such reverses on the

army as well as on the public. In December, 1776, he made a second great

appeal to his countrymen in his pamphlet, "The Crisis," the first part

of which he had written while defeat and gloom were all about him. This

tract was a cry for continued support of the Revolution. "These are the

times that try men's souls," he opened. "The summer soldier and the

sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his

country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of men

and women." Paine laid his lash fiercely on the Tories, branding every

one as a coward grounded in "servile, slavish, self-interested fear." He

deplored the inadequacy of the militia and called for a real army. He

refuted the charge that the retreat through New Jersey was a disaster

and he promised victory soon. "By perseverance and fortitude," he

concluded, "we have the prospect of a glorious issue; by cowardice and

submission the sad choice of a variety of evils--a ravaged country, a

depopulated city, habitations without safety and slavery without

hope.... Look on this picture and weep over it." His ringing call to

arms was followed by another and another until the long contest was

over.

MILITARY AFFAIRS

=The Two Phases of the War.=--The war which opened with the battle of

Lexington, on April 19, 1775, and closed with the surrender of

Cornwallis at Yorktown on October 19, 1781, passed through two distinct

phases--the first lasting until the treaty of alliance with France, in

1778, and the second until the end of the struggle. During the first

phase, the war was confined mainly to the North. The outstanding

features of the contest were the evacuation of Boston by the British,

the expulsion of American forces from New York and their retreat through

New Jersey, the battle of Trenton, the seizure of Philadelphia by the

British (September, 1777), the invasion of New York by Burgoyne and his

capture at Saratoga in October, 1777, and the encampment of American

forces at Valley Forge for the terrible winter of 1777-78.

The final phase of the war, opening with the treaty of alliance with

France on February 6, 1778, was confined mainly to the Middle states,

the West, and the South. In the first sphere of action the chief events

were the withdrawal of the British from Philadelphia, the battle of

Monmouth, and the inclosure of the British in New York by deploying

American forces from Morristown, New Jersey, up to West Point. In the

West, George Rogers Clark, by his famous march into the Illinois

country, secured Kaskaskia and Vincennes and laid a firm grip on the

country between the Ohio and the Great Lakes. In the South, the second

period opened with successes for the British. They captured Savannah,

conquered Georgia, and restored the royal governor. In 1780 they seized

Charleston, administered a crushing defeat to the American forces under

Gates at Camden, and overran South Carolina, though meeting reverses at

Cowpens and King's Mountain. Then came the closing scenes. Cornwallis

began the last of his operations. He pursued General Greene far into

North Carolina, clashed with him at Guilford Court House, retired to the

coast, took charge of British forces engaged in plundering Virginia, and

fortified Yorktown, where he was penned up by the French fleet from the

sea and the combined French and American forces on land.

=The Geographical Aspects of the War.=--For the British the theater of

the war offered many problems. From first to last it extended from

Massachusetts to Georgia, a distance of almost a thousand miles. It was

nearly three thousand miles from the main base of supplies and, though

the British navy kept the channel open, transports were constantly

falling prey to daring privateers and fleet American war vessels. The

sea, on the other hand, offered an easy means of transportation between

points along the coast and gave ready access to the American centers of

wealth and population. Of this the British made good use. Though early

forced to give up Boston, they seized New York and kept it until the end

of the war; they took Philadelphia and retained it until threatened by

the approach of the French fleet; and they captured and held both

Savannah and Charleston. Wars, however, are seldom won by the conquest

of cities.

Particularly was this true in the case of the Revolution. Only a small

portion of the American people lived in towns. Countrymen back from the

coast were in no way dependent upon them for a livelihood. They lived on

the produce of the soil, not upon the profits of trade. This very fact

gave strength to them in the contest. Whenever the British ventured far

from the ports of entry, they encountered reverses. Burgoyne was forced

to surrender at Saratoga because he was surrounded and cut off from his

base of supplies. As soon as the British got away from Charleston, they

were harassed and worried by the guerrilla warriors of Marion, Sumter,

and Pickens. Cornwallis could technically defeat Greene at Guilford far

in the interior; but he could not hold the inland region he had invaded.

Sustained by their own labor, possessing the interior to which their

armies could readily retreat, supplied mainly from native resources, the

Americans could not be hemmed in, penned up, and destroyed at one fell

blow.

=The Sea Power.=--The British made good use of their fleet in cutting

off American trade, but control of the sea did not seriously affect the

United States. As an agricultural country, the ruin of its commerce was

not such a vital matter. All the materials for a comfortable though

somewhat rude life were right at hand. It made little difference to a

nation fighting for existence, if silks, fine linens, and chinaware were

cut off. This was an evil to which submission was necessary.

Nor did the brilliant exploits of John Paul Jones and Captain John Barry

materially change the situation. They demonstrated the skill of American

seamen and their courage as fighting men. They raised the rates of

British marine insurance, but they did not dethrone the mistress of the

seas. Less spectacular, and more distinctive, were the deeds of the

hundreds of privateers and minor captains who overhauled British supply

ships and kept British merchantmen in constant anxiety. Not until the

French fleet was thrown into the scale, were the British compelled to

reckon seriously with the enemy on the sea and make plans based upon the

possibilities of a maritime disaster.

=Commanding Officers.=--On the score of military leadership it is

difficult to compare the contending forces in the revolutionary contest.

There is no doubt that all the British commanders were men of experience

in the art of warfare. Sir William Howe had served in America during the

French War and was accounted an excellent officer, a strict

disciplinarian, and a gallant gentleman. Nevertheless he loved ease,

society, and good living, and his expulsion from Boston, his failure to

overwhelm Washington by sallies from his comfortable bases at New York

and Philadelphia, destroyed every shred of his military reputation. John

Burgoyne, to whom was given the task of penetrating New York from

Canada, had likewise seen service in the French War both in America and

Europe. He had, however, a touch of the theatrical in his nature and

after the collapse of his plans and the surrender of his army in 1777,

he devoted his time mainly to light literature. Sir Henry Clinton, who

directed the movement which ended in the capture of Charleston in 1780,

had "learned his trade on the continent," and was regarded as a man of

discretion and understanding in military matters. Lord Cornwallis, whose

achievements at Camden and Guilford were blotted out by his surrender at

Yorktown, had seen service in the Seven Years' War and had undoubted

talents which he afterward displayed with great credit to himself in

India. Though none of them, perhaps, were men of first-rate ability,

they all had training and experience to guide them.

[Illustration: GEORGE WASHINGTON]

The Americans had a host in Washington himself. He had long been

interested in military strategy and had tested his coolness under fire

during the first clashes with the French nearly twenty years before. He

had no doubts about the justice of his cause, such as plagued some of

the British generals. He was a stern but reasonable disciplinarian. He

was reserved and patient, little given to exaltation at success or

depression at reverses. In the dark hour of the Revolution, "what held

the patriot forces together?" asks Beveridge in his \_Life of John

Marshall\_. Then he answers: "George Washington and he alone. Had he

died or been seriously disabled, the Revolution would have ended....

Washington was the soul of the American cause. Washington was the

government. Washington was the Revolution." The weakness of Congress in

furnishing men and supplies, the indolence of civilians, who lived at

ease while the army starved, the intrigues of army officers against him

such as the "Conway cabal," the cowardice of Lee at Monmouth, even the

treason of Benedict Arnold, while they stirred deep emotions in his

breast and aroused him to make passionate pleas to his countrymen, did

not shake his iron will or his firm determination to see the war through

to the bitter end. The weight of Washington's moral force was

immeasurable.

Of the generals who served under him, none can really be said to have

been experienced military men when the war opened. Benedict Arnold, the

unhappy traitor but brave and daring soldier, was a druggist, book

seller, and ship owner at New Haven when the news of Lexington called

him to battle. Horatio Gates was looked upon as a "seasoned soldier"

because he had entered the British army as a youth, had been wounded at

Braddock's memorable defeat, and had served with credit during the Seven

Years' War; but he was the most conspicuous failure of the Revolution.

The triumph over Burgoyne was the work of other men; and his crushing

defeat at Camden put an end to his military pretensions. Nathanael

Greene was a Rhode Island farmer and smith without military experience

who, when convinced that war was coming, read Caesar's \_Commentaries\_ and

took up the sword. Francis Marion was a shy and modest planter of South

Carolina whose sole passage at arms had been a brief but desperate brush

with the Indians ten or twelve years earlier. Daniel Morgan, one of the

heroes of Cowpens, had been a teamster with Braddock's army and had seen

some fighting during the French and Indian War, but his military

knowledge, from the point of view of a trained British officer, was

negligible. John Sullivan was a successful lawyer at Durham, New

Hampshire, and a major in the local militia when duty summoned him to

lay down his briefs and take up the sword. Anthony Wayne was a

Pennsylvania farmer and land surveyor who, on hearing the clash of arms,

read a few books on war, raised a regiment, and offered himself for

service. Such is the story of the chief American military leaders, and

it is typical of them all. Some had seen fighting with the French and

Indians, but none of them had seen warfare on a large scale with regular

troops commanded according to the strategy evolved in European

experience. Courage, native ability, quickness of mind, and knowledge of

the country they had in abundance, and in battles such as were fought

during the Revolution all those qualities counted heavily in the

balance.

=Foreign Officers in American Service.=--To native genius was added

military talent from beyond the seas. Baron Steuben, well schooled in

the iron regime of Frederick the Great, came over from Prussia, joined

Washington at Valley Forge, and day after day drilled and manoeuvered the

men, laughing and cursing as he turned raw countrymen into regular

soldiers. From France came young Lafayette and the stern De Kalb, from

Poland came Pulaski and Kosciusko;--all acquainted with the arts of war

as waged in Europe and fitted for leadership as well as teaching.

Lafayette came early, in 1776, in a ship of his own, accompanied by

several officers of wide experience, and remained loyally throughout the

war sharing the hardships of American army life. Pulaski fell at the

siege of Savannah and De Kalb at Camden. Kosciusko survived the American

war to defend in vain the independence of his native land. To these

distinguished foreigners, who freely threw in their lot with American

revolutionary fortunes, was due much of that spirit and discipline which

fitted raw recruits and temperamental militiamen to cope with a military

power of the first rank.

=The Soldiers.=--As far as the British soldiers were concerned their

annals are short and simple. The regulars from the standing army who

were sent over at the opening of the contest, the recruits drummed up

by special efforts at home, and the thousands of Hessians bought

outright by King George presented few problems of management to the

British officers. These common soldiers were far away from home and

enlisted for the war. Nearly all of them were well disciplined and many

of them experienced in actual campaigns. The armies of King George

fought bravely, as the records of Bunker Hill, Brandywine, and Monmouth

demonstrate. Many a man and subordinate officer and, for that matter,

some of the high officers expressed a reluctance at fighting against

their own kin; but they obeyed orders.

The Americans, on the other hand, while they fought with grim

determination, as men fighting for their homes, were lacking in

discipline and in the experience of regular troops. When the war broke

in upon them, there were no common preparations for it. There was no

continental army; there were only local bands of militiamen, many of

them experienced in fighting but few of them "regulars" in the military

sense. Moreover they were volunteers serving for a short time,

unaccustomed to severe discipline, and impatient at the restraints

imposed on them by long and arduous campaigns. They were continually

leaving the service just at the most critical moments. "The militia,"

lamented Washington, "come in, you cannot tell how; go, you cannot tell

where; consume your provisions; exhaust your stores; and leave you at

last at a critical moment."

Again and again Washington begged Congress to provide for an army of

regulars enlisted for the war, thoroughly trained and paid according to

some definite plan. At last he was able to overcome, in part at least,

the chronic fear of civilians in Congress and to wring from that

reluctant body an agreement to grant half pay to all officers and a

bonus to all privates who served until the end of the war. Even this

scheme, which Washington regarded as far short of justice to the

soldiers, did not produce quick results. It was near the close of the

conflict before he had an army of well-disciplined veterans capable of

meeting British regulars on equal terms.

Though there were times when militiamen and frontiersmen did valiant and

effective work, it is due to historical accuracy to deny the

time-honored tradition that a few minutemen overwhelmed more numerous

forces of regulars in a seven years' war for independence. They did

nothing of the sort. For the victories of Bennington, Trenton, Saratoga,

and Yorktown there were the defeats of Bunker Hill, Long Island, White

Plains, Germantown, and Camden. Not once did an army of militiamen

overcome an equal number of British regulars in an open trial by battle.

"To bring men to be well acquainted with the duties of a soldier," wrote

Washington, "requires time.... To expect the same service from raw and

undisciplined recruits as from veteran soldiers is to expect what never

did and perhaps never will happen."

=How the War Was Won.=--Then how did the American army win the war? For

one thing there were delays and blunders on the part of the British

generals who, in 1775 and 1776, dallied in Boston and New York with

large bodies of regular troops when they might have been dealing

paralyzing blows at the scattered bands that constituted the American

army. "Nothing but the supineness or folly of the enemy could have saved

us," solemnly averred Washington in 1780. Still it is fair to say that

this apparent supineness was not all due to the British generals. The

ministers behind them believed that a large part of the colonists were

loyal and that compromise would be promoted by inaction rather than by a

war vigorously prosecuted. Victory by masterly inactivity was obviously

better than conquest, and the slighter the wounds the quicker the

healing. Later in the conflict when the seasoned forces of France were

thrown into the scale, the Americans themselves had learned many things

about the practical conduct of campaigns. All along, the British were

embarrassed by the problem of supplies. Their troops could not forage

with the skill of militiamen, as they were in unfamiliar territory. The

long oversea voyages were uncertain at best and doubly so when the

warships of France joined the American privateers in preying on supply

boats.

The British were in fact battered and worn down by a guerrilla war and

outdone on two important occasions by superior forces--at Saratoga and

Yorktown. Stern facts convinced them finally that an immense army, which

could be raised only by a supreme effort, would be necessary to subdue

the colonies if that hazardous enterprise could be accomplished at all.

They learned also that America would then be alienated, fretful, and the

scene of endless uprisings calling for an army of occupation. That was a

price which staggered even Lord North and George III. Moreover, there

were forces of opposition at home with which they had to reckon.

=Women and the War.=--At no time were the women of America indifferent

to the struggle for independence. When it was confined to the realm of

opinion they did their part in creating public sentiment. Mrs. Elizabeth

Timothee, for example, founded in Charleston, in 1773, a newspaper to

espouse the cause of the province. Far to the north the sister of James

Otis, Mrs. Mercy Warren, early begged her countrymen to rest their case

upon their natural rights, and in influential circles she urged the

leaders to stand fast by their principles. While John Adams was tossing

about with uncertainty at the Continental Congress, his wife was writing

letters to him declaring her faith in "independency."

When the war came down upon the country, women helped in every field. In

sustaining public sentiment they were active. Mrs. Warren with a

tireless pen combatted loyalist propaganda in many a drama and satire.

Almost every revolutionary leader had a wife or daughter who rendered

service in the "second line of defense." Mrs. Washington managed the

plantation while the General was at the front and went north to face the

rigors of the awful winter at Valley Forge--an inspiration to her

husband and his men. The daughter of Benjamin Franklin, Mrs. Sarah

Bache, while her father was pleading the American cause in France, set

the women of Pennsylvania to work sewing and collecting supplies. Even

near the firing line women were to be found, aiding the wounded, hauling

powder to the front, and carrying dispatches at the peril of their

lives.

In the economic sphere, the work of women was invaluable. They harvested

crops without enjoying the picturesque title of "farmerettes" and they

canned and preserved for the wounded and the prisoners of war. Of their

labor in spinning and weaving it is recorded: "Immediately on being cut

off from the use of English manufactures, the women engaged within their

own families in manufacturing various kinds of cloth for domestic use.

They thus kept their households decently clad and the surplus of their

labors they sold to such as chose to buy rather than make for

themselves. In this way the female part of families by their industry

and strict economy frequently supported the whole domestic circle,

evincing the strength of their attachment and the value of their

service."

For their war work, women were commended by high authorities on more

than one occasion. They were given medals and public testimonials even

as in our own day. Washington thanked them for their labors and paid

tribute to them for the inspiration and material aid which they had

given to the cause of independence.

THE FINANCES OF THE REVOLUTION

When the Revolution opened, there were thirteen little treasuries in

America but no common treasury, and from first to last the Congress was

in the position of a beggar rather than a sovereign. Having no authority

to lay and collect taxes directly and knowing the hatred of the

provincials for taxation, it resorted mainly to loans and paper money to

finance the war. "Do you think," boldly inquired one of the delegates,

"that I will consent to load my constituents with taxes when we can send

to the printer and get a wagon load of money, one quire of which will

pay for the whole?"

=Paper Money and Loans.=--Acting on this curious but appealing political

economy, Congress issued in June, 1776, two million dollars in bills of

credit to be redeemed by the states on the basis of their respective

populations. Other issues followed in quick succession. In all about

$241,000,000 of continental paper was printed, to which the several

states added nearly $210,000,000 of their own notes. Then came

interest-bearing bonds in ever increasing quantities. Several millions

were also borrowed from France and small sums from Holland and Spain. In

desperation a national lottery was held, producing meager results. The

property of Tories was confiscated and sold, bringing in about

$16,000,000. Begging letters were sent to the states asking them to

raise revenues for the continental treasury, but the states, burdened

with their own affairs, gave little heed.

=Inflation and Depreciation.=--As paper money flowed from the press, it

rapidly declined in purchasing power until in 1779 a dollar was worth

only two or three cents in gold or silver. Attempts were made by

Congress and the states to compel people to accept the notes at face

value; but these were like attempts to make water flow uphill.

Speculators collected at once to fatten on the calamities of the

republic. Fortunes were made and lost gambling on the prices of public

securities while the patriot army, half clothed, was freezing at Valley

Forge. "Speculation, peculation, engrossing, forestalling," exclaimed

Washington, "afford too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public

virtue. Nothing, I am convinced, but the depreciation of our currency

... aided by stock jobbing and party dissensions has fed the hopes of

the enemy."

=The Patriot Financiers.=--To the efforts of Congress in financing the

war were added the labors of private citizens. Hayn Solomon, a merchant

of Philadelphia, supplied members of Congress, including Madison,

Jefferson, and Monroe, and army officers, like Lee and Steuben, with

money for their daily needs. All together he contributed the huge sum of

half a million dollars to the American cause and died broken in purse,

if not in spirit, a British prisoner of war. Another Philadelphia

merchant, Robert Morris, won for himself the name of the "patriot

financier" because he labored night and day to find the money to meet

the bills which poured in upon the bankrupt government. When his own

funds were exhausted, he borrowed from his friends. Experienced in the

handling of merchandise, he created agencies at important points to

distribute supplies to the troops, thus displaying administrative as

well as financial talents.
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Women organized "drives" for money, contributed their plate and their

jewels, and collected from door to door. Farmers took worthless paper in

return for their produce, and soldiers saw many a pay day pass without

yielding them a penny. Thus by the labors and sacrifices of citizens,

the issuance of paper money, lotteries, the floating of loans,

borrowings in Europe, and the impressment of supplies, the Congress

staggered through the Revolution like a pauper who knows not how his

next meal is to be secured but is continuously relieved at a crisis by a

kindly fate.

THE DIPLOMACY OF THE REVOLUTION

When the full measure of honor is given to the soldiers and sailors and

their commanding officers, the civilians who managed finances and

supplies, the writers who sustained the American spirit, and the women

who did well their part, there yet remains the duty of recognizing the

achievements of diplomacy. The importance of this field of activity was

keenly appreciated by the leaders in the Continental Congress. They were

fairly well versed in European history. They knew of the balance of

power and the sympathies, interests, and prejudices of nations and their

rulers. All this information they turned to good account, in opening

relations with continental countries and seeking money, supplies, and

even military assistance. For the transaction of this delicate business,

they created a secret committee on foreign correspondence as early as

1775 and prepared to send agents abroad.

=American Agents Sent Abroad.=--Having heard that France was inclining a

friendly ear to the American cause, the Congress, in March, 1776, sent a

commissioner to Paris, Silas Deane of Connecticut, often styled the

"first American diplomat." Later in the year a form of treaty to be

presented to foreign powers was drawn up, and Franklin, Arthur Lee, and

Deane were selected as American representatives at the court of "His

Most Christian Majesty the King of France." John Jay of New York was

chosen minister to Spain in 1779; John Adams was sent to Holland the

same year; and other agents were dispatched to Florence, Vienna, and

Berlin. The representative selected for St. Petersburg spent two

fruitless years there, "ignored by the court, living in obscurity and

experiencing nothing but humiliation and failure." Frederick the Great,

king of Prussia, expressed a desire to find in America a market for

Silesian linens and woolens, but, fearing England's command of the sea,

he refused to give direct aid to the Revolutionary cause.

=Early French Interest.=--The great diplomatic triumph of the Revolution

was won at Paris, and Benjamin Franklin was the hero of the occasion,

although many circumstances prepared the way for his success. Louis

XVI's foreign minister, Count de Vergennes, before the arrival of any

American representative, had brought to the attention of the king the

opportunity offered by the outbreak of the war between England and her

colonies. He showed him how France could redress her grievances and

"reduce the power and greatness of England"--the empire that in 1763 had

forced upon her a humiliating peace "at the price of our possessions,

of our commerce, and our credit in the Indies, at the price of Canada,

Louisiana, Isle Royale, Acadia, and Senegal." Equally successful in

gaining the king's interest was a curious French adventurer,

Beaumarchais, a man of wealth, a lover of music, and the author of two

popular plays, "Figaro" and "The Barber of Seville." These two men had

already urged upon the king secret aid for America before Deane appeared

on the scene. Shortly after his arrival they made confidential

arrangements to furnish money, clothing, powder, and other supplies to

the struggling colonies, although official requests for them were

officially refused by the French government.

=Franklin at Paris.=--When Franklin reached Paris, he was received only

in private by the king's minister, Vergennes. The French people,

however, made manifest their affection for the "plain republican" in

"his full dress suit of spotted Manchester velvet." He was known among

men of letters as an author, a scientist, and a philosopher of

extraordinary ability. His "Poor Richard" had thrice been translated

into French and was scattered in numerous editions throughout the

kingdom. People of all ranks--ministers, ladies at court, philosophers,

peasants, and stable boys--knew of Franklin and wished him success in

his mission. The queen, Marie Antoinette, fated to lose her head in a

revolution soon to follow, played with fire by encouraging "our dear

republican."

For the king of France, however, this was more serious business. England

resented the presence of this "traitor" in Paris, and Louis had to be

cautious about plunging into another war that might also end

disastrously. Moreover, the early period of Franklin's sojourn in Paris

was a dark hour for the American Revolution. Washington's brilliant

exploit at Trenton on Christmas night, 1776, and the battle with

Cornwallis at Princeton had been followed by the disaster at Brandywine,

the loss of Philadelphia, the defeat at Germantown, and the retirement

to Valley Forge for the winter of 1777-78. New York City and

Philadelphia--two strategic ports--were in British hands; the Hudson

and Delaware rivers were blocked; and General Burgoyne with his British

troops was on his way down through the heart of northern New York,

cutting New England off from the rest of the colonies. No wonder the

king was cautious. Then the unexpected happened. Burgoyne, hemmed in

from all sides by the American forces, his flanks harried, his foraging

parties beaten back, his supplies cut off, surrendered on October 17,

1777, to General Gates, who had superseded General Schuyler in time to

receive the honor.

=Treaties of Alliance and Commerce (1778).=--News of this victory,

placed by historians among the fifteen decisive battles of the world,

reached Franklin one night early in December while he and some friends

sat gloomily at dinner. Beaumarchais, who was with him, grasped at once

the meaning of the situation and set off to the court at Versailles with

such haste that he upset his coach and dislocated his arm. The king and

his ministers were at last convinced that the hour had come to aid the

Revolution. Treaties of commerce and alliance were drawn up and signed

in February, 1778. The independence of the United States was recognized

by France and an alliance was formed to guarantee that independence.

Combined military action was agreed upon and Louis then formally

declared war on England. Men who had, a few short years before, fought

one another in the wilderness of Pennsylvania or on the Plains of

Abraham, were now ranged side by side in a war on the Empire that Pitt

had erected and that George III was pulling down.

=Spain and Holland Involved.=--Within a few months, Spain, remembering

the steady decline of her sea power since the days of the Armada and

hoping to drive the British out of Gibraltar, once more joined the

concert of nations against England. Holland, a member of a league of

armed neutrals formed in protest against British searches on the high

seas, sent her fleet to unite with the forces of Spain, France, and

America to prey upon British commerce. To all this trouble for England

was added the danger of a possible revolt in Ireland, where the spirit

of independence was flaming up.

=The British Offer Terms to America.=--Seeing the colonists about to be

joined by France in a common war on the English empire, Lord North

proposed, in February, 1778, a renewal of negotiations. By solemn

enactment, Parliament declared its intention not to exercise the right

of imposing taxes within the colonies; at the same time it authorized

the opening of negotiations through commissioners to be sent to America.

A truce was to be established, pardons granted, objectionable laws

suspended, and the old imperial constitution, as it stood before the

opening of hostilities, restored to full vigor. It was too late. Events

had taken the affairs of America out of the hands of British

commissioners and diplomats.

=Effects of French Aid.=--The French alliance brought ships of war,

large sums of gold and silver, loads of supplies, and a considerable

body of trained soldiers to the aid of the Americans. Timely as was this

help, it meant no sudden change in the fortunes of war. The British

evacuated Philadelphia in the summer following the alliance, and

Washington's troops were encouraged to come out of Valley Forge. They

inflicted a heavy blow on the British at Monmouth, but the treasonable

conduct of General Charles Lee prevented a triumph. The recovery of

Philadelphia was offset by the treason of Benedict Arnold, the loss of

Savannah and Charleston (1780), and the defeat of Gates at Camden.

The full effect of the French alliance was not felt until 1781, when

Cornwallis went into Virginia and settled at Yorktown. Accompanied by

French troops Washington swept rapidly southward and penned the British

to the shore while a powerful French fleet shut off their escape by sea.

It was this movement, which certainly could not have been executed

without French aid, that put an end to all chance of restoring British

dominion in America. It was the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown that

caused Lord North to pace the floor and cry out: "It is all over! It is

all over!" What might have been done without the French alliance lies

hidden from mankind. What was accomplished with the help of French

soldiers, sailors, officers, money, and supplies, is known to all the

earth. "All the world agree," exultantly wrote Franklin from Paris to

General Washington, "that no expedition was ever better planned or

better executed. It brightens the glory that must accompany your name to

the latest posterity." Diplomacy as well as martial valor had its

reward.

PEACE AT LAST

=British Opposition to the War.=--In measuring the forces that led to

the final discomfiture of King George and Lord North, it is necessary to

remember that from the beginning to the end the British ministry at home

faced a powerful, informed, and relentless opposition. There were

vigorous protests, first against the obnoxious acts which precipitated

the unhappy quarrel, then against the way in which the war was waged,

and finally against the futile struggle to retain a hold upon the

American dominions. Among the members of Parliament who thundered

against the government were the first statesmen and orators of the land.

William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, though he deplored the idea of American

independence, denounced the government as the aggressor and rejoiced in

American resistance. Edmund Burke leveled his heavy batteries against

every measure of coercion and at last strove for a peace which, while

giving independence to America, would work for reconciliation rather

than estrangement. Charles James Fox gave the colonies his generous

sympathy and warmly championed their rights. Outside of the circle of

statesmen there were stout friends of the American cause like David

Hume, the philosopher and historian, and Catherine Macaulay, an author

of wide fame and a republican bold enough to encourage Washington in

seeing it through.

Against this powerful opposition, the government enlisted a whole army

of scribes and journalists to pour out criticism on the Americans and

their friends. Dr. Samuel Johnson, whom it employed in this business,

was so savage that even the ministers had to tone down his pamphlets

before printing them. Far more weighty was Edward Gibbon, who was in

time to win fame as the historian of the \_Decline and Fall of the Roman

Empire\_. He had at first opposed the government; but, on being given a

lucrative post, he used his sharp pen in its support, causing his

friends to ridicule him in these lines:

"King George, in a fright

Lest Gibbon should write

The story of England's disgrace,

Thought no way so sure

His pen to secure

As to give the historian a place."

=Lord North Yields.=--As time wore on, events bore heavily on the side

of the opponents of the government's measures. They had predicted that

conquest was impossible, and they had urged the advantages of a peace

which would in some measure restore the affections of the Americans.

Every day's news confirmed their predictions and lent support to their

arguments. Moreover, the war, which sprang out of an effort to relieve

English burdens, made those burdens heavier than ever. Military expenses

were daily increasing. Trade with the colonies, the greatest single

outlet for British goods and capital, was paralyzed. The heavy debts due

British merchants in America were not only unpaid but postponed into an

indefinite future. Ireland was on the verge of revolution. The French

had a dangerous fleet on the high seas. In vain did the king assert in

December, 1781, that no difficulties would ever make him consent to a

peace that meant American independence. Parliament knew better, and on

February 27, 1782, in the House of Commons was carried an address to the

throne against continuing the war. Burke, Fox, the younger Pitt, Barre,

and other friends of the colonies voted in the affirmative. Lord North

gave notice then that his ministry was at an end. The king moaned:

"Necessity made me yield."

In April, 1782, Franklin received word from the English government that

it was prepared to enter into negotiations leading to a settlement. This

was embarrassing. In the treaty of alliance with France, the United

States had promised that peace should be a joint affair agreed to by

both nations in open conference. Finding France, however, opposed to

some of their claims respecting boundaries and fisheries, the American

commissioners conferred with the British agents at Paris without

consulting the French minister. They actually signed a preliminary peace

draft before they informed him of their operations. When Vergennes

reproached him, Franklin replied that they "had been guilty of

neglecting \_bienseance\_ [good manners] but hoped that the great work

would not be ruined by a single indiscretion."

=The Terms of Peace (1783).=--The general settlement at Paris in 1783

was a triumph for America. England recognized the independence of the

United States, naming each state specifically, and agreed to boundaries

extending from the Atlantic to the Mississippi and from the Great Lakes

to the Floridas. England held Canada, Newfoundland, and the West Indies

intact, made gains in India, and maintained her supremacy on the seas.

Spain won Florida and Minorca but not the coveted Gibraltar. France

gained nothing important save the satisfaction of seeing England humbled

and the colonies independent.

The generous terms secured by the American commission at Paris called

forth surprise and gratitude in the United States and smoothed the way

for a renewal of commercial relations with the mother country. At the

same time they gave genuine anxiety to European diplomats. "This federal

republic is born a pigmy," wrote the Spanish ambassador to his royal

master. "A day will come when it will be a giant; even a colossus

formidable to these countries. Liberty of conscience and the facility

for establishing a new population on immense lands, as well as the

advantages of the new government, will draw thither farmers and artisans

from all the nations. In a few years we shall watch with grief the

tyrannical existence of the same colossus."
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SUMMARY OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD

The independence of the American colonies was foreseen by many European

statesmen as they watched the growth of their population, wealth, and

power; but no one could fix the hour of the great event. Until 1763 the

American colonists lived fairly happily under British dominion. There

were collisions from time to time, of course. Royal governors clashed

with stiff-necked colonial legislatures. There were protests against the

exercise of the king's veto power in specific cases. Nevertheless, on

the whole, the relations between America and the mother country were

more amicable in 1763 than at any period under the Stuart regime which

closed in 1688.

The crash, when it came, was not deliberately willed by any one. It was

the product of a number of forces that happened to converge about 1763.

Three years before, there had come to the throne George III, a young,

proud, inexperienced, and stubborn king. For nearly fifty years his

predecessors, Germans as they were in language and interest, had allowed

things to drift in England and America. George III decided that he would

be king in fact as well as in name. About the same time England brought

to a close the long and costly French and Indian War and was staggering

under a heavy burden of debt and taxes. The war had been fought partly

in defense of the American colonies and nothing seemed more reasonable

to English statesmen than the idea that the colonies should bear part of

the cost of their own defense. At this juncture there came into

prominence, in royal councils, two men bent on taxing America and

controlling her trade, Grenville and Townshend. The king was willing,

the English taxpayers were thankful for any promise of relief, and

statesmen were found to undertake the experiment. England therefore set

out upon a new course. She imposed taxes upon the colonists, regulated

their trade and set royal officers upon them to enforce the law. This

action evoked protests from the colonists. They held a Stamp Act

Congress to declare their rights and petition for a redress of

grievances. Some of the more restless spirits rioted in the streets,

sacked the houses of the king's officers, and tore up the stamped paper.

Frightened by uprising, the English government drew back and repealed

the Stamp Act. Then it veered again and renewed its policy of

interference. Interference again called forth American protests.

Protests aroused sharper retaliation. More British regulars were sent

over to keep order. More irritating laws were passed by Parliament.

Rioting again appeared: tea was dumped in the harbor of Boston and

seized in the harbor of Charleston. The British answer was more force.

The response of the colonists was a Continental Congress for defense. An

unexpected and unintended clash of arms at Lexington and Concord in the

spring of 1775 brought forth from the king of England a proclamation:

"The Americans are rebels!"

The die was cast. The American Revolution had begun. Washington was made

commander-in-chief. Armies were raised, money was borrowed, a huge

volume of paper currency was issued, and foreign aid was summoned.

Franklin plied his diplomatic arts at Paris until in 1778 he induced

France to throw her sword into the balance. Three years later,

Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown. In 1783, by the formal treaty of

peace, George III acknowledged the independence of the United States.

The new nation, endowed with an imperial domain stretching from the

Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River, began its career among the

sovereign powers of the earth.

In the sphere of civil government, the results of the Revolution were

equally remarkable. Royal officers and royal authorities were driven

from the former dominions. All power was declared to be in the people.

All the colonies became states, each with its own constitution or plan

of government. The thirteen states were united in common bonds under the

Articles of Confederation. A republic on a large scale was instituted.

Thus there was begun an adventure in popular government such as the

world had never seen. Could it succeed or was it destined to break down

and be supplanted by a monarchy? The fate of whole continents hung upon

the answer.
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=Questions=

1. What was the non-importation agreement? By what body was it adopted?

Why was it revolutionary in character?

2. Contrast the work of the first and second Continental Congresses.

3. Why did efforts at conciliation fail?

4. Trace the growth of American independence from opinion to the sphere

of action.

5. Why is the Declaration of Independence an "immortal" document?

6. What was the effect of the Revolution on colonial governments? On

national union?

7. Describe the contest between "Patriots" and "Tories."

8. What topics are considered under "military affairs"? Discuss each in

detail.

9. Contrast the American forces with the British forces and show how the

war was won.

10. Compare the work of women in the Revolutionary War with their labors

in the World War (1917-18).

11. How was the Revolution financed?

12. Why is diplomacy important in war? Describe the diplomatic triumph

of the Revolution.

13. What was the nature of the opposition in England to the war?

14. Give the events connected with the peace settlement; the terms of

peace.

=Research Topics=

=The Spirit of America.=--Woodrow Wilson, \_History of the American

People\_, Vol. II, pp. 98-126.

=American Rights.=--Draw up a table showing all the principles laid down

by American leaders in (1) the Resolves of the First Continental

Congress, Macdonald, \_Documentary Source Book\_, pp. 162-166; (2) the

Declaration of the Causes and the Necessity of Taking Up Arms,

Macdonald, pp. 176-183; and (3) the Declaration of Independence.

=The Declaration of Independence.=--Fiske, \_The American Revolution\_,

Vol. I, pp. 147-197. Elson, \_History of the United States\_, pp. 250-254.

=Diplomacy and the French Alliance.=--Hart, \_American History Told by

Contemporaries\_, Vol. II, pp. 574-590. Fiske, Vol. II, pp. 1-24.

Callender, \_Economic History of the United States\_, pp. 159-168; Elson,

pp. 275-280.

=Biographical Studies.=--Washington, Franklin, Samuel Adams, Patrick

Henry, Thomas Jefferson--emphasizing the peculiar services of each.

=The Tories.=--Hart, \_Contemporaries\_, Vol. II, pp. 470-480.

=Valley Forge.=--Fiske, Vol. II, pp. 25-49.

=The Battles of the Revolution.=--Elson, pp. 235-317.

=An English View of the Revolution.=--Green, \_Short History of England\_,

Chap. X, Sect. 2.

=English Opinion and the Revolution.=--Trevelyan, \_The American

Revolution\_, Vol. III (or Part 2, Vol. II), Chaps. XXIV-XXVII.

PART III. THE UNION AND NATIONAL POLITICS

CHAPTER VII

THE FORMATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

THE PROMISE AND THE DIFFICULTIES OF AMERICA

The rise of a young republic composed of thirteen states, each governed

by officials popularly elected under constitutions drafted by "the plain

people," was the most significant feature of the eighteenth century. The

majority of the patriots whose labors and sacrifices had made this

possible naturally looked upon their work and pronounced it good. Those

Americans, however, who peered beneath the surface of things, saw that

the Declaration of Independence, even if splendidly phrased, and paper

constitutions, drawn by finest enthusiasm "uninstructed by experience,"

could not alone make the republic great and prosperous or even free. All

around them they saw chaos in finance and in industry and perils for the

immediate future.

=The Weakness of the Articles of Confederation.=--The government under

the Articles of Confederation had neither the strength nor the resources

necessary to cope with the problems of reconstruction left by the war.

The sole organ of government was a Congress composed of from two to

seven members from each state chosen as the legislature might direct and

paid by the state. In determining all questions, each state had one

vote--Delaware thus enjoying the same weight as Virginia. There was no

president to enforce the laws. Congress was given power to select a

committee of thirteen--one from each state--to act as an executive body

when it was not in session; but this device, on being tried out, proved

a failure. There was no system of national courts to which citizens and

states could appeal for the protection of their rights or through which

they could compel obedience to law. The two great powers of government,

military and financial, were withheld. Congress, it is true, could

authorize expenditures but had to rely upon the states for the payment

of contributions to meet its bills. It could also order the

establishment of an army, but it could only request the states to supply

their respective quotas of soldiers. It could not lay taxes nor bring

any pressure to bear upon a single citizen in the whole country. It

could act only through the medium of the state governments.

=Financial and Commercial Disorders.=--In the field of public finance,

the disorders were pronounced. The huge debt incurred during the war was

still outstanding. Congress was unable to pay either the interest or the

principal. Public creditors were in despair, as the market value of

their bonds sank to twenty-five or even ten cents on the dollar. The

current bills of Congress were unpaid. As some one complained, there was

not enough money in the treasury to buy pen and ink with which to record

the transactions of the shadow legislature. The currency was in utter

chaos. Millions of dollars in notes issued by Congress had become mere

trash worth a cent or two on the dollar. There was no other expression

of contempt so forceful as the popular saying: "not worth a

Continental." To make matters worse, several of the states were pouring

new streams of paper money from the press. Almost the only good money in

circulation consisted of English, French, and Spanish coins, and the

public was even defrauded by them because money changers were busy

clipping and filing away the metal. Foreign commerce was unsettled. The

entire British system of trade discrimination was turned against the

Americans, and Congress, having no power to regulate foreign commerce,

was unable to retaliate or to negotiate treaties which it could enforce.

Domestic commerce was impeded by the jealousies of the states, which

erected tariff barriers against their neighbors. The condition of the

currency made the exchange of money and goods extremely difficult, and,

as if to increase the confusion, backward states enacted laws hindering

the prompt collection of debts within their borders--an evil which

nothing but a national system of courts could cure.

=Congress in Disrepute.=--With treaties set at naught by the states, the

laws unenforced, the treasury empty, and the public credit gone, the

Congress of the United States fell into utter disrepute. It called upon

the states to pay their quotas of money into the treasury, only to be

treated with contempt. Even its own members looked upon it as a solemn

futility. Some of the ablest men refused to accept election to it, and

many who did take the doubtful honor failed to attend the sessions.

Again and again it was impossible to secure a quorum for the transaction

of business.

=Troubles of the State Governments.=--The state governments, free to

pursue their own course with no interference from without, had almost as

many difficulties as the Congress. They too were loaded with

revolutionary debts calling for heavy taxes upon an already restive

population. Oppressed by their financial burdens and discouraged by the

fall in prices which followed the return of peace, the farmers of

several states joined in a concerted effort and compelled their

legislatures to issue large sums of paper money. The currency fell in

value, but nevertheless it was forced on unwilling creditors to square

old accounts.

In every part of the country legislative action fluctuated violently.

Laws were made one year only to be repealed the next and reenacted the

third year. Lands were sold by one legislature and the sales were

canceled by its successor. Uncertainty and distrust were the natural

consequences. Men of substance longed for some power that would forbid

states to issue bills of credit, to make paper money legal tender in

payment of debts, or to impair the obligation of contracts. Men heavily

in debt, on the other hand, urged even more drastic action against

creditors.

So great did the discontent of the farmers in New Hampshire become in

1786 that a mob surrounded the legislature, demanding a repeal of the

taxes and the issuance of paper money. It was with difficulty that an

armed rebellion was avoided. In Massachusetts the malcontents, under the

leadership of Daniel Shays, a captain in the Revolutionary army,

organized that same year open resistance to the government of the state.

Shays and his followers protested against the conduct of creditors in

foreclosing mortgages upon the debt-burdened farmers, against the

lawyers for increasing the costs of legal proceedings, against the

senate of the state the members of which were apportioned among the

towns on the basis of the amount of taxes paid, against heavy taxes, and

against the refusal of the legislature to issue paper money. They seized

the towns of Worcester and Springfield and broke up the courts of

justice. All through the western part of the state the revolt spread,

sending a shock of alarm to every center and section of the young

republic. Only by the most vigorous action was Governor Bowdoin able to

quell the uprising; and when that task was accomplished, the state

government did not dare to execute any of the prisoners because they had

so many sympathizers. Moreover, Bowdoin and several members of the

legislature who had been most zealous in their attacks on the insurgents

were defeated at the ensuing election. The need of national assistance

for state governments in times of domestic violence was everywhere

emphasized by men who were opposed to revolutionary acts.

=Alarm over Dangers to the Republic.=--Leading American citizens,

watching the drift of affairs, were slowly driven to the conclusion that

the new ship of state so proudly launched a few years before was

careening into anarchy. "The facts of our peace and independence," wrote

a friend of Washington, "do not at present wear so promising an

appearance as I had fondly painted in my mind. The prejudices,

jealousies, and turbulence of the people at times almost stagger my

confidence in our political establishments; and almost occasion me to

think that they will show themselves unworthy of the noble prize for

which we have contended."

Washington himself was profoundly discouraged. On hearing of Shays's

rebellion, he exclaimed: "What, gracious God, is man that there should

be such inconsistency and perfidiousness in his conduct! It is but the

other day that we were shedding our blood to obtain the constitutions

under which we now live--constitutions of our own choice and making--and

now we are unsheathing our sword to overturn them." The same year he

burst out in a lament over rumors of restoring royal government. "I am

told that even respectable characters speak of a monarchical government

without horror. From thinking proceeds speaking. Hence to acting is

often but a single step. But how irresistible and tremendous! What a

triumph for our enemies to verify their predictions! What a triumph for

the advocates of despotism to find that we are incapable of governing

ourselves!"

=Congress Attempts Some Reforms.=--The Congress was not indifferent to

the events that disturbed Washington. On the contrary it put forth many

efforts to check tendencies so dangerous to finance, commerce,

industries, and the Confederation itself. In 1781, even before the

treaty of peace was signed, the Congress, having found out how futile

were its taxing powers, carried a resolution of amendment to the

Articles of Confederation, authorizing the levy of a moderate duty on

imports. Yet this mild measure was rejected by the states. Two years

later the Congress prepared another amendment sanctioning the levy of

duties on imports, to be collected this time by state officers and

applied to the payment of the public debt. This more limited proposal,

designed to save public credit, likewise failed. In 1786, the Congress

made a third appeal to the states for help, declaring that they had been

so irregular and so negligent in paying their quotas that further

reliance upon that mode of raising revenues was dishonorable and

dangerous.

THE CALLING OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

=Hamilton and Washington Urge Reform.=--The attempts at reform by the

Congress were accompanied by demand for, both within and without that

body, a convention to frame a new plan of government. In 1780, the

youthful Alexander Hamilton, realizing the weakness of the Articles, so

widely discussed, proposed a general convention for the purpose of

drafting a new constitution on entirely different principles. With

tireless energy he strove to bring his countrymen to his view.

Washington, agreeing with him on every point, declared, in a circular

letter to the governors, that the duration of the union would be short

unless there was lodged somewhere a supreme power "to regulate and

govern the general concerns of the confederated republic." The governor

of Massachusetts, disturbed by the growth of discontent all about him,

suggested to the state legislature in 1785 the advisability of a

national convention to enlarge the powers of the Congress. The

legislature approved the plan, but did not press it to a conclusion.
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=The Annapolis Convention.=--Action finally came from the South. The

Virginia legislature, taking things into its own hands, called a

conference of delegates at Annapolis to consider matters of taxation and

commerce. When the convention assembled in 1786, it was found that only

five states had taken the trouble to send representatives. The leaders

were deeply discouraged, but the resourceful Hamilton, a delegate from

New York, turned the affair to good account. He secured the adoption of

a resolution, calling upon the Congress itself to summon another

convention, to meet at Philadelphia.

=A National Convention Called (1787).=--The Congress, as tardy as ever,

at last decided in February, 1787, to issue the call. Fearing drastic

changes, however, it restricted the convention to "the sole and express

purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation." Jealous of its own

powers, it added that any alterations proposed should be referred to the

Congress and the states for their approval.

Every state in the union, except Rhode Island, responded to this call.

Indeed some of the states, having the Annapolis resolution before them,

had already anticipated the Congress by selecting delegates before the

formal summons came. Thus, by the persistence of governors,

legislatures, and private citizens, there was brought about the

long-desired national convention. In May, 1787, it assembled in

Philadelphia.

=The Eminent Men of the Convention.=--On the roll of that memorable

convention were fifty-five men, at least half of whom were acknowledged

to be among the foremost statesmen and thinkers in America. Every field

of statecraft was represented by them: war and practical management in

Washington, who was chosen president of the convention; diplomacy in

Franklin, now old and full of honor in his own land as well as abroad;

finance in Alexander Hamilton and Robert Morris; law in James Wilson of

Pennsylvania; the philosophy of government in James Madison, called the

"father of the Constitution." They were not theorists but practical men,

rich in political experience and endowed with deep insight into the

springs of human action. Three of them had served in the Stamp Act

Congress: Dickinson of Delaware, William Samuel Johnson of Connecticut,

and John Rutledge of South Carolina. Eight had been signers of the

Declaration of Independence: Read of Delaware, Sherman of Connecticut,

Wythe of Virginia, Gerry of Massachusetts, Franklin, Robert Morris,

George Clymer, and James Wilson of Pennsylvania. All but twelve had at

some time served in the Continental Congress and eighteen were members

of that body in the spring of 1787. Washington, Hamilton, Mifflin, and

Charles Pinckney had been officers in the Revolutionary army. Seven of

the delegates had gained political experience as governors of states.

"The convention as a whole," according to the historian Hildreth,

"represented in a marked manner the talent, intelligence, and

especially the conservative sentiment of the country."

THE FRAMING OF THE CONSTITUTION

=Problems Involved.=--The great problems before the convention were nine

in number: (1) Shall the Articles of Confederation be revised or a new

system of government constructed? (2) Shall the government be founded on

states equal in power as under the Articles or on the broader and deeper

foundation of population? (3) What direct share shall the people have in

the election of national officers? (4) What shall be the qualifications

for the suffrage? (5) How shall the conflicting interests of the

commercial and the planting states be balanced so as to safeguard the

essential rights of each? (6) What shall be the form of the new

government? (7) What powers shall be conferred on it? (8) How shall the

state legislatures be restrained from their attacks on property rights

such as the issuance of paper money? (9) Shall the approval of all the

states be necessary, as under the Articles, for the adoption and

amendment of the Constitution?

=Revision of the Articles or a New Government?=--The moment the first

problem was raised, representatives of the small states, led by William

Paterson of New Jersey, were on their feet. They feared that, if the

Articles were overthrown, the equality and rights of the states would be

put in jeopardy. Their protest was therefore vigorous. They cited the

call issued by the Congress in summoning the convention which

specifically stated that they were assembled for "the sole and express

purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation." They cited also

their instructions from their state legislatures, which authorized them

to "revise and amend" the existing scheme of government, not to make a

revolution in it. To depart from the authorization laid down by the

Congress and the legislatures would be to exceed their powers, they

argued, and to betray the trust reposed in them by their countrymen.

To their contentions, Randolph of Virginia replied: "When the salvation

of the republic is at stake, it would be treason to our trust not to

propose what we find necessary." Hamilton, reminding the delegates that

their work was still subject to the approval of the states, frankly said

that on the point of their powers he had no scruples. With the issue

clear, the convention cast aside the Articles as if they did not exist

and proceeded to the work of drawing up a new constitution, "laying its

foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form"

as to the delegates seemed "most likely to affect their safety and

happiness."

=A Government Founded on States or on People?--The

Compromise.=--Defeated in their attempt to limit the convention to a

mere revision of the Articles, the spokesmen of the smaller states

redoubled their efforts to preserve the equality of the states. The

signal for a radical departure from the Articles on this point was given

early in the sessions when Randolph presented "the Virginia plan." He

proposed that the new national legislature consist of two houses, the

members of which were to be apportioned among the states according to

their wealth or free white population, as the convention might decide.

This plan was vehemently challenged. Paterson of New Jersey flatly

avowed that neither he nor his state would ever bow to such tyranny. As

an alternative, he presented "the New Jersey plan" calling for a

national legislature of one house representing states as such, not

wealth or people--a legislature in which all states, large or small,

would have equal voice. Wilson of Pennsylvania, on behalf of the more

populous states, took up the gauntlet which Paterson had thrown down. It

was absurd, he urged, for 180,000 men in one state to have the same

weight in national counsels as 750,000 men in another state. "The

gentleman from New Jersey," he said, "is candid. He declares his opinion

boldly.... I will be equally candid.... I will never confederate on his

principles." So the bitter controversy ran on through many exciting

sessions.

Greek had met Greek. The convention was hopelessly deadlocked and on the

verge of dissolution, "scarce held together by the strength of a hair,"

as one of the delegates remarked. A crash was averted only by a

compromise. Instead of a Congress of one house as provided by the

Articles, the convention agreed upon a legislature of two houses. In the

Senate, the aspirations of the small states were to be satisfied, for

each state was given two members in that body. In the formation of the

House of Representatives, the larger states were placated, for it was

agreed that the members of that chamber were to be apportioned among the

states on the basis of population, counting three-fifths of the slaves.

=The Question of Popular Election.=--The method of selecting federal

officers and members of Congress also produced an acrimonious debate

which revealed how deep-seated was the distrust of the capacity of the

people to govern themselves. Few there were who believed that no branch

of the government should be elected directly by the voters; still fewer

were there, however, who desired to see all branches so chosen. One or

two even expressed a desire for a monarchy. The dangers of democracy

were stressed by Gerry of Massachusetts: "All the evils we experience

flow from an excess of democracy. The people do not want virtue but are

the dupes of pretended patriots.... I have been too republican

heretofore but have been taught by experience the danger of a leveling

spirit." To the "democratic licentiousness of the state legislatures,"

Randolph sought to oppose a "firm senate." To check the excesses of

popular government Charles Pinckney of South Carolina declared that no

one should be elected President who was not worth $100,000 and that high

property qualifications should be placed on members of Congress and

judges. Other members of the convention were stoutly opposed to such

"high-toned notions of government." Franklin and Wilson, both from

Pennsylvania, vigorously championed popular election; while men like

Madison insisted that at least one part of the government should rest on

the broad foundation of the people.

Out of this clash of opinion also came compromise. One branch, the House

of Representatives, it was agreed, was to be elected directly by the

voters, while the Senators were to be elected indirectly by the state

legislatures. The President was to be chosen by electors selected as the

legislatures of the states might determine, and the judges of the

federal courts, supreme and inferior, by the President and the Senate.

=The Question of the Suffrage.=--The battle over the suffrage was sharp

but brief. Gouverneur Morris proposed that only land owners should be

permitted to vote. Madison replied that the state legislatures, which

had made so much trouble with radical laws, were elected by freeholders.

After the debate, the delegates, unable to agree on any property

limitations on the suffrage, decided that the House of Representatives

should be elected by voters having the "qualifications requisite for

electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature." Thus

they accepted the suffrage provisions of the states.

=The Balance between the Planting and the Commercial States.=--After the

debates had gone on for a few weeks, Madison came to the conclusion that

the real division in the convention was not between the large and the

small states but between the planting section founded on slave labor and

the commercial North. Thus he anticipated by nearly three-quarters of a

century "the irrepressible conflict." The planting states had neither

the free white population nor the wealth of the North. There were,

counting Delaware, six of them as against seven commercial states.

Dependent for their prosperity mainly upon the sale of tobacco, rice,

and other staples abroad, they feared that Congress might impose

restraints upon their enterprise. Being weaker in numbers, they were

afraid that the majority might lay an unfair burden of taxes upon them.

\_Representation and Taxation.\_--The Southern members of the convention

were therefore very anxious to secure for their section the largest

possible representation in Congress, and at the same time to restrain

the taxing power of that body. Two devices were thought adapted to these

ends. One was to count the slaves as people when apportioning

representatives among the states according to their respective

populations; the other was to provide that direct taxes should be

apportioned among the states, in proportion not to their wealth but to

the number of their free white inhabitants. For obvious reasons the

Northern delegates objected to these proposals. Once more a compromise

proved to be the solution. It was agreed that not all the slaves but

three-fifths of them should be counted for both purposes--representation

and direct taxation.

\_Commerce and the Slave Trade.\_--Southern interests were also involved

in the project to confer upon Congress the power to regulate interstate

and foreign commerce. To the manufacturing and trading states this was

essential. It would prevent interstate tariffs and trade jealousies; it

would enable Congress to protect American manufactures and to break

down, by appropriate retaliations, foreign discriminations against

American commerce. To the South the proposal was menacing because

tariffs might interfere with the free exchange of the produce of

plantations in European markets, and navigation acts might confine the

carrying trade to American, that is Northern, ships. The importation of

slaves, moreover, it was feared might be heavily taxed or immediately

prohibited altogether.

The result of this and related controversies was a debate on the merits

of slavery. Gouverneur Morris delivered his mind and heart on that

subject, denouncing slavery as a nefarious institution and the curse of

heaven on the states in which it prevailed. Mason of Virginia, a

slaveholder himself, was hardly less outspoken, saying: "Slavery

discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed

by slaves. They prevent the migration of whites who really strengthen

and enrich a country."

The system, however, had its defenders. Representatives from South

Carolina argued that their entire economic life rested on slave labor

and that the high death rate in the rice swamps made continuous

importation necessary. Ellsworth of Connecticut took the ground that

the convention should not meddle with slavery. "The morality or wisdom

of slavery," he said, "are considerations belonging to the states. What

enriches a part enriches the whole." To the future he turned an

untroubled face: "As population increases, poor laborers will be so

plenty as to render slaves useless. Slavery in time will not be a speck

in our country." Virginia and North Carolina, already overstocked with

slaves, favored prohibiting the traffic in them; but South Carolina was

adamant. She must have fresh supplies of slaves or she would not

federate.

So it was agreed that, while Congress might regulate foreign trade by

majority vote, the importation of slaves should not be forbidden before

the lapse of twenty years, and that any import tax should not exceed $10

a head. At the same time, in connection with the regulation of foreign

trade, it was stipulated that a two-thirds vote in the Senate should be

necessary in the ratification of treaties. A further concession to the

South was made in the provision for the return of runaway slaves--a

provision also useful in the North, where indentured servants were about

as troublesome as slaves in escaping from their masters.

=The Form of the Government.=--As to the details of the frame of

government and the grand principles involved, the opinion of the

convention ebbed and flowed, decisions being taken in the heat of

debate, only to be revoked and taken again.

\_The Executive.\_--There was general agreement that there should be an

executive branch; for reliance upon Congress to enforce its own laws and

treaties had been a broken reed. On the character and functions of the

executive, however, there were many views. The New Jersey plan called

for a council selected by the Congress; the Virginia plan provided that

the executive branch should be chosen by the Congress but did not state

whether it should be composed of one or several persons. On this matter

the convention voted first one way and then another; finally it agreed

on a single executive chosen indirectly by electors selected as the

state legislatures might decide, serving for four years, subject to

impeachment, and endowed with regal powers in the command of the army

and the navy and in the enforcement of the laws.

\_The Legislative Branch--Congress.\_--After the convention had made the

great compromise between the large and small commonwealths by giving

representation to states in the Senate and to population in the House,

the question of methods of election had to be decided. As to the House

of Representatives it was readily agreed that the members should be

elected by direct popular vote. There was also easy agreement on the

proposition that a strong Senate was needed to check the "turbulence" of

the lower house. Four devices were finally selected to accomplish this

purpose. In the first place, the Senators were not to be chosen directly

by the voters but by the legislatures of the states, thus removing their

election one degree from the populace. In the second place, their term

was fixed at six years instead of two, as in the case of the House. In

the third place, provision was made for continuity by having only

one-third of the members go out at a time while two-thirds remained in

service. Finally, it was provided that Senators must be at least thirty

years old while Representatives need be only twenty-five.

\_The Judiciary.\_--The need for federal courts to carry out the law was

hardly open to debate. The feebleness of the Articles of Confederation

was, in a large measure, attributed to the want of a judiciary to hold

states and individuals in obedience to the laws and treaties of the

union. Nevertheless on this point the advocates of states' rights were

extremely sensitive. They looked with distrust upon judges appointed at

the national capital and emancipated from local interests and

traditions; they remembered with what insistence they had claimed

against Britain the right of local trial by jury and with what

consternation they had viewed the proposal to make colonial judges

independent of the assemblies in the matter of their salaries.

Reluctantly they yielded to the demand for federal courts, consenting at

first only to a supreme court to review cases heard in lower state

courts and finally to such additional inferior courts as Congress might

deem necessary.

\_The System of Checks and Balances.\_--It is thus apparent that the

framers of the Constitution, in shaping the form of government, arranged

for a distribution of power among three branches, executive,

legislative, and judicial. Strictly speaking we might say four branches,

for the legislature, or Congress, was composed of two houses, elected in

different ways, and one of them, the Senate, was made a check on the

President through its power of ratifying treaties and appointments. "The

accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judicial, in the

same hands," wrote Madison, "whether of one, a few, or many, and whether

hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the

very definition of tyranny." The devices which the convention adopted to

prevent such a centralization of authority were exceedingly ingenious

and well calculated to accomplish the purposes of the authors.

The legislature consisted of two houses, the members of which were to be

apportioned on a different basis, elected in different ways, and to

serve for different terms. A veto on all its acts was vested in a

President elected in a manner not employed in the choice of either

branch of the legislature, serving for four years, and subject to

removal only by the difficult process of impeachment. After a law had

run the gantlet of both houses and the executive, it was subject to

interpretation and annulment by the judiciary, appointed by the

President with the consent of the Senate and serving for life. Thus it

was made almost impossible for any political party to get possession of

all branches of the government at a single popular election. As Hamilton

remarked, the friends of good government considered "every institution

calculated to restrain the excess of law making and to keep things in

the same state in which they happen to be at any given period as more

likely to do good than harm."

=The Powers of the Federal Government.=--On the question of the powers

to be conferred upon the new government there was less occasion for a

serious dispute. Even the delegates from the small states agreed with

those from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia that new powers

should be added to those intrusted to Congress by the Articles of

Confederation. The New Jersey plan as well as the Virginia plan

recognized this fact. Some of the delegates, like Hamilton and Madison,

even proposed to give Congress a general legislative authority covering

all national matters; but others, frightened by the specter of

nationalism, insisted on specifying each power to be conferred and

finally carried the day.

\_Taxation and Commerce.\_--There were none bold enough to dissent from

the proposition that revenue must be provided to pay current expenses

and discharge the public debt. When once the dispute over the

apportionment of direct taxes among the slave states was settled, it was

an easy matter to decide that Congress should have power to lay and

collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises. In this way the national

government was freed from dependence upon stubborn and tardy

legislatures and enabled to collect funds directly from citizens. There

were likewise none bold enough to contend that the anarchy of state

tariffs and trade discriminations should be longer endured. When the

fears of the planting states were allayed and the "bargain" over the

importation of slaves was reached, the convention vested in Congress the

power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce.

\_National Defense.\_--The necessity for national defense was realized,

though the fear of huge military establishments was equally present. The

old practice of relying on quotas furnished by the state legislatures

was completely discredited. As in the case of taxes a direct authority

over citizens was demanded. Congress was therefore given full power to

raise and support armies and a navy. It could employ the state militia

when desirable; but it could at the same time maintain a regular army

and call directly upon all able-bodied males if the nature of a crisis

was thought to require it.

\_The "Necessary and Proper" Clause.\_--To the specified power vested in

Congress by the Constitution, the advocates of a strong national

government added a general clause authorizing it to make all laws

"necessary and proper" for carrying into effect any and all of the

enumerated powers. This clause, interpreted by that master mind, Chief

Justice Marshall, was later construed to confer powers as wide as the

requirements of a vast country spanning a continent and taking its place

among the mighty nations of the earth.

=Restraints on the States.=--Framing a government and endowing it with

large powers were by no means the sole concern of the convention. Its

very existence had been due quite as much to the conduct of the state

legislatures as to the futilities of a paralyzed Continental Congress.

In every state, explains Marshall in his \_Life of Washington\_, there was

a party of men who had "marked out for themselves a more indulgent

course. Viewing with extreme tenderness the case of the debtor, their

efforts were unceasingly directed to his relief. To exact a faithful

compliance with contracts was, in their opinion, a harsh measure which

the people could not bear. They were uniformly in favor of relaxing the

administration of justice, of affording facilities for the payment of

debts, or of suspending their collection, and remitting taxes."

The legislatures under the dominance of these men had enacted paper

money laws enabling debtors to discharge their obligations more easily.

The convention put an end to such practices by providing that no state

should emit bills of credit or make anything but gold or silver legal

tender in the payment of debts. The state legislatures had enacted laws

allowing men to pay their debts by turning over to creditors land or

personal property; they had repealed the charter of an endowed college

and taken the management from the hands of the lawful trustees; and they

had otherwise interfered with the enforcement of private agreements. The

convention, taking notice of such matters, inserted a clause forbidding

states "to impair the obligation of contracts." The more venturous of

the radicals had in Massachusetts raised the standard of revolt against

the authorities of the state. The convention answered by a brief

sentence to the effect that the President of the United States, to be

equipped with a regular army, would send troops to suppress domestic

insurrections whenever called upon by the legislature or, if it was not

in session, by the governor of the state. To make sure that the

restrictions on the states would not be dead letters, the federal

Constitution, laws, and treaties were made the supreme law of the land,

to be enforced whenever necessary by a national judiciary and executive

against violations on the part of any state authorities.

=Provisions for Ratification and Amendment.=--When the frame of

government had been determined, the powers to be vested in it had been

enumerated, and the restrictions upon the states had been written into

the bond, there remained three final questions. How shall the

Constitution be ratified? What number of states shall be necessary to

put it into effect? How shall it be amended in the future?

On the first point, the mandate under which the convention was sitting

seemed positive. The Articles of Confederation were still in effect.

They provided that amendments could be made only by unanimous adoption

in Congress and the approval of all the states. As if to give force to

this provision of law, the call for the convention had expressly stated

that all alterations and revisions should be reported to Congress for

adoption or rejection, Congress itself to transmit the document

thereafter to the states for their review.

To have observed the strict letter of the law would have defeated the

purposes of the delegates, because Congress and the state legislatures

were openly hostile to such drastic changes as had been made. Unanimous

ratification, as events proved, would have been impossible. Therefore

the delegates decided that the Constitution should be sent to Congress

with the recommendation that it, in turn, transmit the document, not to

the state legislatures, but to conventions held in the states for the

special object of deciding upon ratification. This process was followed.

It was their belief that special conventions would be more friendly than

the state legislatures.

The convention was equally positive in dealing with the problem of the

number of states necessary to establish the new Constitution. Attempts

to change the Articles had failed because amendment required the

approval of every state and there was always at least one recalcitrant

member of the union. The opposition to a new Constitution was

undoubtedly formidable. Rhode Island had even refused to take part in

framing it, and her hostility was deep and open. So the convention cast

aside the provision of the Articles of Confederation which required

unanimous approval for any change in the plan of government; it decreed

that the new Constitution should go into effect when ratified by nine

states.

In providing for future changes in the Constitution itself the

convention also thrust aside the old rule of unanimous approval, and

decided that an amendment could be made on a two-thirds vote in both

houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the states. This

change was of profound significance. Every state agreed to be bound in

the future by amendments duly adopted even in case it did not approve

them itself. America in this way set out upon the high road that led

from a league of states to a nation.

THE STRUGGLE OVER RATIFICATION

On September 17, 1787, the Constitution, having been finally drafted in

clear and simple language, a model to all makers of fundamental law, was

adopted. The convention, after nearly four months of debate in secret

session, flung open the doors and presented to the Americans the

finished plan for the new government. Then the great debate passed to

the people.

=The Opposition.=--Storms of criticism at once descended upon the

Constitution. "Fraudulent usurpation!" exclaimed Gerry, who had refused

to sign it. "A monster" out of the "thick veil of secrecy," declaimed a

Pennsylvania newspaper. "An iron-handed despotism will be the result,"

protested a third. "We, 'the low-born,'" sarcastically wrote a fourth,

"will now admit the 'six hundred well-born' immediately to establish

this most noble, most excellent, and truly divine constitution." The

President will become a king; Congress will be as tyrannical as

Parliament in the old days; the states will be swallowed up; the rights

of the people will be trampled upon; the poor man's justice will be lost

in the endless delays of the federal courts--such was the strain of the

protests against ratification.
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=Defense of the Constitution.=--Moved by the tempest of opposition,

Hamilton, Madison, and Jay took up their pens in defense of the

Constitution. In a series of newspaper articles they discussed and

expounded with eloquence, learning, and dignity every important clause

and provision of the proposed plan. These papers, afterwards collected

and published in a volume known as \_The Federalist\_, form the finest

textbook on the Constitution that has ever been printed. It takes its

place, moreover, among the wisest and weightiest treatises on government

ever written in any language in any time. Other men, not so gifted, were

no less earnest in their support of ratification. In private

correspondence, editorials, pamphlets, and letters to the newspapers,

they urged their countrymen to forget their partisanship and accept a

Constitution which, in spite of any defects great or small, was the

only guarantee against dissolution and warfare at home and dishonor and

weakness abroad.

[Illustration: CELEBRATING THE RATIFICATION]

=The Action of the State Conventions.=--Before the end of the year,

1787, three states had ratified the Constitution: Delaware and New

Jersey unanimously and Pennsylvania after a short, though savage,

contest. Connecticut and Georgia followed early the next year. Then came

the battle royal in Massachusetts, ending in ratification in February by

the narrow margin of 187 votes to 168. In the spring came the news that

Maryland and South Carolina were "under the new roof." On June 21, New

Hampshire, where the sentiment was at first strong enough to defeat the

Constitution, joined the new republic, influenced by the favorable

decision in Massachusetts. Swift couriers were sent to carry the news to

New York and Virginia, where the question of ratification was still

undecided. Nine states had accepted it and were united, whether more saw

fit to join or not.

Meanwhile, however, Virginia, after a long and searching debate, had

given her approval by a narrow margin, leaving New York as the next seat

of anxiety. In that state the popular vote for the delegates to the

convention had been clearly and heavily against ratification. Events

finally demonstrated the futility of resistance, and Hamilton by good

judgment and masterly arguments was at last able to marshal a majority

of thirty to twenty-seven votes in favor of ratification.

The great contest was over. All the states, except North Carolina and

Rhode Island, had ratified. "The sloop Anarchy," wrote an ebullient

journalist, "when last heard from was ashore on Union rocks."

=The First Election.=--In the autumn of 1788, elections were held to

fill the places in the new government. Public opinion was overwhelmingly

in favor of Washington as the first President. Yielding to the

importunities of friends, he accepted the post in the spirit of public

service. On April 30, 1789, he took the oath of office at Federal Hall

in New York City. "Long live George Washington, President of the United

States!" cried Chancellor Livingston as soon as the General had kissed

the Bible. The cry was caught by the assembled multitude and given back.

A new experiment in popular government was launched.

=References=

M. Farrand, \_The Framing of the Constitution of the United States\_.

P.L. Ford, \_Essays on the Constitution of the United States\_.

\_The Federalist\_ (in many editions).

G. Hunt, \_Life of James Madison\_.

A.C. McLaughlin, \_The Confederation and the Constitution\_ (American

Nation Series).

=Questions=

1. Account for the failure of the Articles of Confederation.

2. Explain the domestic difficulties of the individual states.

3. Why did efforts at reform by the Congress come to naught?

4. Narrate the events leading up to the constitutional convention.

5. Who were some of the leading men in the convention? What had been

their previous training?

6. State the great problems before the convention.

7. In what respects were the planting and commercial states opposed?

What compromises were reached?

8. Show how the "check and balance" system is embodied in our form of

government.

9. How did the powers conferred upon the federal government help cure

the defects of the Articles of Confederation?

10. In what way did the provisions for ratifying and amending the

Constitution depart from the old system?

11. What was the nature of the conflict over ratification?

=Research Topics=

=English Treatment of American Commerce.=--Callender, \_Economic History

of the United States\_, pp. 210-220.

=Financial Condition of the United States.=--Fiske, \_Critical Period of

American History\_, pp. 163-186.

=Disordered Commerce.=--Fiske, pp. 134-162.

=Selfish Conduct of the States.=--Callender, pp. 185-191.

=The Failure of the Confederation.=--Elson, \_History of the United

States\_, pp. 318-326.

=Formation of the Constitution.=--(1) The plans before the convention,

Fiske, pp. 236-249; (2) the great compromise, Fiske, pp. 250-255; (3)

slavery and the convention, Fiske, pp. 256-266; and (4) the frame of

government, Fiske, pp. 275-301; Elson, pp. 328-334.

=Biographical Studies.=--Look up the history and services of the leaders

in the convention in any good encyclopedia.

=Ratification of the Constitution.=--Hart, \_History Told by

Contemporaries\_, Vol. III, pp. 233-254; Elson, pp. 334-340.

=Source Study.=--Compare the Constitution and Articles of Confederation

under the following heads: (1) frame of government; (2) powers of

Congress; (3) limits on states; and (4) methods of amendment. Every line

of the Constitution should be read and re-read in the light of the

historical circumstances set forth in this chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CLASH OF POLITICAL PARTIES

THE MEN AND MEASURES OF THE NEW GOVERNMENT

=Friends of the Constitution in Power.=--In the first Congress that

assembled after the adoption of the Constitution, there were eleven

Senators, led by Robert Morris, the financier, who had been delegates to

the national convention. Several members of the House of

Representatives, headed by James Madison, had also been at Philadelphia

in 1787. In making his appointments, Washington strengthened the new

system of government still further by a judicious selection of

officials. He chose as Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton,

who had been the most zealous for its success; General Knox, head of the

War Department, and Edmund Randolph, the Attorney-General, were likewise

conspicuous friends of the experiment. Every member of the federal

judiciary whom Washington appointed, from the Chief Justice, John Jay,

down to the justices of the district courts, had favored the

ratification of the Constitution; and a majority of them had served as

members of the national convention that framed the document or of the

state ratifying conventions. Only one man of influence in the new

government, Thomas Jefferson, the Secretary of State, was reckoned as a

doubter in the house of the faithful. He had expressed opinions both for

and against the Constitution; but he had been out of the country acting

as the minister at Paris when the Constitution was drafted and ratified.

=An Opposition to Conciliate.=--The inauguration of Washington amid the

plaudits of his countrymen did not set at rest all the political turmoil

which had been aroused by the angry contest over ratification. "The

interesting nature of the question," wrote John Marshall, "the equality

of the parties, the animation produced inevitably by ardent debate had a

necessary tendency to embitter the dispositions of the vanquished and to

fix more deeply in many bosoms their prejudices against a plan of

government in opposition to which all their passions were enlisted." The

leaders gathered around Washington were well aware of the excited state

of the country. They saw Rhode Island and North Carolina still outside

of the union.[1] They knew by what small margins the Constitution had

been approved in the great states of Massachusetts, Virginia, and New

York. They were equally aware that a majority of the state conventions,

in yielding reluctant approval to the Constitution, had drawn a number

of amendments for immediate submission to the states.

=The First Amendments--a Bill of Rights.=--To meet the opposition,

Madison proposed, and the first Congress adopted, a series of amendments

to the Constitution. Ten of them were soon ratified and became in 1791 a

part of the law of the land. These amendments provided, among other

things, that Congress could make no law respecting the establishment of

religion, abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right

of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the government for a

redress of grievances. They also guaranteed indictment by grand jury and

trial by jury for all persons charged by federal officers with serious

crimes. To reassure those who still feared that local rights might be

invaded by the federal government, the tenth amendment expressly

provided that the powers not delegated to the United States by the

Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the

states respectively or to the people. Seven years later, the eleventh

amendment was written in the same spirit as the first ten, after a

heated debate over the action of the Supreme Court in permitting a

citizen to bring a suit against "the sovereign state" of Georgia. The

new amendment was designed to protect states against the federal

judiciary by forbidding it to hear any case in which a state was sued by

a citizen.

=Funding the National Debt.=--Paper declarations of rights, however,

paid no bills. To this task Hamilton turned all his splendid genius. At

the very outset he addressed himself to the problem of the huge public

debt, daily mounting as the unpaid interest accumulated. In a \_Report on

Public Credit\_ under date of January 9, 1790, one of the first and

greatest of American state papers, he laid before Congress the outlines

of his plan. He proposed that the federal government should call in all

the old bonds, certificates of indebtedness, and other promises to pay

which had been issued by the Congress since the beginning of the

Revolution. These national obligations, he urged, should be put into one

consolidated debt resting on the credit of the United States; to the

holders of the old paper should be issued new bonds drawing interest at

fixed rates. This process was called "funding the debt." Such a

provision for the support of public credit, Hamilton insisted, would

satisfy creditors, restore landed property to its former value, and

furnish new resources to agriculture and commerce in the form of credit

and capital.

=Assumption and Funding of State Debts.=--Hamilton then turned to the

obligations incurred by the several states in support of the Revolution.

These debts he proposed to add to the national debt. They were to be

"assumed" by the United States government and placed on the same secure

foundation as the continental debt. This measure he defended not merely

on grounds of national honor. It would, as he foresaw, give strength to

the new national government by making all public creditors, men of

substance in their several communities, look to the federal, rather than

the state government, for the satisfaction of their claims.

=Funding at Face Value.=--On the question of the terms of consolidation,

assumption, and funding, Hamilton had a firm conviction. That millions

of dollars' worth of the continental and state bonds had passed out of

the hands of those who had originally subscribed their funds to the

support of the government or had sold supplies for the Revolutionary

army was well known. It was also a matter of common knowledge that a

very large part of these bonds had been bought by speculators at ruinous

figures--ten, twenty, and thirty cents on the dollar. Accordingly, it

had been suggested, even in very respectable quarters, that a

discrimination should be made between original holders and speculative

purchasers. Some who held this opinion urged that the speculators who

had paid nominal sums for their bonds should be reimbursed for their

outlays and the original holders paid the difference; others said that

the government should "scale the debt" by redeeming, not at full value

but at a figure reasonably above the market price. Against the

proposition Hamilton set his face like flint. He maintained that the

government was honestly bound to redeem every bond at its face value,

although the difficulty of securing revenue made necessary a lower rate

of interest on a part of the bonds and the deferring of interest on

another part.

=Funding and Assumption Carried.=--There was little difficulty in

securing the approval of both houses of Congress for the funding of the

national debt at full value. The bill for the assumption of state debts,

however, brought the sharpest division of opinions. To the Southern

members of Congress assumption was a gross violation of states' rights,

without any warrant in the Constitution and devised in the interest of

Northern speculators who, anticipating assumption and funding, had

bought up at low prices the Southern bonds and other promises to pay.

New England, on the other hand, was strongly in favor of assumption;

several representatives from that section were rash enough to threaten a

dissolution of the union if the bill was defeated. To this dispute was

added an equally bitter quarrel over the location of the national

capital, then temporarily at New York City.

[Illustration: FIRST UNITED STATES BANK AT PHILADELPHIA]

A deadlock, accompanied by the most surly feelings on both sides,

threatened the very existence of the young government. Washington and

Hamilton were thoroughly alarmed. Hearing of the extremity to which the

contest had been carried and acting on the appeal from the Secretary of

the Treasury, Jefferson intervened at this point. By skillful management

at a good dinner he brought the opposing leaders together; and thus once

more, as on many other occasions, peace was purchased and the union

saved by compromise. The bargain this time consisted of an exchange of

votes for assumption in return for votes for the capital. Enough

Southern members voted for assumption to pass the bill, and a majority

was mustered in favor of building the capital on the banks of the

Potomac, after locating it for a ten-year period at Philadelphia to

satisfy Pennsylvania members.

=The United States Bank.=--Encouraged by the success of his funding and

assumption measures, Hamilton laid before Congress a project for a great

United States Bank. He proposed that a private corporation be chartered

by Congress, authorized to raise a capital stock of $10,000,000

(three-fourths in new six per cent federal bonds and one-fourth in

specie) and empowered to issue paper currency under proper safeguards.

Many advantages, Hamilton contended, would accrue to the government from

this institution. The price of the government bonds would be increased,

thus enhancing public credit. A national currency would be created of

uniform value from one end of the land to the other. The branches of the

bank in various cities would make easy the exchange of funds so vital to

commercial transactions on a national scale. Finally, through the issue

of bank notes, the money capital available for agriculture and industry

would be increased, thus stimulating business enterprise. Jefferson

hotly attacked the bank on the ground that Congress had no power

whatever under the Constitution to charter such a private corporation.

Hamilton defended it with great cogency. Washington, after weighing all

opinions, decided in favor of the proposal. In 1791 the bill

establishing the first United States Bank for a period of twenty years

became a law.

=The Protective Tariff.=--A third part of Hamilton's program was the

protection of American industries. The first revenue act of 1789, though

designed primarily to bring money into the empty treasury, declared in

favor of the principle. The following year Washington referred to the

subject in his address to Congress. Thereupon Hamilton was instructed to

prepare recommendations for legislative action. The result, after a

delay of more than a year, was his \_Report on Manufactures\_, another

state paper worthy, in closeness of reasoning and keenness of

understanding, of a place beside his report on public credit. Hamilton

based his argument on the broadest national grounds: the protective

tariff would, by encouraging the building of factories, create a home

market for the produce of farms and plantations; by making the United

States independent of other countries in times of peace, it would double

its security in time of war; by making use of the labor of women and

children, it would turn to the production of goods persons otherwise

idle or only partly employed; by increasing the trade between the North

and South it would strengthen the links of union and add to political

ties those of commerce and intercourse. The revenue measure of 1792 bore

the impress of these arguments.

THE RISE OF POLITICAL PARTIES

=Dissensions over Hamilton's Measures.=--Hamilton's plans, touching

deeply as they did the resources of individuals and the interests of the

states, awakened alarm and opposition. Funding at face value, said his

critics, was a government favor to speculators; the assumption of state

debts was a deep design to undermine the state governments; Congress had

no constitutional power to create a bank; the law creating the bank

merely allowed a private corporation to make paper money and lend it at

a high rate of interest; and the tariff was a tax on land and labor for

the benefit of manufacturers.

Hamilton's reply to this bill of indictment was simple and

straightforward. Some rascally speculators had profited from the funding

of the debt at face value, but that was only an incident in the

restoration of public credit. In view of the jealousies of the states it

was a good thing to reduce their powers and pretensions. The

Constitution was not to be interpreted narrowly but in the full light of

national needs. The bank would enlarge the amount of capital so sorely

needed to start up American industries, giving markets to farmers and

planters. The tariff by creating a home market and increasing

opportunities for employment would benefit both land and labor. Out of

such wise policies firmly pursued by the government, he concluded, were

bound to come strength and prosperity for the new government at home,

credit and power abroad. This view Washington fully indorsed, adding

the weight of his great name to the inherent merits of the measures

adopted under his administration.

=The Sharpness of the Partisan Conflict.=--As a result of the clash of

opinion, the people of the country gradually divided into two parties:

Federalists and Anti-Federalists, the former led by Hamilton, the latter

by Jefferson. The strength of the Federalists lay in the cities--Boston,

Providence, Hartford, New York, Philadelphia, Charleston--among the

manufacturing, financial, and commercial groups of the population who

were eager to extend their business operations. The strength of the

Anti-Federalists lay mainly among the debt-burdened farmers who feared

the growth of what they called "a money power" and planters in all

sections who feared the dominance of commercial and manufacturing

interests. The farming and planting South, outside of the few towns,

finally presented an almost solid front against assumption, the bank,

and the tariff. The conflict between the parties grew steadily in

bitterness, despite the conciliatory and engaging manner in which

Hamilton presented his cause in his state papers and despite the

constant efforts of Washington to soften the asperity of the

contestants.

=The Leadership and Doctrines of Jefferson.=--The party dispute had not

gone far before the opponents of the administration began to look to

Jefferson as their leader. Some of Hamilton's measures he had approved,

declaring afterward that he did not at the time understand their

significance. Others, particularly the bank, he fiercely assailed. More

than once, he and Hamilton, shaking violently with anger, attacked each

other at cabinet meetings, and nothing short of the grave and dignified

pleas of Washington prevented an early and open break between them. In

1794 it finally came. Jefferson resigned as Secretary of State and

retired to his home in Virginia to assume, through correspondence and

negotiation, the leadership of the steadily growing party of opposition.

Shy and modest in manner, halting in speech, disliking the turmoil of

public debate, and deeply interested in science and philosophy,

Jefferson was not very well fitted for the strenuous life of political

contest. Nevertheless, he was an ambitious and shrewd negotiator. He was

also by honest opinion and matured conviction the exact opposite of

Hamilton. The latter believed in a strong, active, "high-toned"

government, vigorously compelling in all its branches. Jefferson looked

upon such government as dangerous to the liberties of citizens and

openly avowed his faith in the desirability of occasional popular

uprisings. Hamilton distrusted the people. "Your people is a great

beast," he is reported to have said. Jefferson professed his faith in

the people with an abandon that was considered reckless in his time.

On economic matters, the opinions of the two leaders were also

hopelessly at variance. Hamilton, while cherishing agriculture, desired

to see America a great commercial and industrial nation. Jefferson was

equally set against this course for his country. He feared the

accumulation of riches and the growth of a large urban working class.

The mobs of great cities, he said, are sores on the body politic;

artisans are usually the dangerous element that make revolutions;

workshops should be kept in Europe and with them the artisans with their

insidious morals and manners. The only substantial foundation for a

republic, Jefferson believed to be agriculture. The spirit of

independence could be kept alive only by free farmers, owning the land

they tilled and looking to the sun in heaven and the labor of their

hands for their sustenance. Trusting as he did in the innate goodness of

human nature when nourished on a free soil, Jefferson advocated those

measures calculated to favor agriculture and to enlarge the rights of

persons rather than the powers of government. Thus he became the

champion of the individual against the interference of the government,

and an ardent advocate of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and

freedom of scientific inquiry. It was, accordingly, no mere factious

spirit that drove him into opposition to Hamilton.

=The Whisky Rebellion.=--The political agitation of the Anti-Federalists

was accompanied by an armed revolt against the government in 1794. The

occasion for this uprising was another of Hamilton's measures, a law

laying an excise tax on distilled spirits, for the purpose of increasing

the revenue needed to pay the interest on the funded debt. It so

happened that a very considerable part of the whisky manufactured in the

country was made by the farmers, especially on the frontier, in their

own stills. The new revenue law meant that federal officers would now

come into the homes of the people, measure their liquor, and take the

tax out of their pockets. All the bitterness which farmers felt against

the fiscal measures of the government was redoubled. In the western

districts of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and North Carolina, they refused to

pay the tax. In Pennsylvania, some of them sacked and burned the houses

of the tax collectors, as the Revolutionists thirty years before had

mobbed the agents of King George sent over to sell stamps. They were in

a fair way to nullify the law in whole districts when Washington called

out the troops to suppress "the Whisky Rebellion." Then the movement

collapsed; but it left behind a deep-seated resentment which flared up

in the election of several obdurate Anti-Federalist Congressmen from the

disaffected regions.

FOREIGN INFLUENCES AND DOMESTIC POLITICS

=The French Revolution.=--In this exciting period, when all America was

distracted by partisan disputes, a storm broke in Europe--the

epoch-making French Revolution--which not only shook the thrones of the

Old World but stirred to its depths the young republic of the New World.

The first scene in this dramatic affair occurred in the spring of 1789,

a few days after Washington was inaugurated. The king of France, Louis

XVI, driven into bankruptcy by extravagance and costly wars, was forced

to resort to his people for financial help. Accordingly he called, for

the first time in more than one hundred fifty years, a meeting of the

national parliament, the "Estates General," composed of representatives

of the "three estates"--the clergy, nobility, and commoners. Acting

under powerful leaders, the commoners, or "third estate," swept aside

the clergy and nobility and resolved themselves into a national

assembly. This stirred the country to its depths.
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Great events followed in swift succession. On July 14, 1789, the

Bastille, an old royal prison, symbol of the king's absolutism, was

stormed by a Paris crowd and destroyed. On the night of August 4, the

feudal privileges of the nobility were abolished by the national

assembly amid great excitement. A few days later came the famous

Declaration of the Rights of Man, proclaiming the sovereignty of the

people and the privileges of citizens. In the autumn of 1791, Louis XVI

was forced to accept a new constitution for France vesting the

legislative power in a popular assembly. Little disorder accompanied

these startling changes. To all appearances a peaceful revolution had

stripped the French king of his royal prerogatives and based the

government of his country on the consent of the governed.

=American Influence in France.=--In undertaking their great political

revolt the French had been encouraged by the outcome of the American

Revolution. Officers and soldiers, who had served in the American war,

reported to their French countrymen marvelous tales. At the frugal table

of General Washington, in council with the unpretentious Franklin, or at

conferences over the strategy of war, French noblemen of ancient lineage

learned to respect both the talents and the simple character of the

leaders in the great republican commonwealth beyond the seas. Travelers,

who had gone to see the experiment in republicanism with their own eyes,

carried home to the king and ruling class stories of an astounding

system of popular government.

On the other hand the dalliance with American democracy was regarded by

French conservatives as playing with fire. "When we think of the false

ideas of government and philanthropy," wrote one of Lafayette's aides,

"which these youths acquired in America and propagated in France with so

much enthusiasm and such deplorable success--for this mania of imitation

powerfully aided the Revolution, though it was not the sole cause of

it--we are bound to confess that it would have been better, both for

themselves and for us, if these young philosophers in red-heeled shoes

had stayed at home in attendance on the court."

=Early American Opinion of the French Revolution.=--So close were the

ties between the two nations that it is not surprising to find every

step in the first stages of the French Revolution greeted with applause

in the United States. "Liberty will have another feather in her cap,"

exultantly wrote a Boston editor. "In no part of the globe," soberly

wrote John Marshall, "was this revolution hailed with more joy than in

America.... But one sentiment existed." The main key to the Bastille,

sent to Washington as a memento, was accepted as "a token of the

victory gained by liberty." Thomas Paine saw in the great event "the

first ripe fruits of American principles transplanted into Europe."

Federalists and Anti-Federalists regarded the new constitution of France

as another vindication of American ideals.

=The Reign of Terror.=--While profuse congratulations were being

exchanged, rumors began to come that all was not well in France. Many

noblemen, enraged at the loss of their special privileges, fled into

Germany and plotted an invasion of France to overthrow the new system of

government. Louis XVI entered into negotiations with his brother

monarchs on the continent to secure their help in the same enterprise,

and he finally betrayed to the French people his true sentiments by

attempting to escape from his kingdom, only to be captured and taken

back to Paris in disgrace.

A new phase of the revolution now opened. The working people, excluded

from all share in the government by the first French constitution,

became restless, especially in Paris. Assembling on the Champs de Mars,

a great open field, they signed a petition calling for another

constitution giving them the suffrage. When told to disperse, they

refused and were fired upon by the national guard. This "massacre," as

it was called, enraged the populace. A radical party, known as

"Jacobins," then sprang up, taking its name from a Jacobin monastery in

which it held its sessions. In a little while it became the master of

the popular convention convoked in September, 1792. The monarchy was

immediately abolished and a republic established. On January 21, 1793,

Louis was sent to the scaffold. To the war on Austria, already raging,

was added a war on England. Then came the Reign of Terror, during which

radicals in possession of the convention executed in large numbers

counter-revolutionists and those suspected of sympathy with the

monarchy. They shot down peasants who rose in insurrection against their

rule and established a relentless dictatorship. Civil war followed.

Terrible atrocities were committed on both sides in the name of liberty,

and in the name of monarchy. To Americans of conservative temper it now

seemed that the Revolution, so auspiciously begun, had degenerated into

anarchy and mere bloodthirsty strife.

=Burke Summons the World to War on France.=--In England, Edmund Burke

led the fight against the new French principles which he feared might

spread to all Europe. In his \_Reflections on the French Revolution\_,

written in 1790, he attacked with terrible wrath the whole program of

popular government; he called for war, relentless war, upon the French

as monsters and outlaws; he demanded that they be reduced to order by

the restoration of the king to full power under the protection of the

arms of European nations.

=Paine's Defense of the French Revolution.=--To counteract the campaign

of hate against the French, Thomas Paine replied to Burke in another of

his famous tracts, \_The Rights of Man\_, which was given to the American

public in an edition containing a letter of approval from Jefferson.

Burke, said Paine, had been mourning about the glories of the French

monarchy and aristocracy but had forgotten the starving peasants and the

oppressed people; had wept over the plumage and neglected the dying

bird. Burke had denied the right of the French people to choose their

own governors, blandly forgetting that the English government in which

he saw final perfection itself rested on two revolutions. He had boasted

that the king of England held his crown in contempt of the democratic

societies. Paine answered: "If I ask a man in America if he wants a

king, he retorts and asks me if I take him for an idiot." To the charge

that the doctrines of the rights of man were "new fangled," Paine

replied that the question was not whether they were new or old but

whether they were right or wrong. As to the French disorders and

difficulties, he bade the world wait to see what would be brought forth

in due time.

=The Effect of the French Revolution on American Politics.=--The course

of the French Revolution and the controversies accompanying it,

exercised a profound influence on the formation of the first political

parties in America. The followers of Hamilton, now proud of the name

"Federalists," drew back in fright as they heard of the cruel deeds

committed during the Reign of Terror. They turned savagely upon the

revolutionists and their friends in America, denouncing as "Jacobin"

everybody who did not condemn loudly enough the proceedings of the

French Republic. A Massachusetts preacher roundly assailed "the

atheistical, anarchical, and in other respects immoral principles of the

French Republicans"; he then proceeded with equal passion to attack

Jefferson and the Anti-Federalists, whom he charged with spreading false

French propaganda and betraying America. "The editors, patrons, and

abettors of these vehicles of slander," he exclaimed, "ought to be

considered and treated as enemies to their country.... Of all traitors

they are the most aggravatedly criminal; of all villains, they are the

most infamous and detestable."

The Anti-Federalists, as a matter of fact, were generally favorable to

the Revolution although they deplored many of the events associated with

it. Paine's pamphlet, indorsed by Jefferson, was widely read. Democratic

societies, after the fashion of French political clubs, arose in the

cities; the coalition of European monarchs against France was denounced

as a coalition against the very principles of republicanism; and the

execution of Louis XVI was openly celebrated at a banquet in

Philadelphia. Harmless titles, such as "Sir," "the Honorable," and "His

Excellency," were decried as aristocratic and some of the more excited

insisted on adopting the French title, "Citizen," speaking, for example,

of "Citizen Judge" and "Citizen Toastmaster." Pamphlets in defense of

the French streamed from the press, while subsidized newspapers kept the

propaganda in full swing.

=The European War Disturbs American Commerce.=--This battle of wits, or

rather contest in calumny, might have gone on indefinitely in America

without producing any serious results, had it not been for the war

between England and France, then raging. The English, having command of

the seas, claimed the right to seize American produce bound for French

ports and to confiscate American ships engaged in carrying French goods.

Adding fuel to a fire already hot enough, they began to search American

ships and to carry off British-born sailors found on board American

vessels.

=The French Appeal for Help.=--At the same time the French Republic

turned to the United States for aid in its war on England and sent over

as its diplomatic representative "Citizen" Genet, an ardent supporter of

the new order. On his arrival at Charleston, he was greeted with fervor

by the Anti-Federalists. As he made his way North, he was wined and

dined and given popular ovations that turned his head. He thought the

whole country was ready to join the French Republic in its contest with

England. Genet therefore attempted to use the American ports as the base

of operations for French privateers preying on British merchant ships;

and he insisted that the United States was in honor bound to help France

under the treaty of 1778.

=The Proclamation of Neutrality and the Jay Treaty.=--Unmoved by the

rising tide of popular sympathy for France, Washington took a firm

course. He received Genet coldly. The demand that the United States aid

France under the old treaty of alliance he answered by proclaiming the

neutrality of America and warning American citizens against hostile acts

toward either France or England. When Genet continued to hold meetings,

issue manifestoes, and stir up the people against England, Washington

asked the French government to recall him. This act he followed up by

sending the Chief Justice, John Jay, on a pacific mission to England.

The result was the celebrated Jay treaty of 1794. By its terms Great

Britain agreed to withdraw her troops from the western forts where they

had been since the war for independence and to grant certain slight

trade concessions. The chief sources of bitterness--the failure of the

British to return slaves carried off during the Revolution, the seizure

of American ships, and the impressment of sailors--were not touched,

much to the distress of everybody in America, including loyal

Federalists. Nevertheless, Washington, dreading an armed conflict with

England, urged the Senate to ratify the treaty. The weight of his

influence carried the day.

At this, the hostility of the Anti-Federalists knew no bounds. Jefferson

declared the Jay treaty "an infamous act which is really nothing more

than an alliance between England and the Anglo-men of this country,

against the legislature and the people of the United States." Hamilton,

defending it with his usual courage, was stoned by a mob in New York and

driven from the platform with blood streaming from his face. Jay was

burned in effigy. Even Washington was not spared. The House of

Representatives was openly hostile. To display its feelings, it called

upon the President for the papers relative to the treaty negotiations,

only to be more highly incensed by his flat refusal to present them, on

the ground that the House did not share in the treaty-making power.

=Washington Retires from Politics.=--Such angry contests confirmed the

President in his slowly maturing determination to retire at the end of

his second term in office. He did not believe that a third term was

unconstitutional or improper; but, worn out by his long and arduous

labors in war and in peace and wounded by harsh attacks from former

friends, he longed for the quiet of his beautiful estate at Mount

Vernon.

In September, 1796, on the eve of the presidential election, Washington

issued his Farewell Address, another state paper to be treasured and

read by generations of Americans to come. In this address he directed

the attention of the people to three subjects of lasting interest. He

warned them against sectional jealousies. He remonstrated against the

spirit of partisanship, saying that in government "of the popular

character, in government purely elective, it is a spirit not to be

encouraged." He likewise cautioned the people against "the insidious

wiles of foreign influence," saying: "Europe has a set of primary

interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she

must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are

essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it would be

unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary

vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions

of her friendships or enmities.... Why forego the advantages of so

peculiar a situation?... It is our true policy to steer clear of

permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.... Taking

care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a

respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary

alliances for extraordinary emergencies."

=The Campaign of 1796--Adams Elected.=--On hearing of the retirement of

Washington, the Anti-Federalists cast off all restraints. In honor of

France and in opposition to what they were pleased to call the

monarchical tendencies of the Federalists, they boldly assumed the name

"Republican"; the term "Democrat," then applied only to obscure and

despised radicals, had not come into general use. They selected

Jefferson as their candidate for President against John Adams, the

Federalist nominee, and carried on such a spirited campaign that they

came within four votes of electing him.

The successful candidate, Adams, was not fitted by training or opinion

for conciliating a determined opposition. He was a reserved and studious

man. He was neither a good speaker nor a skillful negotiator. In one of

his books he had declared himself in favor of "government by an

aristocracy of talents and wealth"--an offense which the Republicans

never forgave. While John Marshall found him "a sensible, plain, candid,

good-tempered man," Jefferson could see in him nothing but a "monocrat"

and "Anglo-man." Had it not been for the conduct of the French

government, Adams would hardly have enjoyed a moment's genuine

popularity during his administration.

=The Quarrel with France.=--The French Directory, the executive

department established under the constitution of 1795, managed, however,

to stir the anger of Republicans and Federalists alike. It regarded the

Jay treaty as a rebuke to France and a flagrant violation of obligations

solemnly registered in the treaty of 1778. Accordingly it refused to

receive the American minister, treated him in a humiliating way, and

finally told him to leave the country. Overlooking this affront in his

anxiety to maintain peace, Adams dispatched to France a commission of

eminent men with instructions to reach an understanding with the French

Republic. On their arrival, they were chagrined to find, instead of a

decent reception, an indirect demand for an apology respecting the past

conduct of the American government, a payment in cash, and an annual

tribute as the price of continued friendship. When the news of this

affair reached President Adams, he promptly laid it before Congress,

referring to the Frenchmen who had made the demands as "Mr. X, Mr. Y,

and Mr. Z."

This insult, coupled with the fact that French privateers, like the

British, were preying upon American commerce, enraged even the

Republicans who had been loudest in the profession of their French

sympathies. They forgot their wrath over the Jay treaty and joined with

the Federalists in shouting: "Millions for defense, not a cent for

tribute!" Preparations for war were made on every hand. Washington was

once more called from Mount Vernon to take his old position at the head

of the army. Indeed, fighting actually began upon the high seas and went

on without a formal declaration of war until the year 1800. By that time

the Directory had been overthrown. A treaty was readily made with

Napoleon, the First Consul, who was beginning his remarkable career as

chief of the French Republic, soon to be turned into an empire.

=Alien and Sedition Laws.=--Flushed with success, the Federalists

determined, if possible, to put an end to radical French influence in

America and to silence Republican opposition. They therefore passed two

drastic laws in the summer of 1798: the Alien and Sedition Acts.

The first of these measures empowered the President to expel from the

country or to imprison any alien whom he regarded as "dangerous" or "had

reasonable grounds to suspect" of "any treasonable or secret

machinations against the government."

The second of the measures, the Sedition Act, penalized not only those

who attempted to stir up unlawful combinations against the government

but also every one who wrote, uttered, or published "any false,

scandalous, and malicious writing ... against the government of the

United States or either House of Congress, or the President of the

United States, with intent to defame said government ... or to bring

them or either of them into contempt or disrepute." This measure was

hurried through Congress in spite of the opposition and the clear

provision in the Constitution that Congress shall make no law abridging

the freedom of speech or of the press. Even many Federalists feared the

consequences of the action. Hamilton was alarmed when he read the bill,

exclaiming: "Let us not establish a tyranny. Energy is a very different

thing from violence." John Marshall told his friends in Virginia that,

had he been in Congress, he would have opposed the two bills because he

thought them "useless" and "calculated to create unnecessary discontents

and jealousies."

The Alien law was not enforced; but it gave great offense to the Irish

and French whose activities against the American government's policy

respecting Great Britain put them in danger of prison. The Sedition law,

on the other hand, was vigorously applied. Several editors of Republican

newspapers soon found themselves in jail or broken by ruinous fines for

their caustic criticisms of the Federalist President and his policies.

Bystanders at political meetings, who uttered sentiments which, though

ungenerous and severe, seem harmless enough now, were hurried before

Federalist judges and promptly fined and imprisoned. Although the

prosecutions were not numerous, they aroused a keen resentment. The

Republicans were convinced that their political opponents, having

saddled upon the country Hamilton's fiscal system and the British

treaty, were bent on silencing all censure. The measures therefore had

exactly the opposite effect from that which their authors intended.

Instead of helping the Federalist party, they made criticism of it more

bitter than ever.

=The Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions.=--Jefferson was quick to take

advantage of the discontent. He drafted a set of resolutions declaring

the Sedition law null and void, as violating the federal Constitution.

His resolutions were passed by the Kentucky legislature late in 1798,

signed by the governor, and transmitted to the other states for their

consideration. Though receiving unfavorable replies from a number of

Northern states, Kentucky the following year reaffirmed its position and

declared that the nullification of all unconstitutional acts of Congress

was the rightful remedy to be used by the states in the redress of

grievances. It thus defied the federal government and announced a

doctrine hostile to nationality and fraught with terrible meaning for

the future. In the neighboring state of Virginia, Madison led a movement

against the Alien and Sedition laws. He induced the legislature to pass

resolutions condemning the acts as unconstitutional and calling upon the

other states to take proper means to preserve their rights and the

rights of the people.

=The Republican Triumph in 1800.=--Thus the way was prepared for the

election of 1800. The Republicans left no stone unturned in their

efforts to place on the Federalist candidate, President Adams, all the

odium of the Alien and Sedition laws, in addition to responsibility for

approving Hamilton's measures and policies. The Federalists, divided in

councils and cold in their affection for Adams, made a poor campaign.

They tried to discredit their opponents with epithets of "Jacobins" and

"Anarchists"--terms which had been weakened by excessive use. When the

vote was counted, it was found that Adams had been defeated; while the

Republicans had carried the entire South and New York also and secured

eight of the fifteen electoral votes cast by Pennsylvania. "Our beloved

Adams will now close his bright career," lamented a Federalist

newspaper. "Sons of faction, demagogues and high priests of anarchy, now

you have cause to triumph!"

[Illustration: \_An old cartoon\_

A QUARREL BETWEEN A FEDERALIST AND A REPUBLICAN IN THE HOUSE OF

REPRESENTATIVES]

Jefferson's election, however, was still uncertain. By a curious

provision in the Constitution, presidential electors were required to

vote for two persons without indicating which office each was to fill,

the one receiving the highest number of votes to be President and the

candidate standing next to be Vice President. It so happened that Aaron

Burr, the Republican candidate for Vice President, had received the same

number of votes as Jefferson; as neither had a majority the election was

thrown into the House of Representatives, where the Federalists held the

balance of power. Although it was well known that Burr was not even a

candidate for President, his friends and many Federalists began

intriguing for his election to that high office. Had it not been for the

vigorous action of Hamilton the prize might have been snatched out of

Jefferson's hands. Not until the thirty-sixth ballot on February 17,

1801, was the great issue decided in his favor.[2]
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=Questions=

1. Who were the leaders in the first administration under the

Constitution?

2. What step was taken to appease the opposition?

3. Enumerate Hamilton's great measures and explain each in detail.

4. Show the connection between the parts of Hamilton's system.

5. Contrast the general political views of Hamilton and Jefferson.

6. What were the important results of the "peaceful" French Revolution

(1789-92)?

7. Explain the interaction of opinion between France and the United

States.

8. How did the "Reign of Terror" change American opinion?

9. What was the Burke-Paine controversy?

10. Show how the war in Europe affected American commerce and involved

America with England and France.

11. What were American policies with regard to each of those countries?

12. What was the outcome of the Alien and Sedition Acts?

=Research Topics=

=Early Federal Legislation.=--Coman, \_Industrial History of the United

States\_, pp. 133-156; Elson, \_History of the United States\_, pp.

341-348.

=Hamilton's Report on Public Credit.=--Macdonald, \_Documentary Source

Book\_, pp. 233-243.

=The French Revolution.=--Robinson and Beard, \_Development of Modern

Europe\_, Vol. I, pp. 224-282; Elson, pp. 351-354.

=The Burke-Paine Controversy.=--Make an analysis of Burke's \_Reflections

on the French Revolution\_ and Paine's \_Rights of Man\_.

=The Alien and Sedition Acts.=--Macdonald, \_Documentary Source Book\_,

pp. 259-267; Elson, pp. 367-375.

=Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions.=--Macdonald, pp. 267-278.

=Source Studies.=--Materials in Hart, \_American History Told by

Contemporaries\_, Vol. III, pp. 255-343.

=Biographical Studies.=--Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, Thomas

Jefferson, and Albert Gallatin.

=The Twelfth Amendment.=--Contrast the provision in the original

Constitution with the terms of the Amendment. \_See\_ Appendix.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] North Carolina ratified in November, 1789, and Rhode Island in May,

1790.

[2] To prevent a repetition of such an unfortunate affair, the twelfth

amendment of the Constitution was adopted in 1804, changing slightly the

method of electing the President.

CHAPTER IX

THE JEFFERSONIAN REPUBLICANS IN POWER

REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES

=Opposition to Strong Central Government.=--Cherishing especially the

agricultural interest, as Jefferson said, the Republicans were in the

beginning provincial in their concern and outlook. Their attachment to

America was, certainly, as strong as that of Hamilton; but they regarded

the state, rather than the national government, as the proper center of

power and affection. Indeed, a large part of the rank and file had been

among the opponents of the Constitution in the days of its adoption.

Jefferson had entertained doubts about it and Monroe, destined to be the

fifth President, had been one of the bitter foes of ratification. The

former went so far in the direction of local autonomy that he exalted

the state above the nation in the Kentucky resolutions of 1798,

declaring the Constitution to be a mere compact and the states competent

to interpret and nullify federal law. This was provincialism with a

vengeance. "It is jealousy, not confidence, which prescribes limited

constitutions," wrote Jefferson for the Kentucky legislature. Jealousy

of the national government, not confidence in it--this is the ideal that

reflected the provincial and agricultural interest.

=Republican Simplicity.=--Every act of the Jeffersonian party during its

early days of power was in accord with the ideals of government which it

professed. It had opposed all pomp and ceremony, calculated to give

weight and dignity to the chief executive of the nation, as symbols of

monarchy and high prerogative. Appropriately, therefore, Jefferson's

inauguration on March 4, 1801, the first at the new capital at

Washington, was marked by extreme simplicity. In keeping with this

procedure he quit the practice, followed by Washington and Adams, of

reading presidential addresses to Congress in joint assembly and adopted

in its stead the plan of sending his messages in writing--a custom that

was continued unbroken until 1913 when President Wilson returned to the

example set by the first chief magistrate.

=Republican Measures.=--The Republicans had complained of a great

national debt as the source of a dangerous "money power," giving

strength to the federal government; accordingly they began to pay it off

as rapidly as possible. They had held commerce in low esteem and looked

upon a large navy as a mere device to protect it; consequently they

reduced the number of warships. They had objected to excise taxes,

particularly on whisky; these they quickly abolished, to the intense

satisfaction of the farmers. They had protested against the heavy cost

of the federal government; they reduced expenses by discharging hundreds

of men from the army and abolishing many offices.

They had savagely criticized the Sedition law and Jefferson refused to

enforce it. They had been deeply offended by the assault on freedom of

speech and press and they promptly impeached Samuel Chase, a justice of

the Supreme Court, who had been especially severe in his attacks upon

offenders under the Sedition Act. Their failure to convict Justice Chase

by a narrow margin was due to no lack of zeal on their part but to the

Federalist strength in the Senate where the trial was held. They had

regarded the appointment of a large number of federal judges during the

last hours of Adams' administration as an attempt to intrench

Federalists in the judiciary and to enlarge the sphere of the national

government. Accordingly, they at once repealed the act creating the new

judgeships, thus depriving the "midnight appointees" of their posts.

They had considered the federal offices, civil and military, as sources

of great strength to the Federalists and Jefferson, though committed to

the principle that offices should be open to all and distributed

according to merit, was careful to fill most of the vacancies as they

occurred with trusted Republicans. To his credit, however, it must be

said that he did not make wholesale removals to find room for party

workers.

The Republicans thus hewed to the line of their general policy of

restricting the weight, dignity, and activity of the national

government. Yet there were no Republicans, as the Federalists asserted,

prepared to urge serious modifications in the Constitution. "If there be

any among us who wish to dissolve this union or to change its republican

form," wrote Jefferson in his first inaugural, "let them stand

undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may

be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." After reciting the

fortunate circumstances of climate, soil, and isolation which made the

future of America so full of promise, Jefferson concluded: "A wise and

frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another,

shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of

industry and improvement and shall not take from the mouth of labour the

bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government; and this is

necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

In all this the Republicans had not reckoned with destiny. In a few

short years that lay ahead it was their fate to double the territory of

the country, making inevitable a continental nation; to give the

Constitution a generous interpretation that shocked many a Federalist;

to wage war on behalf of American commerce; to reestablish the hated

United States Bank; to enact a high protective tariff; to see their

Federalist opponents in their turn discredited as nullifiers and

provincials; to announce high national doctrines in foreign affairs; and

to behold the Constitution exalted and defended against the pretensions

of states by a son of old Virginia, John Marshall, Chief Justice of the

Supreme Court of the United States.

THE REPUBLICANS AND THE GREAT WEST

=Expansion and Land Hunger.=--The first of the great measures which

drove the Republicans out upon this new national course--the purchase

of the Louisiana territory--was the product of circumstances rather than

of their deliberate choosing. It was not the lack of land for his

cherished farmers that led Jefferson to add such an immense domain to

the original possessions of the United States. In the Northwest

territory, now embracing Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin,

and a portion of Minnesota, settlements were mainly confined to the

north bank of the Ohio River. To the south, in Kentucky and Tennessee,

where there were more than one hundred thousand white people who had

pushed over the mountains from Virginia and the Carolinas, there were

still wide reaches of untilled soil. The Alabama and Mississippi regions

were vast Indian frontiers of the state of Georgia, unsettled and almost

unexplored. Even to the wildest imagination there seemed to be territory

enough to satisfy the land hunger of the American people for a century

to come.

=The Significance of the Mississippi River.=--At all events the East,

then the center of power, saw no good reason for expansion. The planters

of the Carolinas, the manufacturers of Pennsylvania, the importers of

New York, the shipbuilders of New England, looking to the seaboard and

to Europe for trade, refinements, and sometimes their ideas of

government, were slow to appreciate the place of the West in national

economy. The better educated the Easterners were, the less, it seems,

they comprehended the destiny of the nation. Sons of Federalist fathers

at Williams College, after a long debate decided by a vote of fifteen to

one that the purchase of Louisiana was undesirable.

On the other hand, the pioneers of Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee,

unlearned in books, saw with their own eyes the resources of the

wilderness. Many of them had been across the Mississippi and had beheld

the rich lands awaiting the plow of the white man. Down the great river

they floated their wheat, corn, and bacon to ocean-going ships bound for

the ports of the seaboard or for Europe. The land journeys over the

mountain barriers with bulky farm produce, they knew from experience,

were almost impossible, and costly at best. Nails, bolts of cloth, tea,

and coffee could go or come that way, but not corn and bacon. A free

outlet to the sea by the Mississippi was as essential to the pioneers of

the Kentucky region as the harbor of Boston to the merchant princes of

that metropolis.

=Louisiana under Spanish Rule.=--For this reason they watched with deep

solicitude the fortunes of the Spanish king to whom, at the close of the

Seven Years' War, had fallen the Louisiana territory stretching from New

Orleans to the Rocky Mountains. While he controlled the mouth of the

Mississippi there was little to fear, for he had neither the army nor

the navy necessary to resist any invasion of American trade. Moreover,

Washington had been able, by the exercise of great tact, to secure from

Spain in 1795 a trading privilege through New Orleans which satisfied

the present requirements of the frontiersmen even if it did not allay

their fears for the future. So things stood when a swift succession of

events altered the whole situation.

=Louisiana Transferred to France.=--In July, 1802, a royal order from

Spain instructed the officials at New Orleans to close the port to

American produce. About the same time a disturbing rumor, long current,

was confirmed--Napoleon had coerced Spain into returning Louisiana to

France by a secret treaty signed in 1800. "The scalers of the Alps and

conquerors of Venice" now looked across the sea for new scenes of

adventure. The West was ablaze with excitement. A call for war ran

through the frontier; expeditions were organized to prevent the landing

of the French; and petitions for instant action flooded in upon

Jefferson.

=Jefferson Sees the Danger.=--Jefferson, the friend of France and sworn

enemy of England, compelled to choose in the interest of America, never

winced. "The cession of Louisiana and the Floridas by Spain to France,"

he wrote to Livingston, the American minister in Paris, "works sorely on

the United States. It completely reverses all the political relations of

the United States and will form a new epoch in our political course....

There is on the globe one single spot, the possessor of which is our

natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans through which the produce

of three-eighths of our territory must pass to market.... France,

placing herself in that door, assumes to us an attitude of defiance.

Spain might have retained it quietly for years. Her pacific

dispositions, her feeble state would induce her to increase our

facilities there.... Not so can it ever be in the hands of France....

The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence

which is to restrain her forever within her low water mark.... It seals

the union of the two nations who in conjunction can maintain exclusive

possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the

British fleet and nation.... This is not a state of things we seek or

desire. It is one which this measure, if adopted by France, forces on us

as necessarily as any other cause by the laws of nature brings on its

necessary effect."

=Louisiana Purchased.=--Acting on this belief, but apparently seeing

only the Mississippi outlet at stake, Jefferson sent his friend, James

Monroe, to France with the power to buy New Orleans and West Florida.

Before Monroe arrived, the regular minister, Livingston, had already

convinced Napoleon that it would be well to sell territory which might

be wrested from him at any moment by the British sea power, especially

as the war, temporarily stopped by the peace of Amiens, was once more

raging in Europe. Wise as he was in his day, Livingston had at first no

thought of buying the whole Louisiana country. He was simply dazed when

Napoleon offered to sell the entire domain and get rid of the business

altogether. Though staggered by the proposal, he and Monroe decided to

accept. On April 30, they signed the treaty of cession, agreeing to pay

$11,250,000 in six per cent bonds and to discharge certain debts due

French citizens, making in all approximately fifteen millions. Spain

protested, Napoleon's brother fumed, French newspapers objected; but the

deed was done.

=Jefferson and His Constitutional Scruples.=--When the news of this

extraordinary event reached the United States, the people were filled

with astonishment, and no one was more surprised than Jefferson himself.

He had thought of buying New Orleans and West Florida for a small sum,

and now a vast domain had been dumped into the lap of the nation. He was

puzzled. On looking into the Constitution he found not a line

authorizing the purchase of more territory and so he drafted an

amendment declaring "Louisiana, as ceded by France,--a part of the

United States." He had belabored the Federalists for piling up a big

national debt and he could hardly endure the thought of issuing more

bonds himself.

In the midst of his doubts came the news that Napoleon might withdraw

from the bargain. Thoroughly alarmed by that, Jefferson pressed the

Senate for a ratification of the treaty. He still clung to his original

idea that the Constitution did not warrant the purchase; but he lamely

concluded: "If our friends shall think differently, I shall certainly

acquiesce with satisfaction; confident that the good sense of our

country will correct the evil of construction when it shall produce ill

effects." Thus the stanch advocate of "strict interpretation" cut loose

from his own doctrine and intrusted the construction of the Constitution

to "the good sense" of his countrymen.

=The Treaty Ratified.=--This unusual transaction, so favorable to the

West, aroused the ire of the seaboard Federalists. Some denounced it as

unconstitutional, easily forgetting Hamilton's masterly defense of the

bank, also not mentioned in the Constitution. Others urged that, if "the

howling wilderness" ever should be settled, it would turn against the

East, form new commercial connections, and escape from federal control.

Still others protested that the purchase would lead inevitably to the

dominance of a "hotch potch of wild men from the Far West." Federalists,

who thought "the broad back of America" could readily bear Hamilton's

consolidated debt, now went into agonies over a bond issue of less than

one-sixth of that amount. But in vain. Jefferson's party with a high

hand carried the day. The Senate, after hearing the Federalist protest,

ratified the treaty. In December, 1803, the French flag was hauled down

from the old government buildings in New Orleans and the Stars and

Stripes were hoisted as a sign that the land of Coronado, De Soto,

Marquette, and La Salle had passed forever to the United States.

[Illustration: THE UNITED STATES IN 1805]

By a single stroke, the original territory of the United States was more

than doubled. While the boundaries of the purchase were uncertain, it is

safe to say that the Louisiana territory included what is now Arkansas,

Missouri, Iowa, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and large

portions of Louisiana, Minnesota, North Dakota, Colorado, Montana, and

Wyoming. The farm lands that the friends of "a little America" on the

seacoast declared a hopeless wilderness were, within a hundred years,

fully occupied and valued at nearly seven billion dollars--almost five

hundred times the price paid to Napoleon.

=Western Explorations.=--Having taken the fateful step, Jefferson wisely

began to make the most of it. He prepared for the opening of the new

country by sending the Lewis and Clark expedition to explore it,

discover its resources, and lay out an overland route through the

Missouri Valley and across the Great Divide to the Pacific. The story of

this mighty exploit, which began in the spring of 1804 and ended in the

autumn of 1806, was set down with skill and pains in the journal of

Lewis and Clark; when published even in a short form, it invited the

forward-looking men of the East to take thought about the western

empire. At the same time Zebulon Pike, in a series of journeys, explored

the sources of the Mississippi River and penetrated the Spanish

territories of the far Southwest. Thus scouts and pioneers continued the

work of diplomats.

THE REPUBLICAN WAR FOR COMMERCIAL INDEPENDENCE

=The English and French Blockades.=--In addition to bringing Louisiana

to the United States, the reopening of the European War in 1803, after a

short lull, renewed in an acute form the commercial difficulties that

had plagued the country all during the administrations of Washington and

Adams. The Republicans were now plunged into the hornets' nest. The

party whose ardent spirits had burned Jay in effigy, stoned Hamilton for

defending his treaty, jeered Washington's proclamation of neutrality,

and spoken bitterly of "timid traders," could no longer take refuge in

criticism. It had to act.

Its troubles took a serious turn in 1806. England, in a determined

effort to bring France to her knees by starvation, declared the coast of

Europe blockaded from Brest to the mouth of the Elbe River. Napoleon

retaliated by his Berlin Decree of November, 1806, blockading the

British Isles--a measure terrifying to American ship owners whose

vessels were liable to seizure by any French rover, though Napoleon had

no navy to make good his proclamation. Great Britain countered with a

still more irritating decree--the Orders in Council of 1807. It modified

its blockade, but in so doing merely authorized American ships not

carrying munitions of war to complete their voyage to the Continent, on

condition of their stopping at a British port, securing a license, and

paying a tax. This, responded Napoleon, was the height of insolence, and

he denounced it as a gross violation of international law. He then

closed the circle of American troubles by issuing his Milan Decree of

December, 1807. This order declared that any ship which complied with

the British rules would be subject to seizure and confiscation by French

authorities.

=The Impressment of Seamen.=--That was not all. Great Britain, in dire

need of men for her navy, adopted the practice of stopping American

ships, searching them, and carrying away British-born sailors found on

board. British sailors were so badly treated, so cruelly flogged for

trivial causes, and so meanly fed that they fled in crowds to the

American marine. In many cases it was difficult to tell whether seamen

were English or American. They spoke the same language, so that language

was no test. Rovers on the deep and stragglers in the ports of both

countries, they frequently had no papers to show their nativity.

Moreover, Great Britain held to the old rule--"Once an Englishman,

always an Englishman"--a doctrine rejected by the United States in

favor of the principle that a man could choose the nation to which he

would give allegiance. British sea captains, sometimes by mistake, and

often enough with reckless indifference, carried away into servitude in

their own navy genuine American citizens. The process itself, even when

executed with all the civilities of law, was painful enough, for it

meant that American ships were forced to "come to," and compelled to

rest submissively under British guns until the searching party had pried

into records, questioned seamen, seized and handcuffed victims. Saints

could not have done this work without raising angry passions, and only

saints could have endured it with patience and fortitude.

Had the enactment of the scenes been confined to the high seas and

knowledge of them to rumors and newspaper stories, American resentment

might not have been so intense; but many a search and seizure was made

in sight of land. British and French vessels patrolled the coasts,

firing on one another and chasing one another in American waters within

the three-mile limit. When, in the summer of 1807, the American frigate

\_Chesapeake\_ refused to surrender men alleged to be deserters from King

George's navy, the British warship \_Leopard\_ opened fire, killing three

men and wounding eighteen more--an act which even the British ministry

could hardly excuse. If the French were less frequently the offenders,

it was not because of their tenderness about American rights but because

so few of their ships escaped the hawk-eyed British navy to operate in

American waters.

=The Losses in American Commerce.=--This high-handed conduct on the part

of European belligerents was very injurious to American trade. By their

enterprise, American shippers had become the foremost carriers on the

Atlantic Ocean. In a decade they had doubled the tonnage of American

merchant ships under the American flag, taking the place of the French

marine when Britain swept that from the seas, and supplying Britain with

the sinews of war for the contest with the Napoleonic empire. The

American shipping engaged in foreign trade embraced 363,110 tons in

1791; 669,921 tons in 1800; and almost 1,000,000 tons in 1810. Such was

the enterprise attacked by the British and French decrees. American

ships bound for Great Britain were liable to be captured by French

privateers which, in spite of the disasters of the Nile and Trafalgar,

ranged the seas. American ships destined for the Continent, if they

failed to stop at British ports and pay tribute, were in great danger of

capture by the sleepless British navy and its swarm of auxiliaries.

American sea captains who, in fear of British vengeance, heeded the

Orders in Council and paid the tax were almost certain to fall a prey to

French vengeance, for the French were vigorous in executing the Milan

Decree.

=Jefferson's Policy.=--The President's dilemma was distressing. Both the

belligerents in Europe were guilty of depredations on American commerce.

War on both of them was out of the question. War on France was

impossible because she had no territory on this side of the water which

could be reached by American troops and her naval forces had been

shattered at the battles of the Nile and Trafalgar. War on Great

Britain, a power which Jefferson's followers feared and distrusted, was

possible but not inviting. Jefferson shrank from it. A man of peace, he

disliked war's brazen clamor; a man of kindly spirit, he was startled at

the death and destruction which it brought in its train. So for the

eight years Jefferson steered an even course, suggesting measure after

measure with a view to avoiding bloodshed. He sent, it is true,

Commodore Preble in 1803 to punish Mediterranean pirates preying upon

American commerce; but a great war he evaded with passionate

earnestness, trying in its place every other expedient to protect

American rights.

=The Embargo and Non-intercourse Acts.=--In 1806, Congress passed and

Jefferson approved a non-importation act closing American ports to

certain products from British dominions--a measure intended as a club

over the British government's head. This law, failing in its purpose,

Jefferson proposed and Congress adopted in December, 1807, the Embargo

Act forbidding all vessels to leave American harbors for foreign ports.

France and England were to be brought to terms by cutting off their

supplies.

The result of the embargo was pathetic. England and France refused to

give up search and seizure. American ship owners who, lured by huge

profits, had formerly been willing to take the risk were now restrained

by law to their home ports. Every section suffered. The South and West

found their markets for cotton, rice, tobacco, corn, and bacon

curtailed. Thus they learned by bitter experience the national

significance of commerce. Ship masters, ship builders, longshoremen, and

sailors were thrown out of employment while the prices of foreign goods

doubled. Those who obeyed the law were ruined; violators of the law

smuggled goods into Canada and Florida for shipment abroad.

Jefferson's friends accepted the medicine with a wry face as the only

alternative to supine submission or open war. His opponents, without

offering any solution of their own, denounced it as a contemptible plan

that brought neither relief nor honor. Beset by the clamor that arose on

all sides, Congress, in the closing days of Jefferson's administration,

repealed the Embargo law and substituted a Non-intercourse act

forbidding trade with England and France while permitting it with other

countries--a measure equally futile in staying the depredations on

American shipping.

=Jefferson Retires in Favor of Madison.=--Jefferson, exhausted by

endless wrangling and wounded, as Washington had been, by savage

criticism, welcomed March 4, 1809. His friends urged him to "stay by the

ship" and accept a third term. He declined, saying that election for

life might result from repeated reelection. In following Washington's

course and defending it on principle, he set an example to all his

successors, making the "third term doctrine" a part of American

unwritten law.

His intimate friend, James Madison, to whom he turned over the burdens

of his high office was, like himself, a man of peace. Madison had been a

leader since the days of the Revolution, but in legislative halls and

council chambers, not on the field of battle. Small in stature,

sensitive in feelings, studious in habits, he was no man for the rough

and tumble of practical politics. He had taken a prominent and

distinguished part in the framing and the adoption of the Constitution.

He had served in the first Congress as a friend of Hamilton's measures.

Later he attached himself to Jefferson's fortunes and served for eight

years as his first counselor, the Secretary of State. The principles of

the Constitution, which he had helped to make and interpret, he was now

as President called upon to apply in one of the most perplexing moments

in all American history. In keeping with his own traditions and

following in the footsteps of Jefferson, he vainly tried to solve the

foreign problem by negotiation.

=The Trend of Events.=--Whatever difficulties Madison had in making up

his mind on war and peace were settled by events beyond his own control.

In the spring of 1811, a British frigate held up an American ship near

the harbor of New York and impressed a seaman alleged to be an American

citizen. Burning with resentment, the captain of the \_President\_, an

American warship, acting under orders, poured several broadsides into

the \_Little Belt\_, a British sloop, suspected of being the guilty party.

The British also encouraged the Indian chief Tecumseh, who welded

together the Indians of the Northwest under British protection and gave

signs of restlessness presaging a revolt. This sent a note of alarm

along the frontier that was not checked even when, in November,

Tecumseh's men were badly beaten at Tippecanoe by William Henry

Harrison. The Indians stood in the way of the advancing frontier, and it

seemed to the pioneers that, without support from the British in Canada,

the Red Men would soon be subdued.

=Clay and Calhoun.=--While events were moving swiftly and rumors were

flying thick and fast, the mastery of the government passed from the

uncertain hands of Madison to a party of ardent young men in Congress,

dubbed "Young Republicans," under the leadership of two members destined

to be mighty figures in American history: Henry Clay of Kentucky and

John C. Calhoun of South Carolina. The former contended, in a flair of

folly, that "the militia of Kentucky alone are competent to place

Montreal and Upper Canada at your feet." The latter with a light heart

spoke of conquering Canada in a four weeks' campaign. "It must not be

inferred," says Channing, "that in advocating conquest, the Westerners

were actuated merely by desire for land; they welcomed war because they

thought it would be the easiest way to abate Indian troubles. The

savages were supported by the fur-trading interests that centred at

Quebec and London.... The Southerners on their part wished for Florida

and they thought that the conquest of Canada would obviate some Northern

opposition to this acquisition of slave territory." While Clay and

Calhoun, spokesmen of the West and South, were not unmindful of what

Napoleon had done to American commerce, they knew that their followers

still remembered with deep gratitude the aid of the French in the war

for independence and that the embers of the old hatred for George III,

still on the throne, could be readily blown into flame.

=Madison Accepts War as Inevitable.=--The conduct of the British

ministers with whom Madison had to deal did little to encourage him in

adhering to the policy of "watchful waiting." One of them, a high Tory,

believed that all Americans were alike "except that a few are less

knaves than others" and his methods were colored by his belief. On the

recall of this minister the British government selected another no less

high and mighty in his principles and opinions. So Madison became

thoroughly discouraged about the outcome of pacific measures. When the

pressure from Congress upon him became too heavy, he gave way, signing

on June 18, 1812, the declaration of war on Great Britain. In

proclaiming hostilities, the administration set forth the causes which

justified the declaration; namely, the British had been encouraging the

Indians to attack American citizens on the frontier; they had ruined

American trade by blockades; they had insulted the American flag by

stopping and searching our ships; they had illegally seized American

sailors and driven them into the British navy.

=The Course of the War.=--The war lasted for nearly three years without

bringing victory to either side. The surrender of Detroit by General

Hull to the British and the failure of the American invasion of Canada

were offset by Perry's victory on Lake Erie and a decisive blow

administered to British designs for an invasion of New York by way of

Plattsburgh. The triumph of Jackson at New Orleans helped to atone for

the humiliation suffered in the burning of the Capitol by the British.

The stirring deeds of the \_Constitution\_, the \_United States\_, and the

\_Argus\_ on the seas, the heroic death of Lawrence and the victories of a

hundred privateers furnished consolation for those who suffered from the

iron blockade finally established by the British government when it came

to appreciate the gravity of the situation. While men love the annals of

the sea, they will turn to the running battles, the narrow escapes, and

the reckless daring of American sailors in that naval contest with Great

Britain.

All this was exciting but it was inconclusive. In fact, never was a

government less prepared than was that of the United States in 1812. It

had neither the disciplined troops, the ships of war, nor the supplies

required by the magnitude of the military task. It was fortune that

favored the American cause. Great Britain, harassed, worn, and

financially embarrassed by nearly twenty years of fighting in Europe,

was in no mood to gather her forces for a titanic effort in America even

after Napoleon was overthrown and sent into exile at Elba in the spring

of 1814. War clouds still hung on the European horizon and the conflict

temporarily halted did again break out. To be rid of American anxieties

and free for European eventualities, England was ready to settle with

the United States, especially as that could be done without conceding

anything or surrendering any claims.

=The Treaty of Peace.=--Both countries were in truth sick of a war that

offered neither glory nor profit. Having indulged in the usual

diplomatic skirmishing, they sent representatives to Ghent to discuss

terms of peace. After long negotiations an agreement was reached on

Christmas eve, 1814, a few days before Jackson's victory at New Orleans.

When the treaty reached America the people were surprised to find that

it said nothing about the seizure of American sailors, the destruction

of American trade, the searching of American ships, or the support of

Indians on the frontier. Nevertheless, we are told, the people "passed

from gloom to glory" when the news of peace arrived. The bells were

rung; schools were closed; flags were displayed; and many a rousing

toast was drunk in tavern and private home. The rejoicing could

continue. With Napoleon definitely beaten at Waterloo in June, 1815,

Great Britain had no need to impress sailors, search ships, and

confiscate American goods bound to the Continent. Once more the terrible

sea power sank into the background and the ocean was again white with

the sails of merchantmen.

THE REPUBLICANS NATIONALIZED

=The Federalists Discredited.=--By a strange turn of fortune's wheel,

the party of Hamilton, Washington, Adams, the party of the grand nation,

became the party of provincialism and nullification. New England,

finding its shipping interests crippled in the European conflict and

then penalized by embargoes, opposed the declaration of war on Great

Britain, which meant the completion of the ruin already begun. In the

course of the struggle, the Federalist leaders came perilously near to

treason in their efforts to hamper the government of the United States;

and in their desperation they fell back upon the doctrine of

nullification so recently condemned by them when it came from Kentucky.

The Senate of Massachusetts, while the war was in progress, resolved

that it was waged "without justifiable cause," and refused to approve

military and naval projects not connected with "the defense of our

seacoast and soil." A Boston newspaper declared that the union was

nothing but a treaty among sovereign states, that states could decide

for themselves the question of obeying federal law, and that armed

resistance under the banner of a state would not be rebellion or

treason. The general assembly of Connecticut reminded the administration

at Washington that "the state of Connecticut is a free, sovereign, and

independent state." Gouverneur Morris, a member of the convention which

had drafted the Constitution, suggested the holding of another

conference to consider whether the Northern states should remain in the

union.

[Illustration: \_From an old cartoon\_
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In October, 1814, a convention of delegates from Connecticut,

Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and certain counties of New Hampshire and

Vermont was held at Hartford, on the call of Massachusetts. The counsels

of the extremists were rejected but the convention solemnly went on

record to the effect that acts of Congress in violation of the

Constitution are void; that in cases of deliberate, dangerous, and

palpable infractions the state is duty bound to interpose its authority

for the protection of its citizens; and that when emergencies occur the

states must be their own judges and execute their own decisions. Thus

New England answered the challenge of Calhoun and Clay. Fortunately its

actions were not as rash as its words. The Hartford convention merely

proposed certain amendments to the Constitution and adjourned. At the

close of the war, its proposals vanished harmlessly; but the men who

made them were hopelessly discredited.

=The Second United States Bank.=--In driving the Federalists towards

nullification and waging a national war themselves, the Republicans lost

all their old taint of provincialism. Moreover, in turning to measures

of reconstruction called forth by the war, they resorted to the national

devices of the Federalists. In 1816, they chartered for a period of

twenty years a second United States Bank--the institution which

Jefferson and Madison once had condemned as unsound and

unconstitutional. The Constitution remained unchanged; times and

circumstances had changed. Calhoun dismissed the vexed question of

constitutionality with a scant reference to an ancient dispute, while

Madison set aside his scruples and signed the bill.

=The Protective Tariff of 1816.=--The Republicans supplemented the Bank

by another Federalist measure--a high protective tariff. Clay viewed it

as the beginning of his "American system" of protection. Calhoun

defended it on national principles. For this sudden reversal of policy

the young Republicans were taunted by some of their older party

colleagues with betraying the "agricultural interest" that Jefferson had

fostered; but Calhoun refused to listen to their criticisms. "When the

seas are open," he said, "the produce of the South may pour anywhere

into the markets of the Old World.... What are the effects of a war with

a maritime power--with England? Our commerce annihilated ... our

agriculture cut off from its accustomed markets, the surplus of the

farmer perishes on his hands.... The recent war fell with peculiar

pressure on the growers of cotton and tobacco and the other great

staples of the country; and the same state of things will recur in the

event of another war unless prevented by the foresight of this body....

When our manufactures are grown to a certain perfection, as they soon

will be under the fostering care of the government, we shall no longer

experience these evils." With the Republicans nationalized, the

Federalist party, as an organization, disappeared after a crushing

defeat in the presidential campaign of 1816.

=Monroe and the Florida Purchase.=--To the victor in that political

contest, James Monroe of Virginia, fell two tasks of national

importance, adding to the prestige of the whole country and deepening

the sense of patriotism that weaned men away from mere allegiance to

states. The first of these was the purchase of Florida from Spain. The

acquisition of Louisiana let the Mississippi flow "unvexed to the sea";

but it left all the states east of the river cut off from the Gulf,

affording them ground for discontent akin to that which had moved the

pioneers of Kentucky to action a generation earlier. The uncertainty as

to the boundaries of Louisiana gave the United States a claim to West

Florida, setting on foot a movement for occupation. The Florida swamps

were a basis for Indian marauders who periodically swept into the

frontier settlements, and hiding places for runaway slaves. Thus the

sanction of international law was given to punitive expeditions into

alien territory.

The pioneer leaders stood waiting for the signal. It came. President

Monroe, on the occasion of an Indian outbreak, ordered General Jackson

to seize the offenders, in the Floridas, if necessary. The high-spirited

warrior, taking this as a hint that he was to occupy the coveted region,

replied that, if possession was the object of the invasion, he could

occupy the Floridas within sixty days. Without waiting for an answer to

this letter, he launched his expedition, and in the spring of 1818 was

master of the Spanish king's domain to the south.

There was nothing for the king to do but to make the best of the

inevitable by ceding the Floridas to the United States in return for

five million dollars to be paid to American citizens having claims

against Spain. On Washington's birthday, 1819, the treaty was signed. It

ceded the Floridas to the United States and defined the boundary between

Mexico and the United States by drawing a line from the mouth of the

Sabine River in a northwesterly direction to the Pacific. On this

occasion even Monroe, former opponent of the Constitution, forgot to

inquire whether new territory could be constitutionally acquired and

incorporated into the American union. The Republicans seemed far away

from the days of "strict construction." And Jefferson still lived!

=The Monroe Doctrine.=--Even more effective in fashioning the national

idea was Monroe's enunciation of the famous doctrine that bears his

name. The occasion was another European crisis. During the Napoleonic

upheaval and the years of dissolution that ensued, the Spanish colonies

in America, following the example set by their English neighbors in

1776, declared their independence. Unable to conquer them alone, the

king of Spain turned for help to the friendly powers of Europe that

looked upon revolution and republics with undisguised horror.

\_The Holy Alliance.\_--He found them prepared to view his case with

sympathy. Three of them, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, under the

leadership of the Czar, Alexander I, in the autumn of 1815, had entered

into a Holy Alliance to sustain by reciprocal service the autocratic

principle in government. Although the effusive, almost maudlin, language

of the treaty did not express their purpose explicitly, the Alliance was

later regarded as a mere union of monarchs to prevent the rise and

growth of popular government.

The American people thought their worst fears confirmed when, in 1822, a

conference of delegates from Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France met at

Verona to consider, among other things, revolutions that had just broken

out in Spain and Italy. The spirit of the conference is reflected in the

first article of the agreement reached by the delegates: "The high

contracting powers, being convinced that the system of representative

government is equally incompatible with the monarchical principle and

the maxim of the sovereignty of the people with the divine right,

mutually engage in the most solemn manner to use all their efforts to

put an end to the system of representative government in whatever

country it may exist in Europe and to prevent its being introduced in

those countries where it is not yet known." The Czar, who incidentally

coveted the west coast of North America, proposed to send an army to aid

the king of Spain in his troubles at home, thus preparing the way for

intervention in Spanish America. It was material weakness not want of

spirit, that prevented the grand union of monarchs from making open war

on popular government.

\_The Position of England.\_--Unfortunately, too, for the Holy Alliance,

England refused to cooperate. English merchants had built up a large

trade with the independent Latin-American colonies and they protested

against the restoration of Spanish sovereignty, which meant a renewal of

Spain's former trade monopoly. Moreover, divine right doctrines had been

laid to rest in England and the representative principle thoroughly

established. Already there were signs of the coming democratic flood

which was soon to carry the first reform bill of 1832, extending the

suffrage, and sweep on to even greater achievements. British statesmen,

therefore, had to be cautious. In such circumstances, instead of

cooperating with the autocrats of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, they

turned to the minister of the United States in London. The British prime

minister, Canning, proposed that the two countries join in declaring

their unwillingness to see the Spanish colonies transferred to any other

power.

\_Jefferson's Advice.\_--The proposal was rejected; but President Monroe

took up the suggestion with Madison and Jefferson as well as with his

Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams. They favored the plan. Jefferson

said: "One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit [of

freedom]; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By

acceding to her proposition we detach her from the bands, bring her

mighty weight into the scale of free government and emancipate a

continent at one stroke.... With her on our side we need not fear the

whole world. With her then we should most sedulously cherish a cordial

friendship."

\_Monroe's Statement of the Doctrine.\_--Acting on the advice of trusted

friends, President Monroe embodied in his message to Congress, on

December 2, 1823, a statement of principles now famous throughout the

world as the Monroe Doctrine. To the autocrats of Europe he announced

that he would regard "any attempt on their part to extend their system

to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

While he did not propose to interfere with existing colonies dependent

on European powers, he ranged himself squarely on the side of those that

had declared their independence. Any attempt by a European power to

oppress them or control their destiny in any manner he characterized as

"a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Referring in another part of his message to a recent claim which the

Czar had made to the Pacific coast, President Monroe warned the Old

World that "the American continents, by the free and independent

condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to

be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European

powers." The effect of this declaration was immediate and profound. Men

whose political horizon had been limited to a community or state were

led to consider their nation as a great power among the sovereignties of

the earth, taking its part in shaping their international relations.

=The Missouri Compromise.=--Respecting one other important measure of

this period, the Republicans also took a broad view of their obligations

under the Constitution; namely, the Missouri Compromise. It is true,

they insisted on the admission of Missouri as a slave state, balanced

against the free state of Maine; but at the same time they assented to

the prohibition of slavery in the Louisiana territory north of the line

36 o 30'. During the debate on the subject an extreme view had been

presented, to the effect that Congress had no constitutional warrant for

abolishing slavery in the territories. The precedent of the Northwest

Ordinance, ratified by Congress in 1789, seemed a conclusive answer from

practice to this contention; but Monroe submitted the issue to his

cabinet, which included Calhoun of South Carolina, Crawford of Georgia,

and Wirt of Virginia, all presumably adherents to the Jeffersonian

principle of strict construction. He received in reply a unanimous

verdict to the effect that Congress did have the power to prohibit

slavery in the territories governed by it. Acting on this advice he

approved, on March 6, 1820, the bill establishing freedom north of the

compromise line. This generous interpretation of the powers of Congress

stood for nearly forty years, until repudiated by the Supreme Court in

the Dred Scott case.

THE NATIONAL DECISIONS OF CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL

=John Marshall, the Nationalist.=--The Republicans in the lower ranges

of state politics, who did not catch the grand national style of their

leaders charged with responsibilities in the national field, were

assisted in their education by a Federalist from the Old Dominion, John

Marshall, who, as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United

States from 1801 to 1835, lost no occasion to exalt the Constitution

above the claims of the provinces. No differences of opinion as to his

political views have ever led even his warmest opponents to deny his

superb abilities or his sincere devotion to the national idea. All will

likewise agree that for talents, native and acquired, he was an ornament

to the humble democracy that brought him forth. His whole career was

American. Born on the frontier of Virginia, reared in a log cabin,

granted only the barest rudiments of education, inured to hardship and

rough life, he rose by masterly efforts to the highest judicial honor

America can bestow.

On him the bitter experience of the Revolution and of later days made a

lasting impression. He was no "summer patriot." He had been a soldier in

the Revolutionary army. He had suffered with Washington at Valley Forge.

He had seen his comrades in arms starving and freezing because the

Continental Congress had neither the power nor the inclination to force

the states to do their full duty. To him the Articles of Confederation

were the symbol of futility. Into the struggle for the formation of the

Constitution and its ratification in Virginia he had thrown himself with

the ardor of a soldier. Later, as a member of Congress, a representative

to France, and Secretary of State, he had aided the Federalists in

establishing the new government. When at length they were driven from

power in the executive and legislative branches of the government, he

was chosen for their last stronghold, the Supreme Court. By historic

irony he administered the oath of office to his bitterest enemy, Thomas

Jefferson; and, long after the author of the Declaration of Independence

had retired to private life, the stern Chief Justice continued to

announce the old Federalist principles from the Supreme Bench.

[Illustration: JOHN MARSHALL]

=Marbury \_vs.\_ Madison--An Act of Congress Annulled.=--He had been in

his high office only two years when he laid down for the first time in

the name of the entire Court the doctrine that the judges have the power

to declare an act of Congress null and void when in their opinion it

violates the Constitution. This power was not expressly conferred on the

Court. Though many able men held that the judicial branch of the

government enjoyed it, the principle was not positively established

until 1803 when the case of Marbury \_vs.\_ Madison was decided. In

rendering the opinion of the Court, Marshall cited no precedents. He

sought no foundations for his argument in ancient history. He rested it

on the general nature of the American system. The Constitution, ran his

reasoning, is the supreme law of the land; it limits and binds all who

act in the name of the United States; it limits the powers of Congress

and defines the rights of citizens. If Congress can ignore its

limitations and trespass upon the rights of citizens, Marshall argued,

then the Constitution disappears and Congress is supreme. Since,

however, the Constitution is supreme and superior to Congress, it is the

duty of judges, under their oath of office, to sustain it against

measures which violate it. Therefore, from the nature of the American

constitutional system the courts must declare null and void all acts

which are not authorized. "A law repugnant to the Constitution," he

closed, "is void and the courts as well as other departments are bound

by that instrument." From that day to this the practice of federal and

state courts in passing upon the constitutionality of laws has remained

unshaken.

This doctrine was received by Jefferson and many of his followers with

consternation. If the idea was sound, he exclaimed, "then indeed is our

Constitution a complete \_felo de se\_ [legally, a suicide]. For,

intending to establish three departments, coordinate and independent

that they might check and balance one another, it has given, according

to this opinion, to one of them alone the right to prescribe rules for

the government of the others, and to that one, too, which is unelected

by and independent of the nation.... The Constitution, on this

hypothesis, is a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary which

they may twist and shape into any form they please. It should be

remembered, as an axiom of eternal truth in politics, that whatever

power in any government is independent, is absolute also.... A judiciary

independent of a king or executive alone is a good thing; but

independence of the will of the nation is a solecism, at least in a

republican government." But Marshall was mighty and his view prevailed,

though from time to time other men, clinging to Jefferson's opinion,

likewise opposed the exercise by the Courts of the high power of passing

upon the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

=Acts of State Legislatures Declared Unconstitutional.=--Had Marshall

stopped with annulling an act of Congress, he would have heard less

criticism from Republican quarters; but, with the same firmness, he set

aside acts of state legislatures as well, whenever, in his opinion, they

violated the federal Constitution. In 1810, in the case of Fletcher

\_vs.\_ Peck, he annulled an act of the Georgia legislature, informing the

state that it was not sovereign, but "a part of a large empire, ... a

member of the American union; and that union has a constitution ...

which imposes limits to the legislatures of the several states." In the

case of McCulloch \_vs.\_ Maryland, decided in 1819, he declared void an

act of the Maryland legislature designed to paralyze the branches of the

United States Bank established in that state. In the same year, in the

still more memorable Dartmouth College case, he annulled an act of the

New Hampshire legislature which infringed upon the charter received by

the college from King George long before. That charter, he declared, was

a contract between the state and the college, which the legislature

under the federal Constitution could not impair. Two years later he

stirred the wrath of Virginia by summoning her to the bar of the Supreme

Court to answer in a case in which the validity of one of her laws was

involved and then justified his action in a powerful opinion rendered in

the case of Cohens \_vs.\_ Virginia.

All these decisions aroused the legislatures of the states. They passed

sheaves of resolutions protesting and condemning; but Marshall never

turned and never stayed. The Constitution of the United States, he

fairly thundered at them, is the supreme law of the land; the Supreme

Court is the proper tribunal to pass finally upon the validity of the

laws of the states; and "those sovereignties," far from possessing the

right of review and nullification, are irrevocably bound by the

decisions of that Court. This was strong medicine for the authors of the

Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and for the members of the Hartford

convention; but they had to take it.

=The Doctrine of Implied Powers.=--While restraining Congress in the

Marbury case and the state legislatures in a score of cases, Marshall

also laid the judicial foundation for a broad and liberal view of the

Constitution as opposed to narrow and strict construction. In McCulloch

\_vs.\_ Maryland, he construed generously the words "necessary and proper"

in such a way as to confer upon Congress a wide range of "implied

powers" in addition to their express powers. That case involved, among

other things, the question whether the act establishing the second

United States Bank was authorized by the Constitution. Marshall answered

in the affirmative. Congress, ran his reasoning, has large powers over

taxation and the currency; a bank is of appropriate use in the exercise

of these enumerated powers; and therefore, though not absolutely

necessary, a bank is entirely proper and constitutional. "With respect

to the means by which the powers that the Constitution confers are to be

carried into execution," he said, Congress must be allowed the

discretion which "will enable that body to perform the high duties

assigned to it, in the manner most beneficial to the people." In short,

the Constitution of the United States is not a strait jacket but a

flexible instrument vesting in Congress the powers necessary to meet

national problems as they arise. In delivering this opinion Marshall

used language almost identical with that employed by Lincoln when,

standing on the battle field of a war waged to preserve the nation, he

said that "a government of the people, by the people, for the people

shall not perish from the earth."

SUMMARY OF THE UNION AND NATIONAL POLITICS

During the strenuous period between the establishment of American

independence and the advent of Jacksonian democracy the great American

experiment was under the direction of the men who had launched it. All

the Presidents in that period, except John Quincy Adams, had taken part

in the Revolution. James Madison, the chief author of the Constitution,

lived until 1836. This age, therefore, was the "age of the fathers." It

saw the threatened ruin of the country under the Articles of

Confederation, the formation of the Constitution, the rise of political

parties, the growth of the West, the second war with England, and the

apparent triumph of the national spirit over sectionalism.

The new republic had hardly been started in 1783 before its troubles

began. The government could not raise money to pay its debts or running

expenses; it could not protect American commerce and manufactures

against European competition; it could not stop the continual issues of

paper money by the states; it could not intervene to put down domestic

uprisings that threatened the existence of the state governments.

Without money, without an army, without courts of law, the union under

the Articles of Confederation was drifting into dissolution. Patriots,

who had risked their lives for independence, began to talk of monarchy

again. Washington, Hamilton, and Madison insisted that a new

constitution alone could save America from disaster.

By dint of much labor the friends of a new form of government induced

the Congress to call a national convention to take into account the

state of America. In May, 1787, it assembled at Philadelphia and for

months it debated and wrangled over plans for a constitution. The small

states clamored for equal rights in the union. The large states vowed

that they would never grant it. A spirit of conciliation, fair play, and

compromise saved the convention from breaking up. In addition, there

were jealousies between the planting states and the commercial states.

Here, too, compromises had to be worked out. Some of the delegates

feared the growth of democracy and others cherished it. These factions

also had to be placated. At last a plan of government was drafted--the

Constitution of the United States--and submitted to the states for

approval. Only after a long and acrimonious debate did enough states

ratify the instrument to put it into effect. On April 30, 1789, George

Washington was inaugurated first President.

The new government proceeded to fund the old debt of the nation, assume

the debts of the states, found a national bank, lay heavy taxes to pay

the bills, and enact laws protecting American industry and commerce.

Hamilton led the way, but he had not gone far before he encountered

opposition. He found a formidable antagonist in Jefferson. In time two

political parties appeared full armed upon the scene: the Federalists

and the Republicans. For ten years they filled the country with

political debate. In 1800 the Federalists were utterly vanquished by the

Republicans with Jefferson in the lead.

By their proclamations of faith the Republicans favored the states

rather than the new national government, but in practice they added

immensely to the prestige and power of the nation. They purchased

Louisiana from France, they waged a war for commercial independence

against England, they created a second United States Bank, they enacted

the protective tariff of 1816, they declared that Congress had power to

abolish slavery north of the Missouri Compromise line, and they spread

the shield of the Monroe Doctrine between the Western Hemisphere and

Europe.

Still America was a part of European civilization. Currents of opinion

flowed to and fro across the Atlantic. Friends of popular government in

Europe looked to America as the great exemplar of their ideals. Events

in Europe reacted upon thought in the United States. The French

Revolution exerted a profound influence on the course of political

debate. While it was in the stage of mere reform all Americans favored

it. When the king was executed and a radical democracy set up, American

opinion was divided. When France fell under the military dominion of

Napoleon and preyed upon American commerce, the United States made ready

for war.

The conduct of England likewise affected American affairs. In 1793 war

broke out between England and France and raged with only a slight

intermission until 1815. England and France both ravaged American

commerce, but England was the more serious offender because she had

command of the seas. Though Jefferson and Madison strove for peace, the

country was swept into war by the vehemence of the "Young Republicans,"

headed by Clay and Calhoun.

When the armed conflict was closed, one in diplomacy opened. The

autocratic powers of Europe threatened to intervene on behalf of Spain

in her attempt to recover possession of her Latin-American colonies.

Their challenge to America brought forth the Monroe Doctrine. The powers

of Europe were warned not to interfere with the independence or the

republican policies of this hemisphere or to attempt any new

colonization in it. It seemed that nationalism was to have a peaceful

triumph over sectionalism.
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=Questions=

1. What was the leading feature of Jefferson's political theory?

2. Enumerate the chief measures of his administration.

3. Were the Jeffersonians able to apply their theories? Give the

reasons.

4. Explain the importance of the Mississippi River to Western farmers.

5. Show how events in Europe forced the Louisiana Purchase.

6. State the constitutional question involved in the Louisiana Purchase.

7. Show how American trade was affected by the European war.

8. Compare the policies of Jefferson and Madison.

9. Why did the United States become involved with England rather than

with France?

10. Contrast the causes of the War of 1812 with the results.

11. Give the economic reasons for the attitude of New England.

12. Give five "nationalist" measures of the Republicans. Discuss each in

detail.

13. Sketch the career of John Marshall.

14. Discuss the case of Marbury \_vs.\_ Madison.

15. Summarize Marshall's views on: (\_a\_) states' rights; and (\_b\_) a

liberal interpretation of the Constitution.
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PART IV. THE WEST AND JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY

CHAPTER X

THE FARMERS BEYOND THE APPALACHIANS

The nationalism of Hamilton was undemocratic. The democracy of Jefferson

was, in the beginning, provincial. The historic mission of uniting

nationalism and democracy was in the course of time given to new leaders

from a region beyond the mountains, peopled by men and women from all

sections and free from those state traditions which ran back to the

early days of colonization. The voice of the democratic nationalism

nourished in the West was heard when Clay of Kentucky advocated his

American system of protection for industries; when Jackson of Tennessee

condemned nullification in a ringing proclamation that has taken its

place among the great American state papers; and when Lincoln of

Illinois, in a fateful hour, called upon a bewildered people to meet the

supreme test whether this was a nation destined to survive or to perish.

And it will be remembered that Lincoln's party chose for its banner that

earlier device--Republican--which Jefferson had made a sign of power.

The "rail splitter" from Illinois united the nationalism of Hamilton

with the democracy of Jefferson, and his appeal was clothed in the

simple language of the people, not in the sonorous rhetoric which

Webster learned in the schools.

PREPARATION FOR WESTERN SETTLEMENT

=The West and the American Revolution.=--The excessive attention devoted

by historians to the military operations along the coast has obscured

the role played by the frontier in the American Revolution. The action

of Great Britain in closing western land to easy settlement in 1763 was

more than an incident in precipitating the war for independence.

Americans on the frontier did not forget it; when Indians were employed

by England to defend that land, zeal for the patriot cause set the

interior aflame. It was the members of the western vanguard, like Daniel

Boone, John Sevier, and George Rogers Clark, who first understood the

value of the far-away country under the guns of the English forts, where

the Red Men still wielded the tomahawk and the scalping knife. It was

they who gave the East no rest until their vision was seen by the

leaders on the seaboard who directed the course of national policy. It

was one of their number, a seasoned Indian fighter, George Rogers Clark,

who with aid from Virginia seized Kaskaskia and Vincennes and secured

the whole Northwest to the union while the fate of Washington's army was

still hanging in the balance.

=Western Problems at the End of the Revolution.=--The treaty of peace,

signed with Great Britain in 1783, brought the definite cession of the

coveted territory west to the Mississippi River, but it left unsolved

many problems. In the first place, tribes of resentful Indians in the

Ohio region, even though British support was withdrawn at last, had to

be reckoned with; and it was not until after the establishment of the

federal Constitution that a well-equipped army could be provided to

guarantee peace on the border. In the second place, British garrisons

still occupied forts on Lake Erie pending the execution of the terms of

the treaty of 1783--terms which were not fulfilled until after the

ratification of the Jay treaty twelve years later. In the third place,

Virginia, Connecticut, and Massachusetts had conflicting claims to the

land in the Northwest based on old English charters and Indian treaties.

It was only after a bitter contest that the states reached an agreement

to transfer their rights to the government of the United States,

Virginia executing her deed of cession on March 1, 1784. In the fourth

place, titles to lands bought by individuals remained uncertain in the

absence of official maps and records. To meet this last situation,

Congress instituted a systematic survey of the Ohio country, laying it

out into townships, sections of 640 acres each, and quarter sections. In

every township one section of land was set aside for the support of

public schools.

=The Northwest Ordinance.=--The final problem which had to be solved

before settlement on a large scale could be begun was that of governing

the territory. Pioneers who looked with hungry eyes on the fertile

valley of the Ohio could hardly restrain their impatience. Soldiers of

the Revolution, who had been paid for their services in land warrants

entitling them to make entries in the West, called for action.

Congress answered by passing in 1787 the famous Northwest Ordinance

providing for temporary territorial government to be followed by the

creation of a popular assembly as soon as there were five thousand free

males in any district. Eventual admission to the union on an equal

footing with the original states was promised to the new territories.

Religious freedom was guaranteed. The safeguards of trial by jury,

regular judicial procedure, and \_habeas corpus\_ were established, in order

that the methods of civilized life might take the place of the

rough-and-ready justice of lynch law. During the course of the debate on

the Ordinance, Congress added the sixth article forbidding slavery and

involuntary servitude.

This Charter of the Northwest, so well planned by the Congress under the

Articles of Confederation, was continued in force by the first Congress

under the Constitution in 1789. The following year its essential

provisions, except the ban on slavery, were applied to the territory

south of the Ohio, ceded by North Carolina to the national government,

and in 1798 to the Mississippi territory, once held by Georgia. Thus it

was settled for all time that "the new colonies were not to be exploited

for the benefit of the parent states (any more than for the benefit of

England) but were to be autonomous and coordinate commonwealths." This

outcome, bitterly opposed by some Eastern leaders who feared the triumph

of Western states over the seaboard, completed the legal steps necessary

by way of preparation for the flood of settlers.

=The Land Companies, Speculators, and Western Land Tenure.=--As in the

original settlement of America, so in the opening of the West, great

companies and single proprietors of large grants early figured. In 1787

the Ohio Land Company, a New England concern, acquired a million and a

half acres on the Ohio and began operations by planting the town of

Marietta. A professional land speculator, J.C. Symmes, secured a million

acres lower down where the city of Cincinnati was founded. Other

individuals bought up soldiers' claims and so acquired enormous holdings

for speculative purposes. Indeed, there was such a rush to make fortunes

quickly through the rise in land values that Washington was moved to cry

out against the "rage for speculating in and forestalling of land on the

North West of the Ohio," protesting that "scarce a valuable spot within

any tolerable distance of it is left without a claimant." He therefore

urged Congress to fix a reasonable price for the land, not "too

exorbitant and burdensome for real occupiers, but high enough to

discourage monopolizers."

Congress, however, was not prepared to use the public domain for the

sole purpose of developing a body of small freeholders in the West. It

still looked upon the sale of public lands as an important source of

revenue with which to pay off the public debt; consequently it thought

more of instant income than of ultimate results. It placed no limit on

the amount which could be bought when it fixed the price at $2 an acre

in 1796, and it encouraged the professional land operator by making the

first installment only twenty cents an acre in addition to the small

registration and survey fee. On such terms a speculator with a few

thousand dollars could get possession of an enormous plot of land. If he

was fortunate in disposing of it, he could meet the installments, which

were spread over a period of four years, and make a handsome profit for

himself. Even when the credit or installment feature was abolished in

1821 and the price of the land lowered to a cash price of $1.75 an acre,

the opportunity for large speculative purchases continued to attract

capital to land ventures.

=The Development of the Small Freehold.=--The cheapness of land and the

scarcity of labor, nevertheless, made impossible the triumph of the huge

estate with its semi-servile tenantry. For about $45 a man could get a

farm of 160 acres on the installment plan; another payment of $80 was

due in forty days; but a four-year term was allowed for the discharge of

the balance. With a capital of from two to three hundred dollars a

family could embark on a land venture. If it had good crops, it could

meet the deferred payments. It was, however, a hard battle at best. Many

a man forfeited his land through failure to pay the final installment;

yet in the end, in spite of all the handicaps, the small freehold of a

few hundred acres at most became the typical unit of Western

agriculture, except in the planting states of the Gulf. Even the lands

of the great companies were generally broken up and sold in small lots.

The tendency toward moderate holdings, so favored by Western conditions,

was also promoted by a clause in the Northwest Ordinance declaring that

the land of any person dying intestate--that is, without any will

disposing of it--should be divided equally among his descendants.

Hildreth says of this provision: "It established the important

republican principle, not then introduced into all the states, of the

equal distribution of landed as well as personal property." All these

forces combined made the wide dispersion of wealth, in the early days of

the nineteenth century, an American characteristic, in marked contrast

with the European system of family prestige and vast estates based on

the law of primogeniture.

THE WESTERN MIGRATION AND NEW STATES

=The People.=--With government established, federal arms victorious over

the Indians, and the lands surveyed for sale, the way was prepared for

the immigrants. They came with a rush. Young New Englanders, weary of

tilling the stony soil of their native states, poured through New York

and Pennsylvania, some settling on the northern bank of the Ohio but

most of them in the Lake region. Sons and daughters of German farmers in

Pennsylvania and many a redemptioner who had discharged his bond of

servitude pressed out into Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, or beyond. From

the exhausted fields and the clay hills of the Southern states came

pioneers of English and Scotch-Irish descent, the latter in great

numbers. Indeed one historian of high authority has ventured to say that

"the rapid expansion of the United States from a coast strip to a

continental area is largely a Scotch-Irish achievement." While native

Americans of mixed stocks led the way into the West, it was not long

before immigrants direct from Europe, under the stimulus of company

enterprise, began to filter into the new settlements in increasing

numbers.

The types of people were as various as the nations they represented.

Timothy Flint, who published his entertaining \_Recollections\_ in 1826,

found the West a strange mixture of all sorts and conditions of people.

Some of them, he relates, had been hunters in the upper world of the

Mississippi, above the falls of St. Anthony. Some had been still farther

north, in Canada. Still others had wandered from the South--the Gulf of

Mexico, the Red River, and the Spanish country. French boatmen and

trappers, Spanish traders from the Southwest, Virginia planters with

their droves of slaves mingled with English, German, and Scotch-Irish

farmers. Hunters, forest rangers, restless bordermen, and squatters,

like the foaming combers of an advancing tide, went first. Then followed

the farmers, masters of the ax and plow, with their wives who shared

every burden and hardship and introduced some of the features of

civilized life. The hunters and rangers passed on to new scenes; the

home makers built for all time.

=The Number of Immigrants.=--There were no official stations on the

frontier to record the number of immigrants who entered the West during

the decades following the American Revolution. But travelers of the time

record that every road was "crowded" with pioneers and their families,

their wagons and cattle; and that they were seldom out of the sound of

the snapping whip of the teamster urging forward his horses or the crack

of the hunter's rifle as he brought down his evening meal. "During the

latter half of 1787," says Coman, "more than nine hundred boats floated

down the Ohio carrying eighteen thousand men, women, and children, and

twelve thousand horses, sheep, and cattle, and six hundred and fifty

wagons." Other lines of travel were also crowded and with the passing

years the flooding tide of home seekers rose higher and higher.

=The Western Routes.=--Four main routes led into the country beyond the

Appalachians. The Genesee road, beginning at Albany, ran almost due west

to the present site of Buffalo on Lake Erie, through a level country. In

the dry season, wagons laden with goods could easily pass along it into

northern Ohio. A second route, through Pittsburgh, was fed by three

eastern branches, one starting at Philadelphia, one at Baltimore, and

another at Alexandria. A third main route wound through the mountains

from Alexandria to Boonesboro in Kentucky and then westward across the

Ohio to St. Louis. A fourth, the most famous of them all, passed through

the Cumberland Gap and by branches extended into the Cumberland valley

and the Kentucky country.

Of these four lines of travel, the Pittsburgh route offered the most

advantages. Pioneers, no matter from what section they came, when once

they were on the headwaters of the Ohio and in possession of a flatboat,

could find a quick and easy passage into all parts of the West and

Southwest. Whether they wanted to settle in Ohio, Kentucky, or western

Tennessee they could find their way down the drifting flood to their

destination or at least to some spot near it. Many people from the South

as well as the Northern and Middle states chose this route; so it came

about that the sons and daughters of Virginia and the Carolinas mingled

with those of New York, Pennsylvania, and New England in the settlement

of the Northwest territory.

=The Methods of Travel into the West.=--Many stories giving exact

descriptions of methods of travel into the West in the early days have

been preserved. The country was hardly opened before visitors from the

Old World and from the Eastern states, impelled by curiosity, made their

way to the very frontier of civilization and wrote books to inform or

amuse the public. One of them, Gilbert Imlay, an English traveler, has

given us an account of the Pittsburgh route as he found it in 1791. "If

a man ... " he writes, "has a family or goods of any sort to remove, his

best way, then, would be to purchase a waggon and team of horses to

carry his property to Redstone Old Fort or to Pittsburgh, according as

he may come from the Northern or Southern states. A good waggon will

cost, at Philadelphia, about $10 ... and the horses about $12 each; they

would cost something more both at Baltimore and Alexandria. The waggon

may be covered with canvass, and if it is the choice of the people, they

may sleep in it of nights with the greatest safety. But if they dislike

that, there are inns of accommodation the whole distance on the

different roads.... The provisions I would purchase in the same manner

[that is, from the farmers along the road]; and by having two or three

camp kettles and stopping every evening when the weather is fine upon

the brink of some rivulet and by kindling a fire they may soon dress

their own food.... This manner of journeying is so far from being

disagreeable that in a fine season it is extremely pleasant." The

immigrant once at Pittsburgh or Wheeling could then buy a flatboat of a

size required for his goods and stock, and drift down the current to his

journey's end.

[Illustration: ROADS AND TRAILS INTO THE WESTERN TERRITORY]

=The Admission of Kentucky and Tennessee.=--When the eighteenth century

drew to a close, Kentucky had a population larger than Delaware, Rhode

Island, or New Hampshire. Tennessee claimed 60,000 inhabitants. In 1792

Kentucky took her place as a state beside her none too kindly parent,

Virginia. The Eastern Federalists resented her intrusion; but they took

some consolation in the admission of Vermont because the balance of

Eastern power was still retained.

As if to assert their independence of old homes and conservative ideas

the makers of Kentucky's first constitution swept aside the landed

qualification on the suffrage and gave the vote to all free white males.

Four years later, Kentucky's neighbor to the south, Tennessee, followed

this step toward a wider democracy. After encountering fierce opposition

from the Federalists, Tennessee was accepted as the sixteenth state.

=Ohio.=--The door of the union had hardly opened for Tennessee when

another appeal was made to Congress, this time from the pioneers in

Ohio. The little posts founded at Marietta and Cincinnati had grown into

flourishing centers of trade. The stream of immigrants, flowing down the

river, added daily to their numbers and the growing settlements all

around poured produce into their markets to be exchanged for "store

goods." After the Indians were disposed of in 1794 and the last British

soldier left the frontier forts under the terms of the Jay treaty of

1795, tiny settlements of families appeared on Lake Erie in the "Western

Reserve," a region that had been retained by Connecticut when she

surrendered her other rights in the Northwest.

At the close of the century, Ohio, claiming a population of more than

50,000, grew discontented with its territorial status. Indeed, two years

before the enactment of the Northwest Ordinance, squatters in that

region had been invited by one John Emerson to hold a convention after

the fashion of the men of Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield in old

Connecticut and draft a frame of government for themselves. This true

son of New England declared that men "have an undoubted right to pass

into every vacant country and there to form their constitution and that

from the confederation of the whole United States Congress is not

empowered to forbid them." This grand convention was never held because

the heavy hand of the government fell upon the leaders; but the spirit

of John Emerson did not perish. In November, 1802, a convention chosen

by voters, assembled under the authority of Congress at Chillicothe,

drew up a constitution. It went into force after a popular ratification.

The roll of the convention bore such names as Abbot, Baldwin, Cutler,

Huntington, Putnam, and Sargent, and the list of counties from which

they came included Adams, Fairfield, Hamilton, Jefferson, Trumbull, and

Washington, showing that the new America in the West was peopled and led

by the old stock. In 1803 Ohio was admitted to the union.

=Indiana and Illinois.=--As in the neighboring state, the frontier in

Indiana advanced northward from the Ohio, mainly under the leadership,

however, of settlers from the South--restless Kentuckians hoping for

better luck in a newer country and pioneers from the far frontiers of

Virginia and North Carolina. As soon as a tier of counties swinging

upward like the horns of the moon against Ohio on the east and in the

Wabash Valley on the west was fairly settled, a clamor went up for

statehood. Under the authority of an act of Congress in 1816 the

Indianians drafted a constitution and inaugurated their government at

Corydon. "The majority of the members of the convention," we are told by

a local historian, "were frontier farmers who had a general idea of what

they wanted and had sense enough to let their more erudite colleagues

put it into shape."

Two years later, the pioneers of Illinois, also settled upward from the

Ohio, like Indiana, elected their delegates to draft a constitution.

Leadership in the convention, quite properly, was taken by a man born in

New York and reared in Tennessee; and the constitution as finally

drafted "was in its principal provisions a copy of the then existing

constitutions of Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana.... Many of the articles

are exact copies in wording although differently arranged and

numbered."

=Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.=--Across the Mississippi to the

far south, clearing and planting had gone on with much bustle and

enterprise. The cotton and sugar lands of Louisiana, opened by French

and Spanish settlers, were widened in every direction by planters with

their armies of slaves from the older states. New Orleans, a good market

and a center of culture not despised even by the pioneer, grew apace. In

1810 the population of lower Louisiana was over 75,000. The time had

come, said the leaders of the people, to fulfill the promise made to

France in the treaty of cession; namely, to grant to the inhabitants of

the territory statehood and the rights of American citizens. Federalists

from New England still having a voice in Congress, if somewhat weaker,

still protested in tones of horror. "I am compelled to declare it as my

deliberate opinion," pronounced Josiah Quincy in the House of

Representatives, "that if this bill [to admit Louisiana] passes, the

bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved ... that as it will be the

right of all, so it will be the duty of some [states] to prepare

definitely for a separation; amicably if they can, violently if they

must.... It is a death blow to the Constitution. It may afterwards

linger; but lingering, its fate will, at no very distant period, be

consummated." Federalists from New York like those from New England had

their doubts about the wisdom of admitting Western states; but the party

of Jefferson and Madison, having the necessary majority, granted the

coveted statehood to Louisiana in 1812.

When, a few years later, Mississippi and Alabama knocked at the doors of

the union, the Federalists had so little influence, on account of their

conduct during the second war with England, that spokesmen from the

Southwest met a kindlier reception at Washington. Mississippi, in 1817,

and Alabama, in 1819, took their places among the United States of

America. Both of them, while granting white manhood suffrage, gave their

constitutions the tone of the old East by providing landed

qualifications for the governor and members of the legislature.

=Missouri.=--Far to the north in the Louisiana purchase, a new

commonwealth was rising to power. It was peopled by immigrants who came

down the Ohio in fleets of boats or crossed the Mississippi from

Kentucky and Tennessee. Thrifty Germans from Pennsylvania, hardy farmers

from Virginia ready to work with their own hands, freemen seeking

freemen's homes, planters with their slaves moving on from worn-out

fields on the seaboard, came together in the widening settlements of the

Missouri country. Peoples from the North and South flowed together,

small farmers and big planters mingling in one community. When their

numbers had reached sixty thousand or more, they precipitated a contest

over their admission to the union, "ringing an alarm bell in the night,"

as Jefferson phrased it. The favorite expedient of compromise with

slavery was brought forth in Congress once more. Maine consequently was

brought into the union without slavery and Missouri with slavery. At the

same time there was drawn westward through the rest of the Louisiana

territory a line separating servitude from slavery.

THE SPIRIT OF THE FRONTIER

=Land Tenure and Liberty.=--Over an immense western area there developed

an unbroken system of freehold farms. In the Gulf states and the lower

Mississippi Valley, it is true, the planter with his many slaves even

led in the pioneer movement; but through large sections of Tennessee and

Kentucky, as well as upper Georgia and Alabama, and all throughout the

Northwest territory the small farmer reigned supreme. In this immense

dominion there sprang up a civilization without caste or class--a body

of people all having about the same amount of this world's goods and

deriving their livelihood from one source: the labor of their own hands

on the soil. The Northwest territory alone almost equaled in area all

the original thirteen states combined, except Georgia, and its system of

agricultural economy was unbroken by plantations and feudal estates. "In

the subdivision of the soil and the great equality of condition," as

Webster said on more than one occasion, "lay the true basis, most

certainly, of popular government." There was the undoubted source of

Jacksonian democracy.

[Illustration: A LOG CABIN--LINCOLN'S BIRTHPLACE]

=The Characteristics of the Western People.=--Travelers into the

Northwest during the early years of the nineteenth century were agreed

that the people of that region were almost uniformly marked by the

characteristics common to an independent yeomanry. A close observer thus

recorded his impressions: "A spirit of adventurous enterprise, a

willingness to go through any hardship to accomplish an object....

Independence of thought and action. They have felt the influence of

these principles from their childhood. Men who can endure anything; that

have lived almost without restraint, free as the mountain air or as the

deer and the buffalo of their forests, and who know they are Americans

all.... An apparent roughness which some would deem rudeness of

manner.... Where there is perfect equality in a neighborhood of people

who know little about each other's previous history or ancestry but

where each is lord of the soil he cultivates. Where a log cabin is all

that the best of families can expect to have for years and of course can

possess few of the external decorations which have so much influence in

creating a diversity of rank in society. These circumstances have laid

the foundation for that equality of intercourse, simplicity of manners,

want of deference, want of reserve, great readiness to make

acquaintances, freedom of speech, indisposition to brook real or

imaginary insults which one witnesses among people of the West."

This equality, this independence, this rudeness so often described by

the traveler as marking a new country, were all accentuated by the

character of the settlers themselves. Traces of the fierce, unsociable,

eagle-eyed, hard-drinking hunter remained. The settlers who followed the

hunter were, with some exceptions, soldiers of the Revolutionary army,

farmers of the "middling order," and mechanics from the towns,--English,

Scotch-Irish, Germans,--poor in possessions and thrown upon the labor of

their own hands for support. Sons and daughters from well-to-do Eastern

homes sometimes brought softer manners; but the equality of life and the

leveling force of labor in forest and field soon made them one in spirit

with their struggling neighbors. Even the preachers and teachers, who

came when the cabins were raised in the clearings and rude churches and

schoolhouses were built, preached sermons and taught lessons that

savored of the frontier, as any one may know who reads Peter

Cartwright's \_A Muscular Christian\_ or Eggleston's \_The Hoosier

Schoolmaster\_.

THE WEST AND THE EAST MEET

=The East Alarmed.=--A people so independent as the Westerners and so

attached to local self-government gave the conservative East many a rude

shock, setting gentlemen in powdered wigs and knee breeches agog with

the idea that terrible things might happen in the Mississippi Valley.

Not without good grounds did Washington fear that "a touch of a feather

would turn" the Western settlers away from the seaboard to the

Spaniards; and seriously did he urge the East not to neglect them, lest

they be "drawn into the arms of, or be dependent upon foreigners."

Taking advantage of the restless spirit in the Southwest, Aaron Burr,

having disgraced himself by killing Alexander Hamilton in a duel, laid

wild plans, if not to bring about a secession in that region, at least

to build a state of some kind out of the Spanish dominions adjoining

Louisiana. Frightened at such enterprises and fearing the dominance of

the West, the Federalists, with a few conspicuous exceptions, opposed

equality between the sections. Had their narrow views prevailed, the

West, with its new democracy, would have been held in perpetual tutelage

to the seaboard or perhaps been driven into independence as the thirteen

colonies had been not long before.

=Eastern Friends of the West.=--Fortunately for the nation, there were

many Eastern leaders, particularly from the South, who understood the

West, approved its spirit, and sought to bring the two sections together

by common bonds. Washington kept alive and keen the zeal for Western

advancement which he acquired in his youth as a surveyor. He never grew

tired of urging upon his Eastern friends the importance of the lands

beyond the mountains. He pressed upon the governor of Virginia a project

for a wagon road connecting the seaboard with the Ohio country and was

active in a movement to improve the navigation of the Potomac. He

advocated strengthening the ties of commerce. "Smooth the roads," he

said, "and make easy the way for them, and then see what an influx of

articles will be poured upon us; how amazingly our exports will be

increased by them; and how amply we shall be compensated for any trouble

and expense we may encounter to effect it." Jefferson, too, was

interested in every phase of Western development--the survey of lands,

the exploration of waterways, the opening of trade, and even the

discovery of the bones of prehistoric animals. Robert Fulton, the

inventor of the steamboat, was another man of vision who for many years

pressed upon his countrymen the necessity of uniting East and West by a

canal which would cement the union, raise the value of the public lands,

and extend the principles of confederate and republican government.

=The Difficulties of Early Transportation.=--Means of communication

played an important part in the strategy of all those who sought to

bring together the seaboard and the frontier. The produce of the

West--wheat, corn, bacon, hemp, cattle, and tobacco--was bulky and the

cost of overland transportation was prohibitive. In the Eastern market,

"a cow and her calf were given for a bushel of salt, while a suit of

'store clothes' cost as much as a farm." In such circumstances, the

inhabitants of the Mississippi Valley were forced to ship their produce

over a long route by way of New Orleans and to pay high freight rates

for everything that was brought across the mountains. Scows of from five

to fifty tons were built at the towns along the rivers and piloted down

the stream to the Crescent City. In a few cases small ocean-going

vessels were built to transport goods to the West Indies or to the

Eastern coast towns. Salt, iron, guns, powder, and the absolute

essentials which the pioneers had to buy mainly in Eastern markets were

carried over narrow wagon trails that were almost impassable in the

rainy season.

=The National Road.=--To far-sighted men, like Albert Gallatin, "the

father of internal improvements," the solution of this problem was the

construction of roads and canals. Early in Jefferson's administration,

Congress dedicated a part of the proceeds from the sale of lands to

building highways from the headwaters of the navigable waters emptying

into the Atlantic to the Ohio River and beyond into the Northwest

territory. In 1806, after many misgivings, it authorized a great

national highway binding the East and the West. The Cumberland Road, as

it was called, began in northwestern Maryland, wound through southern

Pennsylvania, crossed the narrow neck of Virginia at Wheeling, and then

shot almost straight across Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, into Missouri.

By 1817, stagecoaches were running between Washington and Wheeling; by

1833 contractors had carried their work to Columbus, Ohio, and by 1852,

to Vandalia, Illinois. Over this ballasted road mail and passenger

coaches could go at high speed, and heavy freight wagons proceed in

safety at a steady pace.

[Illustration: THE CUMBERLAND ROAD]

=Canals and Steamboats.=--A second epoch in the economic union of the

East and West was reached with the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825,

offering an all-water route from New York City to the Great Lakes and

the Mississippi Valley. Pennsylvania, alarmed by the advantages

conferred on New York by this enterprise, began her system of canals and

portages from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, completing the last link in

1834. In the South, the Chesapeake and Ohio Company, chartered in 1825,

was busy with a project to connect Georgetown and Cumberland when

railways broke in upon the undertaking before it was half finished.

About the same time, Ohio built a canal across the state, affording

water communication between Lake Erie and the Ohio River through a rich

wheat belt. Passengers could now travel by canal boat into the West with

comparative ease and comfort, if not at a rapid speed, and the bulkiest

of freight could be easily handled. Moreover, the rate charged for

carrying goods was cut by the Erie Canal from $32 a ton per hundred

miles to $1. New Orleans was destined to lose her primacy in the

Mississippi Valley.

The diversion of traffic to Eastern markets was also stimulated by

steamboats which appeared on the Ohio about 1810, three years after

Fulton had made his famous trip on the Hudson. It took twenty men to

sail and row a five-ton scow up the river at a speed of from ten to

twenty miles a day. In 1825, Timothy Flint traveled a hundred miles a

day on the new steamer \_Grecian\_ "against the whole weight of the

Mississippi current." Three years later the round trip from Louisville

to New Orleans was cut to eight days. Heavy produce that once had to

float down to New Orleans could be carried upstream and sent to the East

by way of the canal systems.

[Illustration: \_From an old print\_

AN EARLY MISSISSIPPI STEAMBOAT]

Thus the far country was brought near. The timid no longer hesitated at

the thought of the perilous journey. All routes were crowded with

Western immigrants. The forests fell before the ax like grain before the

sickle. Clearings scattered through the woods spread out into a great

mosaic of farms stretching from the Southern Appalachians to Lake

Michigan. The national census of 1830 gave 937,000 inhabitants to Ohio;

343,000 to Indiana; 157,000 to Illinois; 687,000 to Kentucky; and

681,000 to Tennessee.

[Illustration: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION, 1830]

With the increase in population and the growth of agriculture came

political influence. People who had once petitioned Congress now sent

their own representatives. Men who had hitherto accepted without

protests Presidents from the seaboard expressed a new spirit of dissent

in 1824 by giving only three electoral votes for John Quincy Adams; and

four years later they sent a son of the soil from Tennessee, Andrew

Jackson, to take Washington's chair as chief executive of the

nation--the first of a long line of Presidents from the Mississippi

basin.
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=Questions=

1. How did the West come to play a role in the Revolution?

2. What preparations were necessary to settlement?

3. Give the principal provisions of the Northwest Ordinance.

4. Explain how freehold land tenure happened to predominate in the West.

5. Who were the early settlers in the West? What routes did they take?

How did they travel?

6. Explain the Eastern opposition to the admission of new Western

states. Show how it was overcome.

7. Trace a connection between the economic system of the West and the

spirit of the people.

8. Who were among the early friends of Western development?

9. Describe the difficulties of trade between the East and the West.

10. Show how trade was promoted.

=Research Topics=

=Northwest Ordinance.=--Analysis of text in Macdonald, \_Documentary

Source Book\_. Roosevelt, \_Winning of the West\_, Vol. V, pp. 5-57.

=The West before the Revolution.=--Roosevelt, Vol. I.

=The West during the Revolution.=--Roosevelt, Vols. II and III.

=Tennessee.=--Roosevelt, Vol. V, pp. 95-119 and Vol. VI, pp. 9-87.

=The Cumberland Road.=--A.B. Hulbert, \_The Cumberland Road\_.

=Early Life in the Middle West.=--Callender, \_Economic History of the

United States\_, pp. 617-633; 636-641.

=Slavery in the Southwest.=--Callender, pp. 641-652.

=Early Land Policy.=--Callender, pp. 668-680.

=Westward Movement of Peoples.=--Roosevelt, Vol. IV, pp. 7-39.

Lists of books dealing with the early history of Western states are

given in Hart, Channing, and Turner, \_Guide to the Study and Reading of

American History\_ (rev. ed.), pp. 62-89.

=Kentucky.=--Roosevelt, Vol. IV, pp. 176-263.

CHAPTER XI

JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY

The New England Federalists, at the Hartford convention, prophesied that

in time the West would dominate the East. "At the adoption of the

Constitution," they said, "a certain balance of power among the original

states was considered to exist, and there was at that time and yet is

among those parties a strong affinity between their great and general

interests. By the admission of these [new] states that balance has been

materially affected and unless the practice be modified must ultimately

be destroyed. The Southern states will first avail themselves of their

new confederates to govern the East, and finally the Western states,

multiplied in number, and augmented in population, will control the

interests of the whole." Strangely enough the fulfillment of this

prophecy was being prepared even in Federalist strongholds by the rise

of a new urban democracy that was to make common cause with the farmers

beyond the mountains.

THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT IN THE EAST

=The Aristocratic Features of the Old Order.=--The Revolutionary

fathers, in setting up their first state constitutions, although they

often spoke of government as founded on the consent of the governed, did

not think that consistency required giving the vote to all adult males.

On the contrary they looked upon property owners as the only safe

"depositary" of political power. They went back to the colonial

tradition that related taxation and representation. This, they argued,

was not only just but a safeguard against the "excesses of democracy."

In carrying their theory into execution they placed taxpaying or

property qualifications on the right to vote. Broadly speaking, these

limitations fell into three classes. Three states, Pennsylvania (1776),

New Hampshire (1784), and Georgia (1798), gave the ballot to all who

paid taxes, without reference to the value of their property. Three,

Virginia, Delaware, and Rhode Island, clung firmly to the ancient

principles that only freeholders could be intrusted with electoral

rights. Still other states, while closely restricting the suffrage,

accepted the ownership of other things as well as land in fulfillment of

the requirements. In Massachusetts, for instance, the vote was granted

to all men who held land yielding an annual income of three pounds or

possessed other property worth sixty pounds.

The electors thus enfranchised, numerous as they were, owing to the wide

distribution of land, often suffered from a very onerous disability. In

many states they were able to vote only for persons of wealth because

heavy property qualifications were imposed on public officers. In New

Hampshire, the governor had to be worth five hundred pounds, one-half in

land; in Massachusetts, one thousand pounds, all freehold; in Maryland,

five thousand pounds, one thousand of which was freehold; in North

Carolina, one thousand pounds freehold; and in South Carolina, ten

thousand pounds freehold. A state senator in Massachusetts had to be the

owner of a freehold worth three hundred pounds or personal property

worth six hundred pounds; in New Jersey, one thousand pounds' worth of

property; in North Carolina, three hundred acres of land; in South

Carolina, two thousand pounds freehold. For members of the lower house

of the legislature lower qualifications were required.

In most of the states the suffrage or office holding or both were

further restricted by religious provisions. No single sect was powerful

enough to dominate after the Revolution, but, for the most part,

Catholics and Jews were either disfranchised or excluded from office.

North Carolina and Georgia denied the ballot to any one who was not a

Protestant. Delaware withheld it from all who did not believe in the

Trinity and the inspiration of the Scriptures. Massachusetts and

Maryland limited it to Christians. Virginia and New York, advanced for

their day, made no discrimination in government on account of religious

opinion.

=The Defense of the Old Order.=--It must not be supposed that property

qualifications were thoughtlessly imposed at the outset or considered of

little consequence in practice. In the beginning they were viewed as

fundamental. As towns grew in size and the number of landless citizens

increased, the restrictions were defended with even more vigor. In

Massachusetts, the great Webster upheld the rights of property in

government, saying: "It is entirely just that property should have its

due weight and consideration in political arrangements.... The

disastrous revolutions which the world has witnessed, those political

thunderstorms and earthquakes which have shaken the pillars of society

to their deepest foundations, have been revolutions against property."

In Pennsylvania, a leader in local affairs cried out against a plan to

remove the taxpaying limitation on the suffrage: "What does the delegate

propose? To place the vicious vagrant, the wandering Arabs, the Tartar

hordes of our large cities on the level with the virtuous and good man?"

In Virginia, Jefferson himself had first believed in property

qualifications and had feared with genuine alarm the "mobs of the great

cities." It was near the end of the eighteenth century before he

accepted the idea of manhood suffrage. Even then he was unable to

convince the constitution-makers of his own state. "It is not an idle

chimera of the brain," urged one of them, "that the possession of land

furnishes the strongest evidence of permanent, common interest with, and

attachment to, the community.... It is upon this foundation I wish to

place the right of suffrage. This is the best general standard which can

be resorted to for the purpose of determining whether the persons to be

invested with the right of suffrage are such persons as could be,

consistently with the safety and well-being of the community, intrusted

with the exercise of that right."

=Attacks on the Restricted Suffrage.=--The changing circumstances of

American life, however, soon challenged the rule of those with property.

Prominent among the new forces were the rising mercantile and business

interests. Where the freehold qualification was applied, business men

who did not own land were deprived of the vote and excluded from office.

In New York, for example, the most illiterate farmer who had one hundred

pounds' worth of land could vote for state senator and governor, while

the landless banker or merchant could not. It is not surprising,

therefore, to find business men taking the lead in breaking down

freehold limitations on the suffrage. The professional classes also were

interested in removing the barriers which excluded many of them from

public affairs. It was a schoolmaster, Thomas Dorr, who led the popular

uprising in Rhode Island which brought the exclusive rule by freeholders

to an end.

In addition to the business and professional classes, the mechanics of

the towns showed a growing hostility to a system of government that

generally barred them from voting or holding office. Though not

numerous, they had early begun to exercise an influence on the course of

public affairs. They had led the riots against the Stamp Act, overturned

King George's statue, and "crammed stamps down the throats of

collectors." When the state constitutions were framed they took a lively

interest, particularly in New York City and Philadelphia. In June, 1776,

the "mechanicks in union" in New York protested against putting the new

state constitution into effect without their approval, declaring that

the right to vote on the acceptance or rejection of a fundamental law

"is the birthright of every man to whatever state he may belong." Though

their petition was rejected, their spirit remained. When, a few years

later, the federal Constitution was being framed, the mechanics watched

the process with deep concern; they knew that one of its main objects

was to promote trade and commerce, affecting directly their daily bread.

During the struggle over ratification, they passed resolutions approving

its provisions and they often joined in parades organized to stir up

sentiment for the Constitution, even though they could not vote for

members of the state conventions and so express their will directly.

After the organization of trade unions they collided with the courts of

law and thus became interested in the election of judges and lawmakers.

Those who attacked the old system of class rule found a strong moral

support in the Declaration of Independence. Was it not said that all men

are created equal? Whoever runs may read. Was it not declared that

governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed?

That doctrine was applied with effect to George III and seemed

appropriate for use against the privileged classes of Massachusetts or

Virginia. "How do the principles thus proclaimed," asked the

non-freeholders of Richmond, in petitioning for the ballot, "accord with

the existing regulation of the suffrage? A regulation which, instead of

the equality nature ordains, creates an odious distinction between

members of the same community ... and vests in a favored class, not in

consideration of their public services but of their private possessions,

the highest of all privileges."

=Abolition of Property Qualifications.=--By many minor victories rather

than by any spectacular triumphs did the advocates of manhood suffrage

carry the day. Slight gains were made even during the Revolution or

shortly afterward. In Pennsylvania, the mechanics, by taking an active

part in the contest over the Constitution of 1776, were able to force

the qualification down to the payment of a small tax. Vermont came into

the union in 1792 without any property restrictions. In the same year

Delaware gave the vote to all men who paid taxes. Maryland, reckoned one

of the most conservative of states, embarked on the experiment of

manhood suffrage in 1809; and nine years later, Connecticut, equally

conservative, decided that all taxpayers were worthy of the ballot.

Five states, Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, Rhode Island, and North

Carolina, remained obdurate while these changes were going on around

them; finally they had to yield themselves. The last struggle in

Massachusetts took place in the constitutional convention of 1820. There

Webster, in the prime of his manhood, and John Adams, in the closing

years of his old age, alike protested against such radical innovations

as manhood suffrage. Their protests were futile. The property test was

abolished and a small tax-paying qualification was substituted. New York

surrendered the next year and, after trying some minor restrictions for

five years, went completely over to white manhood suffrage in 1826.

Rhode Island clung to her freehold qualification through thirty years of

agitation. Then Dorr's Rebellion, almost culminating in bloodshed,

brought about a reform in 1843 which introduced a slight tax-paying

qualification as an alternative to the freehold. Virginia and North

Carolina were still unconvinced. The former refused to abandon ownership

of land as the test for political rights until 1850 and the latter until

1856. Although religious discriminations and property qualifications for

office holders were sometimes retained after the establishment of

manhood suffrage, they were usually abolished along with the monopoly of

government enjoyed by property owners and taxpayers.

[Illustration: THOMAS DORR AROUSING HIS FOLLOWERS]

At the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the white

male industrial workers and the mechanics of the Northern cities, at

least, could lay aside the petition for the ballot and enjoy with the

free farmer a voice in the government of their common country.

"Universal democracy," sighed Carlyle, who was widely read in the United

States, "whatever we may think of it has declared itself the inevitable

fact of the days in which we live; and he who has any chance to instruct

or lead in these days must begin by admitting that ... Where no

government is wanted, save that of the parish constable, as in America

with its boundless soil, every man being able to find work and

recompense for himself, democracy may subsist; not elsewhere." Amid the

grave misgivings of the first generation of statesmen, America was

committed to the great adventure, in the populous towns of the East as

well as in the forests and fields of the West.

THE NEW DEMOCRACY ENTERS THE ARENA

The spirit of the new order soon had a pronounced effect on the

machinery of government and the practice of politics. The enfranchised

electors were not long in demanding for themselves a larger share in

administration.

=The Spoils System and Rotation in Office.=--First of all they wanted

office for themselves, regardless of their fitness. They therefore

extended the system of rewarding party workers with government

positions--a system early established in several states, notably New

York and Pennsylvania. Closely connected with it was the practice of

fixing short terms for officers and making frequent changes in

personnel. "Long continuance in office," explained a champion of this

idea in Pennsylvania in 1837, "unfits a man for the discharge of its

duties, by rendering him arbitrary and aristocratic, and tends to beget,

first life office, and then hereditary office, which leads to the

destruction of free government." The solution offered was the historic

doctrine of "rotation in office." At the same time the principle of

popular election was extended to an increasing number of officials who

had once been appointed either by the governor or the legislature. Even

geologists, veterinarians, surveyors, and other technical officers were

declared elective on the theory that their appointment "smacked of

monarchy."

=Popular Election of Presidential Electors.=--In a short time the spirit

of democracy, while playing havoc with the old order in state

government, made its way upward into the federal system. The framers of

the Constitution, bewildered by many proposals and unable to agree on

any single plan, had committed the choice of presidential electors to

the discretion of the state legislatures. The legislatures, in turn,

greedy of power, early adopted the practice of choosing the electors

themselves; but they did not enjoy it long undisturbed. Democracy,

thundering at their doors, demanded that they surrender the privilege to

the people. Reluctantly they yielded, sometimes granting popular

election and then withdrawing it. The drift was inevitable, and the

climax came with the advent of Jacksonian democracy. In 1824, Vermont,

New York, Delaware, South Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana, though some

had experimented with popular election, still left the choice of

electors with the legislature. Eight years later South Carolina alone

held to the old practice. Popular election had become the final word.

The fanciful idea of an electoral college of "good and wise men,"

selected without passion or partisanship by state legislatures acting as

deliberative bodies, was exploded for all time; the election of the

nation's chief magistrate was committed to the tempestuous methods of

democracy.

=The Nominating Convention.=--As the suffrage was widened and the

popular choice of presidential electors extended, there arose a violent

protest against the methods used by the political parties in nominating

candidates. After the retirement of Washington, both the Republicans and

the Federalists found it necessary to agree upon their favorites before

the election, and they adopted a colonial device--the pre-election

caucus. The Federalist members of Congress held a conference and

selected their candidate, and the Republicans followed the example. In

a short time the practice of nominating by a "congressional caucus"

became a recognized institution. The election still remained with the

people; but the power of picking candidates for their approval passed

into the hands of a small body of Senators and Representatives.

A reaction against this was unavoidable. To friends of "the plain

people," like Andrew Jackson, it was intolerable, all the more so

because the caucus never favored him with the nomination. More

conservative men also found grave objections to it. They pointed out

that, whereas the Constitution intended the President to be an

independent officer, he had now fallen under the control of a caucus of

congressmen. The supremacy of the legislative branch had been obtained

by an extra-legal political device. To such objections were added

practical considerations. In 1824, when personal rivalry had taken the

place of party conflicts, the congressional caucus selected as the

candidate, William H. Crawford, of Georgia, a man of distinction but no

great popularity, passing by such an obvious hero as General Jackson.

The followers of the General were enraged and demanded nothing short of

the death of "King Caucus." Their clamor was effective. Under their

attacks, the caucus came to an ignominious end.

In place of it there arose in 1831 a new device, the national nominating

convention, composed of delegates elected by party voters for the sole

purpose of nominating candidates. Senators and Representatives were

still prominent in the party councils, but they were swamped by hundreds

of delegates "fresh from the people," as Jackson was wont to say. In

fact, each convention was made up mainly of office holders and office

seekers, and the new institution was soon denounced as vigorously as

King Caucus had been, particularly by statesmen who failed to obtain a

nomination. Still it grew in strength and by 1840 was firmly

established.

=The End of the Old Generation.=--In the election of 1824, the

representatives of the "aristocracy" made their last successful stand.

Until then the leadership by men of "wealth and talents" had been

undisputed. There had been five Presidents--Washington, John Adams,

Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe--all Eastern men brought up in prosperous

families with the advantages of culture which come from leisure and the

possession of life's refinements. None of them had ever been compelled

to work with his hands for a livelihood. Four of them had been

slaveholders. Jefferson was a philosopher, learned in natural science, a

master of foreign languages, a gentleman of dignity and grace of manner,

notwithstanding his studied simplicity. Madison, it was said, was armed

"with all the culture of his century." Monroe was a graduate of William

and Mary, a gentleman of the old school. Jefferson and his three

successors called themselves Republicans and professed a genuine faith

in the people but they were not "of the people" themselves; they were

not sons of the soil or the workshop. They were all men of "the grand

old order of society" who gave finish and style even to popular

government.

Monroe was the last of the Presidents belonging to the heroic epoch of

the Revolution. He had served in the war for independence, in the

Congress under the Articles of Confederation, and in official capacity

after the adoption of the Constitution. In short, he was of the age that

had wrought American independence and set the government afloat. With

his passing, leadership went to a new generation; but his successor,

John Quincy Adams, formed a bridge between the old and the new in that

he combined a high degree of culture with democratic sympathies.

Washington had died in 1799, preceded but a few months by Patrick Henry

and followed in four years by Samuel Adams. Hamilton had been killed in

a duel with Burr in 1804. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were yet alive

in 1824 but they were soon to pass from the scene, reconciled at last,

full of years and honors. Madison was in dignified retirement, destined

to live long enough to protest against the doctrine of nullification

proclaimed by South Carolina before death carried him away at the ripe

old age of eighty-five.

=The Election of John Quincy Adams (1824).=--The campaign of 1824 marked

the end of the "era of good feeling" inaugurated by the collapse of the

Federalist party after the election of 1816. There were four leading

candidates, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, and W.H.

Crawford. The result of the election was a division of the electoral

votes into four parts and no one received a majority. Under the

Constitution, therefore, the selection of President passed to the House

of Representatives. Clay, who stood at the bottom of the poll, threw his

weight to Adams and assured his triumph, much to the chagrin of

Jackson's friends. They thought, with a certain justification, that

inasmuch as the hero of New Orleans had received the largest electoral

vote, the House was morally bound to accept the popular judgment and

make him President. Jackson shook hands cordially with Adams on the day

of the inauguration, but never forgave him for being elected.

While Adams called himself a Republican in politics and often spoke of

"the rule of the people," he was regarded by Jackson's followers as "an

aristocrat." He was not a son of the soil. Neither was he acquainted at

first hand with the labor of farmers and mechanics. He had been educated

at Harvard and in Europe. Like his illustrious father, John Adams, he

was a stern and reserved man, little given to seeking popularity.

Moreover, he was from the East and the frontiersmen of the West regarded

him as a man "born with a silver spoon in his mouth." Jackson's

supporters especially disliked him because they thought their hero

entitled to the presidency. Their anger was deepened when Adams

appointed Clay to the office of Secretary of State; and they set up a

cry that there had been a "deal" by which Clay had helped to elect Adams

to get office for himself.

Though Adams conducted his administration with great dignity and in a

fine spirit of public service, he was unable to overcome the opposition

which he encountered on his election to office or to win popularity in

the West and South. On the contrary, by advocating government assistance

in building roads and canals and public grants in aid of education,

arts, and sciences, he ran counter to the current which had set in

against appropriations of federal funds for internal improvements. By

signing the Tariff Bill of 1828, soon known as the "Tariff of

Abominations," he made new enemies without adding to his friends in New

York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio where he sorely needed them. Handicapped by

the false charge that he had been a party to a "corrupt bargain" with

Clay to secure his first election; attacked for his advocacy of a high

protective tariff; charged with favoring an "aristocracy of

office-holders" in Washington on account of his refusal to discharge

government clerks by the wholesale, Adams was retired from the White

House after he had served four years.

=The Triumph of Jackson in 1828.=--Probably no candidate for the

presidency ever had such passionate popular support as Andrew Jackson

had in 1828. He was truly a man of the people. Born of poor parents in

the upland region of South Carolina, schooled in poverty and adversity,

without the advantages of education or the refinements of cultivated

leisure, he seemed the embodiment of the spirit of the new American

democracy. Early in his youth he had gone into the frontier of Tennessee

where he soon won a name as a fearless and intrepid Indian fighter. On

the march and in camp, he endeared himself to his men by sharing their

hardships, sleeping on the ground with them, and eating parched corn

when nothing better could be found for the privates. From local

prominence he sprang into national fame by his exploit at the battle of

New Orleans. His reputation as a military hero was enhanced by the

feeling that he had been a martyr to political treachery in 1824. The

farmers of the West and South claimed him as their own. The mechanics of

the Eastern cities, newly enfranchised, also looked upon him as their

friend. Though his views on the tariff, internal improvements, and other

issues before the country were either vague or unknown, he was readily

elected President.

The returns of the electoral vote in 1828 revealed the sources of

Jackson's power. In New England, he received but one ballot, from

Maine; he had a majority of the electors in New York and all of them in

Pennsylvania; and he carried every state south of Maryland and beyond

the Appalachians. Adams did not get a single electoral vote in the South

and West. The prophecy of the Hartford convention had been fulfilled.

[Illustration: ANDREW JACKSON]

When Jackson took the oath of office on March 4, 1829, the government of

the United States entered into a new era. Until this time the

inauguration of a President--even that of Jefferson, the apostle of

simplicity--had brought no rude shock to the course of affairs at the

capital. Hitherto the installation of a President meant that an

old-fashioned gentleman, accompanied by a few servants, had driven to

the White House in his own coach, taken the oath with quiet dignity,

appointed a few new men to the higher posts, continued in office the

long list of regular civil employees, and begun his administration with

respectable decorum. Jackson changed all this. When he was inaugurated,

men and women journeyed hundreds of miles to witness the ceremony. Great

throngs pressed into the White House, "upset the bowls of punch, broke

the glasses, and stood with their muddy boots on the satin-covered

chairs to see the people's President." If Jefferson's inauguration was,

as he called it, the "great revolution," Jackson's inauguration was a

cataclysm.

THE NEW DEMOCRACY AT WASHINGTON

=The Spoils System.=--The staid and respectable society of Washington

was disturbed by this influx of farmers and frontiersmen. To speak of

politics became "bad form" among fashionable women. The clerks and

civil servants of the government who had enjoyed long and secure tenure

of office became alarmed at the clamor of new men for their positions.

Doubtless the major portion of them had opposed the election of Jackson

and looked with feelings akin to contempt upon him and his followers.

With a hunter's instinct, Jackson scented his prey. Determined to have

none but his friends in office, he made a clean sweep, expelling old

employees to make room for men "fresh from the people." This was a new

custom. Other Presidents had discharged a few officers for engaging in

opposition politics. They had been careful in making appointments not to

choose inveterate enemies; but they discharged relatively few men on

account of their political views and partisan activities.

By wholesale removals and the frank selection of officers on party

grounds--a practice already well intrenched in New York--Jackson

established the "spoils system" at Washington. The famous slogan, "to

the victor belong the spoils of victory," became the avowed principle of

the national government. Statesmen like Calhoun denounced it; poets like

James Russell Lowell ridiculed it; faithful servants of the government

suffered under it; but it held undisturbed sway for half a century

thereafter, each succeeding generation outdoing, if possible, its

predecessor in the use of public office for political purposes. If any

one remarked that training and experience were necessary qualifications

for important public positions, he met Jackson's own profession of

faith: "The duties of any public office are so simple or admit of being

made so simple that any man can in a short time become master of them."

=The Tariff and Nullification.=--Jackson had not been installed in power

very long before he was compelled to choose between states' rights and

nationalism. The immediate occasion of the trouble was the tariff--a

matter on which Jackson did not have any very decided views. His mind

did not run naturally to abstruse economic questions; and owing to the

divided opinion of the country it was "good politics" to be vague and

ambiguous in the controversy. Especially was this true, because the

tariff issue was threatening to split the country into parties again.

\_The Development of the Policy of "Protection."\_--The war of 1812 and

the commercial policies of England which followed it had accentuated the

need for American economic independence. During that conflict, the

United States, cut off from English manufactures as during the

Revolution, built up home industries to meet the unusual call for iron,

steel, cloth, and other military and naval supplies as well as the

demands from ordinary markets. Iron foundries and textile mills sprang

up as in the night; hundreds of business men invested fortunes in

industrial enterprises so essential to the military needs of the

government; and the people at large fell into the habit of buying

American-made goods again. As the London \_Times\_ tersely observed of the

Americans, "their first war with England made them independent; their

second war made them formidable."

In recognition of this state of affairs, the tariff of 1816 was

designed: \_first\_, to prevent England from ruining these "infant

industries" by dumping the accumulated stores of years suddenly upon

American markets; and, \_secondly\_, to enlarge in the manufacturing

centers the demand for American agricultural produce. It accomplished

the purposes of its framers. It kept in operation the mills and furnaces

so recently built. It multiplied the number of industrial workers and

enhanced the demand for the produce of the soil. It brought about

another very important result. It turned the capital and enterprise of

New England from shipping to manufacturing, and converted her statesmen,

once friends of low tariffs, into ardent advocates of protection.

In the early years of the nineteenth century, the Yankees had bent their

energies toward building and operating ships to carry produce from

America to Europe and manufactures from Europe to America. For this

reason, they had opposed the tariff of 1816 calculated to increase

domestic production and cut down the carrying trade. Defeated in their

efforts, they accepted the inevitable and turned to manufacturing. Soon

they were powerful friends of protection for American enterprise. As the

money invested and the labor employed in the favored industries

increased, the demand for continued and heavier protection grew apace.

Even the farmers who furnished raw materials, like wool, flax, and hemp,

began to see eye to eye with the manufacturers. So the textile interests

of New England, the iron masters of Connecticut, New Jersey, and

Pennsylvania, the wool, hemp, and flax growers of Ohio, Kentucky, and

Tennessee, and the sugar planters of Louisiana developed into a

formidable combination in support of a high protective tariff.

\_The Planting States Oppose the Tariff.\_--In the meantime, the cotton

states on the seaboard had forgotten about the havoc wrought during the

Napoleonic wars when their produce rotted because there were no ships to

carry it to Europe. The seas were now open. The area devoted to cotton

had swiftly expanded as Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana were opened

up. Cotton had in fact become "king" and the planters depended for their

prosperity, as they thought, upon the sale of their staple to English

manufacturers whose spinning and weaving mills were the wonder of the

world. Manufacturing nothing and having to buy nearly everything except

farm produce and even much of that for slaves, the planters naturally

wanted to purchase manufactures in the cheapest market, England, where

they sold most of their cotton. The tariff, they contended, raised the

price of the goods they had to buy and was thus in fact a tribute laid

on them for the benefit of the Northern mill owners.

\_The Tariff of Abominations.\_--They were overborne, however, in 1824 and

again in 1828 when Northern manufacturers and Western farmers forced

Congress to make an upward revision of the tariff. The Act of 1828 known

as "the Tariff of Abominations," though slightly modified in 1832, was

"the straw which broke the camel's back." Southern leaders turned in

rage against the whole system. The legislatures of Virginia, North

Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama denounced it; a general

convention of delegates held at Augusta issued a protest of defiance

against it; and South Carolina, weary of verbal battles, decided to

prevent its enforcement.

\_South Carolina Nullifies the Tariff.\_--The legislature of that state,

on October 26, 1832, passed a bill calling for a state convention which

duly assembled in the following month. In no mood for compromise, it

adopted the famous Ordinance of Nullification after a few days' debate.

Every line of this document was clear and firm. The tariff, it opened,

gives "bounties to classes and individuals ... at the expense and to the

injury and oppression of other classes and individuals"; it is a

violation of the Constitution of the United States and therefore null

and void; its enforcement in South Carolina is unlawful; if the federal

government attempts to coerce the state into obeying the law, "the

people of this state will thenceforth hold themselves absolved from all

further obligations to maintain or preserve their political connection

with the people of the other states and will forthwith proceed to

organize a separate government and do all other acts and things which

sovereign and independent states may of right do."

\_Southern States Condemn Nullification.\_--The answer of the country to

this note of defiance, couched in the language used in the Kentucky

resolutions and by the New England Federalists during the war of 1812,

was quick and positive. The legislatures of the Southern states, while

condemning the tariff, repudiated the step which South Carolina had

taken. Georgia responded: "We abhor the doctrine of nullification as

neither a peaceful nor a constitutional remedy." Alabama found it

"unsound in theory and dangerous in practice." North Carolina replied

that it was "revolutionary in character, subversive of the Constitution

of the United States." Mississippi answered: "It is disunion by

force--it is civil war." Virginia spoke more softly, condemning the

tariff and sustaining the principle of the Virginia resolutions but

denying that South Carolina could find in them any sanction for her

proceedings.

\_Jackson Firmly Upholds the Union.\_--The eyes of the country were turned

upon Andrew Jackson. It was known that he looked with no friendly

feelings upon nullification, for, at a Jefferson dinner in the spring of

1830 while the subject was in the air, he had with laconic firmness

announced a toast: "Our federal union; it must be preserved." When two

years later the open challenge came from South Carolina, he replied that

he would enforce the law, saying with his frontier directness: "If a

single drop of blood shall be shed there in opposition to the laws of

the United States, I will hang the first man I can lay my hands on

engaged in such conduct upon the first tree that I can reach." He made

ready to keep his word by preparing for the use of military and naval

forces in sustaining the authority of the federal government. Then in a

long and impassioned proclamation to the people of South Carolina he

pointed out the national character of the union, and announced his

solemn resolve to preserve it by all constitutional means. Nullification

he branded as "incompatible with the existence of the union,

contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized

by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was

founded, and destructive of the great objects for which it was formed."

\_A Compromise.\_--In his messages to Congress, however, Jackson spoke the

language of conciliation. A few days before issuing his proclamation he

suggested that protection should be limited to the articles of domestic

manufacture indispensable to safety in war time, and shortly afterward

he asked for new legislation to aid him in enforcing the laws. With two

propositions before it, one to remove the chief grounds for South

Carolina's resistance and the other to apply force if it was continued,

Congress bent its efforts to avoid a crisis. On February 12, 1833,

Henry Clay laid before the Senate a compromise tariff bill providing for

the gradual reduction of the duties until by 1842 they would reach the

level of the law which Calhoun had supported in 1816. About the same

time the "force bill," designed to give the President ample authority in

executing the law in South Carolina, was taken up. After a short but

acrimonious debate, both measures were passed and signed by President

Jackson on the same day, March 2. Looking upon the reduction of the

tariff as a complete vindication of her policy and an undoubted victory,

South Carolina rescinded her ordinance and enacted another nullifying

the force bill.
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\_The Webster-Hayne Debate.\_--Where the actual victory lay in this

quarrel, long the subject of high dispute, need not concern us to-day.

Perhaps the chief result of the whole affair was a clarification of the

issue between the North and the South--a definite statement of the

principles for which men on both sides were years afterward to lay down

their lives. On behalf of nationalism and a perpetual union, the stanch

old Democrat from Tennessee had, in his proclamation on nullification,

spoken a language that admitted of only one meaning. On behalf of

nullification, Senator Hayne, of South Carolina, a skilled lawyer and

courtly orator, had in a great speech delivered in the Senate in

January, 1830, set forth clearly and cogently the doctrine that the

union is a compact among sovereign states from which the parties may

lawfully withdraw. It was this address that called into the arena

Daniel Webster, Senator from Massachusetts, who, spreading the mantle

of oblivion over the Hartford convention, delivered a reply to Hayne

that has been reckoned among the powerful orations of all time--a plea

for the supremacy of the Constitution and the national character of the

union.

=The War on the United States Bank.=--If events forced the issue of

nationalism and nullification upon Jackson, the same could not be said

of his attack on the bank. That institution, once denounced by every

true Jeffersonian, had been reestablished in 1816 under the

administration of Jefferson's disciple, James Madison. It had not been

in operation very long, however, before it aroused bitter opposition,

especially in the South and the West. Its notes drove out of circulation

the paper currency of unsound banks chartered by the states, to the

great anger of local financiers. It was accused of favoritism in making

loans, of conferring special privileges upon politicians in return for

their support at Washington. To all Jackson's followers it was "an

insidious money power." One of them openly denounced it as an

institution designed "to strengthen the arm of wealth and counterpoise

the influence of extended suffrage in the disposition of public

affairs."

This sentiment President Jackson fully shared. In his first message to

Congress he assailed the bank in vigorous language. He declared that its

constitutionality was in doubt and alleged that it had failed to

establish a sound and uniform currency. If such an institution was

necessary, he continued, it should be a public bank, owned and managed

by the government, not a private concern endowed with special privileges

by it. In his second and third messages, Jackson came back to the

subject, leaving the decision, however, to "an enlightened people and

their representatives."

Moved by this frank hostility and anxious for the future, the bank

applied to Congress for a renewal of its charter in 1832, four years

before the expiration of its life. Clay, with his eye upon the

presidency and an issue for the campaign, warmly supported the

application. Congress, deeply impressed by his leadership, passed the

bill granting the new charter, and sent the open defiance to Jackson.

His response was an instant veto. The battle was on and it raged with

fury until the close of his second administration, ending in the

destruction of the bank, a disordered currency, and a national panic.

In his veto message, Jackson attacked the bank as unconstitutional and

even hinted at corruption. He refused to assent to the proposition that

the Supreme Court had settled the question of constitutionality by the

decision in the McCulloch case. "Each public officer," he argued, "who

takes an oath to support the Constitution, swears that he will support

it as he understands it, not as it is understood by others."

Not satisfied with his veto and his declaration against the bank,

Jackson ordered the Secretary of the Treasury to withdraw the government

deposits which formed a large part of the institution's funds. This

action he followed up by an open charge that the bank had used money

shamefully to secure the return of its supporters to Congress. The

Senate, stung by this charge, solemnly resolved that Jackson had

"assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the

Constitution and laws, but in derogation of both."

The effects of the destruction of the bank were widespread. When its

charter expired in 1836, banking was once more committed to the control

of the states. The state legislatures, under a decision rendered by the

Supreme Court after the death of Marshall, began to charter banks under

state ownership and control, with full power to issue paper money--this

in spite of the provision in the Constitution that states shall not

issue bills of credit or make anything but gold and silver coin legal

tender in the payment of debts. Once more the country was flooded by

paper currency of uncertain value. To make matters worse, Jackson

adopted the practice of depositing huge amounts of government funds in

these banks, not forgetting to render favors to those institutions which

supported him in politics--"pet banks," as they were styled at the

time. In 1837, partially, though by no means entirely, as a result of

the abolition of the bank, the country was plunged into one of the most

disastrous panics which it ever experienced.

=Internal Improvements Checked.=--The bank had presented to Jackson a

very clear problem--one of destruction. Other questions were not so

simple, particularly the subject of federal appropriations in aid of

roads and other internal improvements. Jefferson had strongly favored

government assistance in such matters, but his administration was

followed by a reaction. Both Madison and Monroe vetoed acts of Congress

appropriating public funds for public roads, advancing as their reason

the argument that the Constitution authorized no such laws. Jackson,

puzzled by the clamor on both sides, followed their example without

making the constitutional bar absolute. Congress, he thought, might

lawfully build highways of a national and military value, but he

strongly deprecated attacks by local interests on the federal treasury.

=The Triumph of the Executive Branch.=--Jackson's reelection in 1832

served to confirm his opinion that he was the chosen leader of the

people, freed and instructed to ride rough shod over Congress and even

the courts. No President before or since ever entertained in times of

peace such lofty notions of executive prerogative. The entire body of

federal employees he transformed into obedient servants of his wishes, a

sign or a nod from him making and undoing the fortunes of the humble and

the mighty. His lawful cabinet of advisers, filling all of the high

posts in the government, he treated with scant courtesy, preferring

rather to secure his counsel and advice from an unofficial body of

friends and dependents who, owing to their secret methods and back

stairs arrangements, became known as "the kitchen cabinet." Under the

leadership of a silent, astute, and resourceful politician, Amos

Kendall, this informal gathering of the faithful both gave and carried

out decrees and orders, communicating the President's lightest wish or

strictest command to the uttermost part of the country. Resolutely and

in the face of bitter opposition Jackson had removed the deposits from

the United States Bank. When the Senate protested against this arbitrary

conduct, he did not rest until it was forced to expunge the resolution

of condemnation; in time one of his lieutenants with his own hands was

able to tear the censure from the records. When Chief Justice Marshall

issued a decree against Georgia which did not suit him, Jackson,

according to tradition, blurted out that Marshall could go ahead and

enforce his own orders. To the end he pursued his willful way, finally

even choosing his own successor.

THE RISE OF THE WHIGS

=Jackson's Measures Arouse Opposition.=--Measures so decided, policies

so radical, and conduct so high-handed could not fail to arouse against

Jackson a deep and exasperated opposition. The truth is the conduct of

his entire administration profoundly disturbed the business and finances

of the country. It was accompanied by conditions similar to those which

existed under the Articles of Confederation. A paper currency, almost as

unstable and irritating as the worthless notes of revolutionary days,

flooded the country, hindering the easy transaction of business. The use

of federal funds for internal improvements, so vital to the exchange of

commodities which is the very life of industry, was blocked by executive

vetoes. The Supreme Court, which, under Marshall, had held refractory

states to their obligations under the Constitution, was flouted; states'

rights judges, deliberately selected by Jackson for the bench, began to

sap and undermine the rulings of Marshall. The protective tariff, under

which the textile industry of New England, the iron mills of

Pennsylvania, and the wool, flax, and hemp farms of the West had

flourished, had received a severe blow in the compromise of 1833 which

promised a steady reduction of duties. To cap the climax, Jackson's

party, casting aside the old and reputable name of Republican, boldly

chose for its title the term "Democrat," throwing down the gauntlet to

every conservative who doubted the omniscience of the people. All these

things worked together to evoke an opposition that was sharp and

determined.
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=Clay and the National Republicans.=--In this opposition movement,

leadership fell to Henry Clay, a son of Kentucky, rather than to Daniel

Webster of Massachusetts. Like Jackson, Clay was born in a home haunted

by poverty. Left fatherless early and thrown upon his own resources, he

went from Virginia into Kentucky where by sheer force of intellect he

rose to eminence in the profession of law. Without the martial gifts or

the martial spirit of Jackson, he slipped more easily into the social

habits of the East at the same time that he retained his hold on the

affections of the boisterous West. Farmers of Ohio, Indiana, and

Kentucky loved him; financiers of New York and Philadelphia trusted him.

He was thus a leader well fitted to gather the forces of opposition

into union against Jackson.

Around Clay's standard assembled a motley collection, representing every

species of political opinion, united by one tie only--hatred for "Old

Hickory." Nullifiers and less strenuous advocates of states' rights were

yoked with nationalists of Webster's school; ardent protectionists were

bound together with equally ardent free traders, all fraternizing in one

grand confusion of ideas under the title of "National Republicans." Thus

the ancient and honorable term selected by Jefferson and his party, now

abandoned by Jacksonian Democracy, was adroitly adopted to cover the

supporters of Clay. The platform of the party, however, embraced all the

old Federalist principles: protection for American industry; internal

improvements; respect for the Supreme Court; resistance to executive

tyranny; and denunciation of the spoils system. Though Jackson was

easily victorious in 1832, the popular vote cast for Clay should have

given him some doubts about the faith of "the whole people" in the

wisdom of his "reign."

=Van Buren and the Panic of 1837.=--Nothing could shake the General's

superb confidence. At the end of his second term he insisted on

selecting his own successor; at a national convention, chosen by party

voters, but packed with his office holders and friends, he nominated

Martin Van Buren of New York. Once more he proved his strength by

carrying the country for the Democrats. With a fine flourish, he

attended the inauguration of Van Buren and then retired, amid the

applause and tears of his devotees, to the Hermitage, his home in

Tennessee.

Fortunately for him, Jackson escaped the odium of a disastrous panic

which struck the country with terrible force in the following summer.

Among the contributory causes of this crisis, no doubt, were the

destruction of the bank and the issuance of the "specie circular" of

1836 which required the purchasers of public lands to pay for them in

coin, instead of the paper notes of state banks. Whatever the dominating

cause, the ruin was widespread. Bank after bank went under; boom towns

in the West collapsed; Eastern mills shut down; and working people in

the industrial centers, starving from unemployment, begged for relief.

Van Buren braved the storm, offering no measure of reform or assistance

to the distracted people. He did seek security for government funds by

suggesting the removal of deposits from private banks and the

establishment of an independent treasury system, with government

depositaries for public funds, in several leading cities. This plan was

finally accepted by Congress in 1840.

Had Van Buren been a captivating figure he might have lived down the

discredit of the panic unjustly laid at his door; but he was far from

being a favorite with the populace. Though a man of many talents, he

owed his position to the quiet and adept management of Jackson rather

than to his own personal qualities. The men of the frontier did not care

for him. They suspected that he ate from "gold plate" and they could not

forgive him for being an astute politician from New York. Still the

Democratic party, remembering Jackson's wishes, renominated him

unanimously in 1840 and saw him go down to utter defeat.

=The Whigs and General Harrison.=--By this time, the National

Republicans, now known as Whigs--a title taken from the party of

opposition to the Crown in England, had learned many lessons. Taking a

leaf out of the Democratic book, they nominated, not Clay of Kentucky,

well known for his views on the bank, the tariff, and internal

improvements, but a military hero, General William Henry Harrison, a man

of uncertain political opinions. Harrison, a son of a Virginia signer of

the Declaration of Independence, sprang into public view by winning a

battle more famous than important, "Tippecanoe"--a brush with the

Indians in Indiana. He added to his laurels by rendering praiseworthy

services during the war of 1812. When days of peace returned he was

rewarded by a grateful people with a seat in Congress. Then he retired

to quiet life in a little village near Cincinnati. Like Jackson he was

held to be a son of the South and the West. Like Jackson he was a

military hero, a lesser light, but still a light. Like Old Hickory he

rode into office on a tide of popular feeling against an Eastern man

accused of being something of an aristocrat. His personal popularity was

sufficient. The Whigs who nominated him shrewdly refused to adopt a

platform or declare their belief in anything. When some Democrat

asserted that Harrison was a backwoodsman whose sole wants were a jug of

hard cider and a log cabin, the Whigs treated the remark not as an

insult but as proof positive that Harrison deserved the votes of Jackson

men. The jug and the cabin they proudly transformed into symbols of the

campaign, and won for their chieftain 234 electoral votes, while Van

Buren got only sixty.

=Harrison and Tyler.=--The Hero of Tippecanoe was not long to enjoy the

fruits of his victory. The hungry horde of Whig office seekers descended

upon him like wolves upon the fold. If he went out they waylaid him; if

he stayed indoors, he was besieged; not even his bed chamber was spared.

He was none too strong at best and he took a deep cold on the day of his

inauguration. Between driving out Democrats and appeasing Whigs, he fell

mortally ill. Before the end of a month he lay dead at the capitol.

Harrison's successor, John Tyler, the Vice President, whom the Whigs had

nominated to catch votes in Virginia, was more of a Democrat than

anything else, though he was not partisan enough to please anybody. The

Whigs railed at him because he would not approve the founding of another

United States Bank. The Democrats stormed at him for refusing, until

near the end of his term, to sanction the annexation of Texas, which had

declared its independence of Mexico in 1836. His entire administration,

marked by unseemly wrangling, produced only two measures of importance.

The Whigs, flushed by victory, with the aid of a few protectionist

Democrats, enacted, in 1842, a new tariff law destroying the compromise

which had brought about the truce between the North and the South, in

the days of nullification. The distinguished leader of the Whigs, Daniel

Webster, as Secretary of State, in negotiation with Lord Ashburton

representing Great Britain, settled the long-standing dispute between

the two countries over the Maine boundary. A year after closing this

chapter in American diplomacy, Webster withdrew to private life, leaving

the President to endure alone the buffets of political fortune.

To the end, the Whigs regarded Tyler as a traitor to their cause; but

the judgment of history is that it was a case of the biter bitten. They

had nominated him for the vice presidency as a man of views acceptable

to Southern Democrats in order to catch their votes, little reckoning

with the chances of his becoming President. Tyler had not deceived them

and, thoroughly soured, he left the White House in 1845 not to appear in

public life again until the days of secession, when he espoused the

Southern confederacy. Jacksonian Democracy, with new leadership, serving

a new cause--slavery--was returned to power under James K. Polk, a

friend of the General from Tennessee. A few grains of sand were to run

through the hour glass before the Whig party was to be broken and

scattered as the Federalists had been more than a generation before.

THE INTERACTION OF AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN OPINION

=Democracy in England and France.=--During the period of Jacksonian

Democracy, as in all epochs of ferment, there was a close relation

between the thought of the New World and the Old. In England, the

successes of the American experiment were used as arguments in favor of

overthrowing the aristocracy which George III had manipulated with such

effect against America half a century before. In the United States, on

the other hand, conservatives like Chancellor Kent, the stout opponent

of manhood suffrage in New York, cited the riots of the British working

classes as a warning against admitting the same classes to a share in

the government of the United States. Along with the agitation of opinion

went epoch-making events. In 1832, the year of Jackson's second

triumph, the British Parliament passed its first reform bill, which

conferred the ballot--not on workingmen as yet--but on mill owners and

shopkeepers whom the landlords regarded with genuine horror. The initial

step was thus taken in breaking down the privileges of the landed

aristocracy and the rich merchants of England.

About the same time a popular revolution occurred in France. The Bourbon

family, restored to the throne of France by the allied powers after

their victory over Napoleon in 1815, had embarked upon a policy of

arbitrary government. To use the familiar phrase, they had learned

nothing and forgotten nothing. Charles X, who came to the throne in

1824, set to work with zeal to undo the results of the French

Revolution, to stifle the press, restrict the suffrage, and restore the

clergy and the nobility to their ancient rights. His policy encountered

equally zealous opposition and in 1830 he was overthrown. The popular

party, under the leadership of Lafayette, established, not a republic as

some of the radicals had hoped, but a "liberal" middle-class monarchy

under Louis Philippe. This second French Revolution made a profound

impression on Americans, convincing them that the whole world was moving

toward democracy. The mayor, aldermen, and citizens of New York City

joined in a great parade to celebrate the fall of the Bourbons. Mingled

with cheers for the new order in France were hurrahs for "the people's

own, Andrew Jackson, the Hero of New Orleans and President of the United

States!"

=European Interest in America.=--To the older and more settled

Europeans, the democratic experiment in America was either a menace or

an inspiration. Conservatives viewed it with anxiety; liberals with

optimism. Far-sighted leaders could see that the tide of democracy was

rising all over the world and could not be stayed. Naturally the country

that had advanced furthest along the new course was the place in which

to find arguments for and against proposals that Europe should make

experiments of the same character.

=De Tocqueville's \_Democracy in America\_.=--In addition to the casual

traveler there began to visit the United States the thoughtful observer

bent on finding out what manner of nation this was springing up in the

wilderness. Those who looked with sympathy upon the growing popular

forces of England and France found in the United States, in spite of

many blemishes and defects, a guarantee for the future of the people's

rule in the Old World. One of these, Alexis de Tocqueville, a French

liberal of mildly democratic sympathies, made a journey to this country

in 1831; he described in a very remarkable volume, \_Democracy in

America\_, the grand experiment as he saw it. On the whole he was

convinced. After examining with a critical eye the life and labor of the

American people, as well as the constitutions of the states and the

nation, he came to the conclusion that democracy with all its faults was

both inevitable and successful. Slavery he thought was a painful

contrast to the other features of American life, and he foresaw what

proved to be the irrepressible conflict over it. He believed that

through blundering the people were destined to learn the highest of all

arts, self-government on a grand scale. The absence of a leisure class,

devoted to no calling or profession, merely enjoying the refinements of

life and adding to its graces--the flaw in American culture that gave

deep distress to many a European leader--de Tocqueville thought a

necessary virtue in the republic. "Amongst a democratic people where

there is no hereditary wealth, every man works to earn a living, or has

worked, or is born of parents who have worked. A notion of labor is

therefore presented to the mind on every side as the necessary, natural,

and honest condition of human existence." It was this notion of a

government in the hands of people who labored that struck the French

publicist as the most significant fact in the modern world.

=Harriet Martineau's Visit to America.=--This phase of American life

also profoundly impressed the brilliant English writer, Harriet

Martineau. She saw all parts of the country, the homes of the rich and

the log cabins of the frontier; she traveled in stagecoaches, canal

boats, and on horseback; and visited sessions of Congress and auctions

at slave markets. She tried to view the country impartially and the

thing that left the deepest mark on her mind was the solidarity of the

people in one great political body. "However various may be the tribes

of inhabitants in those states, whatever part of the world may have been

their birthplace, or that of their fathers, however broken may be their

language, however servile or noble their employments, however exalted or

despised their state, all are declared to be bound together by equal

political obligations.... In that self-governing country all are held to

have an equal interest in the principles of its institutions and to be

bound in equal duty to watch their workings." Miss Martineau was also

impressed with the passion of Americans for land ownership and

contrasted the United States favorably with England where the tillers of

the soil were either tenants or laborers for wages.

=Adverse Criticism.=--By no means all observers and writers were

convinced that America was a success. The fastidious traveler, Mrs.

Trollope, who thought the English system of church and state was ideal,

saw in the United States only roughness and ignorance. She lamented the

"total and universal want of manners both in males and females," adding

that while "they appear to have clear heads and active intellects,"

there was "no charm, no grace in their conversation." She found

everywhere a lack of reverence for kings, learning, and rank. Other

critics were even more savage. The editor of the \_Foreign Quarterly\_

petulantly exclaimed that the United States was "a brigand

confederation." Charles Dickens declared the country to be "so maimed

and lame, so full of sores and ulcers that her best friends turn from

the loathsome creature in disgust." Sydney Smith, editor of the

\_Edinburgh Review\_, was never tired of trying his caustic wit at the

expense of America. "Their Franklins and Washingtons and all the other

sages and heroes of their revolution were born and bred subjects of the

king of England," he observed in 1820. "During the thirty or forty

years of their independence they have done absolutely nothing for the

sciences, for the arts, for literature, or even for the statesmanlike

studies of politics or political economy.... In the four quarters of the

globe who reads an American book? Or goes to an American play? Or looks

at an American picture or statue?" To put a sharp sting into his taunt

he added, forgetting by whose authority slavery was introduced and

fostered: "Under which of the old tyrannical governments of Europe is

every sixth man a slave whom his fellow creatures may buy and sell?"

Some Americans, while resenting the hasty and often superficial

judgments of European writers, winced under their satire and took

thought about certain particulars in the indictments brought against

them. The mass of the people, however, bent on the great experiment,

gave little heed to carping critics who saw the flaws and not the

achievements of our country--critics who were in fact less interested in

America than in preventing the rise and growth of democracy in Europe.
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=Questions=

1. By what devices was democracy limited in the first days of our

Republic?

2. On what grounds were the limitations defended? Attacked?

3. Outline the rise of political democracy in the United States.

4. Describe three important changes in our political system.

5. Contrast the Presidents of the old and the new generations.

6. Account for the unpopularity of John Adams' administration.

7. What had been the career of Andrew Jackson before 1829?

8. Sketch the history of the protective tariff and explain the theory

underlying it.

9. Explain the growth of Southern opposition to the tariff.

10. Relate the leading events connected with nullification in South

Carolina.

11. State Jackson's views and tell the outcome of the controversy.

12. Why was Jackson opposed to the bank? How did he finally destroy it?

13. The Whigs complained of Jackson's "executive tyranny." What did they

mean?

14. Give some of the leading events in Clay's career.

15. How do you account for the triumph of Harrison in 1840?

16. Why was Europe especially interested in America at this period? Who

were some of the European writers on American affairs?

=Research Topics=

=Jackson's Criticisms of the Bank.=--Macdonald, \_Documentary Source

Book\_, pp. 320-329.

=Financial Aspects of the Bank Controversy.=--Dewey, \_Financial History

of the United States\_, Sections 86-87; Elson, \_History of the United

States\_, pp. 492-496.

=Jackson's View of the Union.=--See his proclamation on nullification in

Macdonald, pp. 333-340.

=Nullification.=--McMaster, \_History of the People of the United

States\_, Vol. VI, pp. 153-182; Elson, pp. 487-492.

=The Webster-Hayne Debate.=--Analyze the arguments. Extensive extracts

are given in Macdonald's larger three-volume work, \_Select Documents of

United States History, 1776-1761\_, pp. 239-260.

=The Character of Jackson's Administration.=--Woodrow Wilson, \_History

of the American People\_, Vol. IV, pp. 1-87; Elson, pp. 498-501.

=The People in 1830.=--From contemporary writings in Hart, \_American

History Told by Contemporaries\_, Vol. III, pp. 509-530.

=Biographical Studies.=--Andrew Jackson, J.Q. Adams, Henry Clay, Daniel

Webster, J.C. Calhoun, and W.H. Harrison.

CHAPTER XII

THE MIDDLE BORDER AND THE GREAT WEST

"We shall not send an emigrant beyond the Mississippi in a hundred

years," exclaimed Livingston, the principal author of the Louisiana

purchase. When he made this astounding declaration, he doubtless had

before his mind's eye the great stretches of unoccupied lands between

the Appalachians and the Mississippi. He also had before him the history

of the English colonies, which told him of the two centuries required to

settle the seaboard region. To practical men, his prophecy did not seem

far wrong; but before the lapse of half that time there appeared beyond

the Mississippi a tier of new states, reaching from the Gulf of Mexico

to the southern boundary of Minnesota, and a new commonwealth on the

Pacific Ocean where American emigrants had raised the Bear flag of

California.

THE ADVANCE OF THE MIDDLE BORDER

=Missouri.=--When the middle of the nineteenth century had been reached,

the Mississippi River, which Daniel Boone, the intrepid hunter, had

crossed during Washington's administration "to escape from civilization"

in Kentucky, had become the waterway for a vast empire. The center of

population of the United States had passed to the Ohio Valley. Missouri,

with its wide reaches of rich lands, low-lying, level, and fertile, well

adapted to hemp raising, had drawn to its borders thousands of planters

from the old Southern states--from Virginia and the Carolinas as well as

from Kentucky and Tennessee. When the great compromise of 1820-21

admitted her to the union, wearing "every jewel of sovereignty," as a

florid orator announced, migratory slave owners were assured that their

property would be safe in Missouri. Along the western shore of the

Mississippi and on both banks of the Missouri to the uttermost limits of

the state, plantations tilled by bondmen spread out in broad expanses.

In the neighborhood of Jefferson City the slaves numbered more than a

fourth of the population.

Into this stream of migration from the planting South flowed another

current of land-tilling farmers; some from Kentucky, Tennessee, and

Mississippi, driven out by the onrush of the planters buying and

consolidating small farms into vast estates; and still more from the

East and the Old World. To the northwest over against Iowa and to the

southwest against Arkansas, these yeomen laid out farms to be tilled by

their own labor. In those regions the number of slaves seldom rose above

five or six per cent of the population. The old French post, St. Louis,

enriched by the fur trade of the Far West and the steamboat traffic of

the river, grew into a thriving commercial city, including among its

seventy-five thousand inhabitants in 1850 nearly forty thousand

foreigners, German immigrants from Pennsylvania and Europe being the

largest single element.

=Arkansas.=--Below Missouri lay the territory of Arkansas, which had

long been the paradise of the swarthy hunter and the restless

frontiersman fleeing from the advancing borders of farm and town. In

search of the life, wild and free, where the rifle supplied the game and

a few acres of ground the corn and potatoes, they had filtered into the

territory in an unending drift, "squatting" on the land. Without so much

as asking the leave of any government, territorial or national, they

claimed as their own the soil on which they first planted their feet.

Like the Cherokee Indians, whom they had as neighbors, whose very

customs and dress they sometimes adopted, the squatters spent their days

in the midst of rough plenty, beset by chills, fevers, and the ills of

the flesh, but for many years unvexed by political troubles or the

restrictions of civilized life.

Unfortunately for them, however, the fertile valleys of the Mississippi

and Arkansas were well adapted to the cultivation of cotton and tobacco

and their sylvan peace was soon broken by an invasion of planters. The

newcomers, with their servile workers, spread upward in the valley

toward Missouri and along the southern border westward to the Red River.

In time the slaves in the tier of counties against Louisiana ranged from

thirty to seventy per cent of the population. This marked the doom of

the small farmer, swept Arkansas into the main current of planting

politics, and led to a powerful lobby at Washington in favor of

admission to the union, a boon granted in 1836.

=Michigan.=--In accordance with a well-established custom, a free state

was admitted to the union to balance a slave state. In 1833, the people

of Michigan, a territory ten times the size of Connecticut, announced

that the time had come for them to enjoy the privileges of a

commonwealth. All along the southern border the land had been occupied

largely by pioneers from New England, who built prim farmhouses and

adopted the town-meeting plan of self-government after the fashion of

the old home. The famous post of Detroit was growing into a flourishing

city as the boats plying on the Great Lakes carried travelers, settlers,

and freight through the narrows. In all, according to the census, there

were more than ninety thousand inhabitants in the territory; so it was

not without warrant that they clamored for statehood. Congress, busy as

ever with politics, delayed; and the inhabitants of Michigan, unable to

restrain their impatience, called a convention, drew up a constitution,

and started a lively quarrel with Ohio over the southern boundary. The

hand of Congress was now forced. Objections were made to the new

constitution on the ground that it gave the ballot to all free white

males, including aliens not yet naturalized; but the protests were

overborne in a long debate. The boundary was fixed, and Michigan, though

shorn of some of the land she claimed, came into the union in 1837.

=Wisconsin.=--Across Lake Michigan to the west lay the territory of

Wisconsin, which shared with Michigan the interesting history of the

Northwest, running back into the heroic days when French hunters and

missionaries were planning a French empire for the great monarch, Louis

XIV. It will not be forgotten that the French rangers of the woods, the

black-robed priests, prepared for sacrifice, even to death, the trappers

of the French agencies, and the French explorers--Marquette, Joliet, and

Menard--were the first white men to paddle their frail barks through the

northern waters. They first blazed their trails into the black forests

and left traces of their work in the names of portages and little

villages. It was from these forests that Red Men in full war paint

journeyed far to fight under the \_fleur-de-lis\_ of France when the

soldiers of King Louis made their last stand at Quebec and Montreal

against the imperial arms of Britain. It was here that the British flag

was planted in 1761 and that the great Pontiac conspiracy was formed two

years later to overthrow British dominion.

When, a generation afterward, the Stars and Stripes supplanted the Union

Jack, the French were still almost the only white men in the region.

They were soon joined by hustling Yankee fur traders who did battle

royal against British interlopers. The traders cut their way through

forest trails and laid out the routes through lake and stream and over

portages for the settlers and their families from the states "back

East." It was the forest ranger who discovered the water power later

used to turn the busy mills grinding the grain from the spreading farm

lands. In the wake of the fur hunters, forest men, and farmers came

miners from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri crowding in to exploit the

lead ores of the northwest, some of them bringing slaves to work their

claims. Had it not been for the gold fever of 1849 that drew the

wielders of pick and shovel to the Far West, Wisconsin would early have

taken high rank among the mining regions of the country.

From a favorable point of vantage on Lake Michigan, the village of

Milwaukee, a center for lumber and grain transport and a place of entry

for Eastern goods, grew into a thriving city. It claimed twenty thousand

inhabitants, when in 1848 Congress admitted Wisconsin to the union.

Already the Germans, Irish, and Scandinavians had found their way into

the territory. They joined Americans from the older states in clearing

forests, building roads, transforming trails into highways, erecting

mills, and connecting streams with canals to make a network of routes

for the traffic that poured to and from the Great Lakes.

=Iowa and Minnesota.=--To the southwest of Wisconsin beyond the

Mississippi, where the tall grass of the prairies waved like the sea,

farmers from New England, New York, and Ohio had prepared Iowa for

statehood. A tide of immigration that might have flowed into Missouri

went northward; for freemen, unaccustomed to slavery and slave markets,

preferred the open country above the compromise line. With incredible

swiftness, they spread farms westward from the Mississippi. With Yankee

ingenuity they turned to trading on the river, building before 1836

three prosperous centers of traffic: Dubuque, Davenport, and Burlington.

True to their old traditions, they founded colleges and academies that

religion and learning might be cherished on the frontier as in the

states from which they came. Prepared for self-government, the Iowans

laid siege to the door of Congress and were admitted to the union in

1846.

Above Iowa, on the Mississippi, lay the territory of Minnesota--the home

of the Dakotas, the Ojibways, and the Sioux. Like Michigan and

Wisconsin, it had been explored early by the French scouts, and the

first white settlement was the little French village of Mendota. To the

people of the United States, the resources of the country were first

revealed by the historic journey of Zebulon Pike in 1805 and by American

fur traders who were quick to take advantage of the opportunity to ply

their arts of hunting and bartering in fresh fields. In 1839 an

American settlement was planted at Marina on the St. Croix, the outpost

of advancing civilization. Within twenty years, the territory, boasting

a population of 150,000, asked for admission to the union. In 1858 the

plea was granted and Minnesota showed her gratitude three years later by

being first among the states to offer troops to Lincoln in the hour of

peril.

ON TO THE PACIFIC--TEXAS AND THE MEXICAN WAR

=The Uniformity of the Middle West.=--There was a certain monotony about

pioneering in the Northwest and on the middle border. As the long

stretches of land were cleared or prepared for the plow, they were laid

out like checkerboards into squares of forty, eighty, one hundred sixty,

or more acres, each the seat of a homestead. There was a striking

uniformity also about the endless succession of fertile fields spreading

far and wide under the hot summer sun. No majestic mountains relieved

the sweep of the prairie. Few monuments of other races and antiquity

were there to awaken curiosity about the region. No sonorous bells in

old missions rang out the time of day. The chaffering Red Man bartering

blankets and furs for powder and whisky had passed farther on. The

population was made up of plain farmers and their families engaged in

severe and unbroken labor, chopping down trees, draining fever-breeding

swamps, breaking new ground, and planting from year to year the same

rotation of crops. Nearly all the settlers were of native American stock

into whose frugal and industrious lives the later Irish and German

immigrants fitted, on the whole, with little friction. Even the Dutch

oven fell before the cast-iron cooking stove. Happiness and sorrow,

despair and hope were there, but all encompassed by the heavy tedium of

prosaic sameness.
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=A Contrast in the Far West and Southwest.=--As George Rogers Clark and

Daniel Boone had stirred the snug Americans of the seaboard to seek

their fortunes beyond the Appalachians, so now Kit Carson, James Bowie,

Sam Houston, Davy Crockett, and John C. Fremont were to lead the way

into a new land, only a part of which was under the American flag. The

setting for this new scene in the westward movement was thrown out in a

wide sweep from the headwaters of the Mississippi to the banks of the

Rio Grande; from the valleys of the Sabine and Red rivers to Montana and

the Pacific slope. In comparison with the middle border, this region

presented such startling diversities that only the eye of faith could

foresee the unifying power of nationalism binding its communities with

the older sections of the country. What contrasts indeed! The blue grass

region of Kentucky or the rich, black soil of Illinois--the painted

desert, the home of the sage brush and the coyote! The level prairies of

Iowa--the mighty Rockies shouldering themselves high against the

horizon! The long bleak winters of Wisconsin--California of endless

summer! The log churches of Indiana or Illinois--the quaint missions of

San Antonio, Tucson, and Santa Barbara! The little state of

Delaware--the empire of Texas, one hundred and twenty times its area!

And scattered about through the Southwest were signs of an ancient

civilization--fragments of four-and five-story dwellings, ruined dams,

aqueducts, and broken canals, which told of once prosperous peoples

who, by art and science, had conquered the aridity of the desert and

lifted themselves in the scale of culture above the savages of the

plain.

The settlers of this vast empire were to be as diverse in their origins

and habits as those of the colonies on the coast had been. Americans of

English, Irish, and Scotch-Irish descent came as usual from the Eastern

states. To them were added the migratory Germans as well. Now for the

first time came throngs of Scandinavians. Some were to make their homes

on quiet farms as the border advanced against the setting sun. Others

were to be Indian scouts, trappers, fur hunters, miners, cowboys, Texas

planters, keepers of lonely posts on the plain and the desert, stage

drivers, pilots of wagon trains, pony riders, fruit growers, "lumber

jacks," and smelter workers. One common bond united them--a passion for

the self-government accorded to states. As soon as a few thousand

settlers came together in a single territory, there arose a mighty shout

for a position beside the staid commonwealths of the East and the South.

Statehood meant to the pioneers self-government, dignity, and the right

to dispose of land, minerals, and timber in their own way. In the quest

for this local autonomy there arose many a wordy contest in Congress,

each of the political parties lending a helping hand in the admission of

a state when it gave promise of adding new congressmen of the "right

political persuasion," to use the current phrase.

=Southern Planters and Texas.=--While the farmers of the North found the

broad acres of the Western prairies stretching on before them apparently

in endless expanse, it was far different with the Southern planters.

Ever active in their search for new fields as they exhausted the virgin

soil of the older states, the restless subjects of King Cotton quickly

reached the frontier of Louisiana. There they paused; but only for a

moment. The fertile land of Texas just across the boundary lured them on

and the Mexican republic to which it belonged extended to them a more

than generous welcome. Little realizing the perils lurking in a

"peaceful penetration," the authorities at Mexico City opened wide the

doors and made large grants of land to American contractors, who agreed

to bring a number of families into Texas. The omnipresent Yankee, in the

person of Moses Austin of Connecticut, hearing of this good news in the

Southwest, obtained a grant in 1820 to settle three hundred Americans

near Bexar--a commission finally carried out to the letter by his son

and celebrated in the name given to the present capital of the state of

Texas. Within a decade some twenty thousand Americans had crossed the

border.

=Mexico Closes the Door.=--The government of Mexico, unaccustomed to

such enterprise and thoroughly frightened by its extent, drew back in

dismay. Its fears were increased as quarrels broke out between the

Americans and the natives in Texas. Fear grew into consternation when

efforts were made by President Jackson to buy the territory for the

United States. Mexico then sought to close the flood gates. It stopped

all American colonization schemes, canceled many of the land grants, put

a tariff on farming implements, and abolished slavery. These barriers

were raised too late. A call for help ran through the western border of

the United States. The sentinels of the frontier answered. Davy

Crockett, the noted frontiersman, bear hunter, and backwoods politician;

James Bowie, the dexterous wielder of the knife that to this day bears

his name; and Sam Houston, warrior and pioneer, rushed to the aid of

their countrymen in Texas. Unacquainted with the niceties of diplomacy,

impatient at the formalities of international law, they soon made it

known that in spite of Mexican sovereignty they would be their own

masters.

=The Independence of Texas Declared.=--Numbering only about one-fourth

of the population in Texas, they raised the standard of revolt in 1836

and summoned a convention. Following in the footsteps of their

ancestors, they issued a declaration of independence signed mainly by

Americans from the slave states. Anticipating that the government of

Mexico would not quietly accept their word of defiance as final, they

dispatched a force to repel "the invading army," as General Houston

called the troops advancing under the command of Santa Ana, the Mexican

president. A portion of the Texan soldiers took their stand in the

Alamo, an old Spanish mission in the cottonwood trees in the town of San

Antonio. Instead of obeying the order to blow up the mission and retire,

they held their ground until they were completely surrounded and cut off

from all help. Refusing to surrender, they fought to the bitter end, the

last man falling a victim to the sword. Vengeance was swift. Within

three months General Houston overwhelmed Santa Ana at the San Jacinto,

taking him prisoner of war and putting an end to all hopes for the

restoration of Mexican sovereignty over Texas.

The Lone Star Republic, with Houston at the head, then sought admission

to the United States. This seemed at first an easy matter. All that was

required to bring it about appeared to be a treaty annexing Texas to the

union. Moreover, President Jackson, at the height of his popularity, had

a warm regard for General Houston and, with his usual sympathy for rough

and ready ways of doing things, approved the transaction. Through an

American representative in Mexico, Jackson had long and anxiously

labored, by means none too nice, to wring from the Mexican republic the

cession of the coveted territory. When the Texans took matters into

their own hands, he was more than pleased; but he could not marshal the

approval of two-thirds of the Senators required for a treaty of

annexation. Cautious as well as impetuous, Jackson did not press the

issue; he went out of office in 1837 with Texas uncertain as to her

future.

=Northern Opposition to Annexation.=--All through the North the

opposition to annexation was clear and strong. Anti-slavery agitators

could hardly find words savage enough to express their feelings.

"Texas," exclaimed Channing in a letter to Clay, "is but the first step

of aggression. I trust indeed that Providence will beat back and humble

our cupidity and ambition. I now ask whether as a people we are

prepared to seize on a neighboring territory for the end of extending

slavery? I ask whether as a people we can stand forth in the sight of

God, in the sight of nations, and adopt this atrocious policy? Sooner

perish! Sooner be our name blotted out from the record of nations!"

William Lloyd Garrison called for the secession of the Northern states

if Texas was brought into the union with slavery. John Quincy Adams

warned his countrymen that they were treading in the path of the

imperialism that had brought the nations of antiquity to judgment and

destruction. Henry Clay, the Whig candidate for President, taking into

account changing public sentiment, blew hot and cold, losing the state

of New York and the election of 1844 by giving a qualified approval of

annexation. In the same campaign, the Democrats boldly demanded the

"Reannexation of Texas," based on claims which the United States once

had to Spanish territory beyond the Sabine River.

=Annexation.=--The politicians were disposed to walk very warily. Van

Buren, at heart opposed to slavery extension, refused to press the issue

of annexation. Tyler, a pro-slavery Democrat from Virginia, by a strange

fling of fortune carried into office as a nominal Whig, kept his mind

firmly fixed on the idea of reelection and let the troublesome matter

rest until the end of his administration was in sight. He then listened

with favor to the voice of the South. Calhoun stated what seemed to be a

convincing argument: All good Americans have their hearts set on the

Constitution; the admission of Texas is absolutely essential to the

preservation of the union; it will give a balance of power to the South

as against the North growing with incredible swiftness in wealth and

population. Tyler, impressed by the plea, appointed Calhoun to the

office of Secretary of State in 1844, authorizing him to negotiate the

treaty of annexation--a commission at once executed. This scheme was

blocked in the Senate where the necessary two-thirds vote could not be

secured. Balked but not defeated, the advocates of annexation drew up a

joint resolution which required only a majority vote in both houses,

and in February of the next year, just before Tyler gave way to Polk,

they pushed it through Congress. So Texas, amid the groans of Boston and

the hurrahs of Charleston, folded up her flag and came into the union.

[Illustration: TEXAS AND THE TERRITORY IN DISPUTE]

=The Mexican War.=--The inevitable war with Mexico, foretold by the

abolitionists and feared by Henry Clay, ensued, the ostensible cause

being a dispute over the boundaries of the new state. The Texans claimed

all the lands down to the Rio Grande. The Mexicans placed the border of

Texas at the Nueces River and a line drawn thence in a northerly

direction. President Polk, accepting the Texan view of the controversy,

ordered General Zachary Taylor to move beyond the Nueces in defense of

American sovereignty. This act of power, deemed by the Mexicans an

invasion of their territory, was followed by an attack on our troops.

President Polk, not displeased with the turn of events, announced that

American blood had been "spilled on American soil" and that war existed

"by the act of Mexico." Congress, in a burst of patriotic fervor,

brushed aside the protests of those who deplored the conduct of the

government as wanton aggression on a weaker nation and granted money and

supplies to prosecute the war. The few Whigs in the House of

Representatives, who refused to vote in favor of taking up arms,

accepted the inevitable with such good grace as they could command. All

through the South and the West the war was popular. New England

grumbled, but gave loyal, if not enthusiastic, support to a conflict

precipitated by policies not of its own choosing. Only a handful of firm

objectors held out. James Russell Lowell, in his \_Biglow Papers\_, flung

scorn and sarcasm to the bitter end.

=The Outcome of the War.=--The foregone conclusion was soon reached.

General Taylor might have delivered the fatal thrust from northern

Mexico if politics had not intervened. Polk, anxious to avoid raising up

another military hero for the Whigs to nominate for President, decided

to divide the honors by sending General Scott to strike a blow at the

capital, Mexico City. The deed was done with speed and pomp and two

heroes were lifted into presidential possibilities. In the Far West a

third candidate was made, John C. Fremont, who, in cooperation with

Commodores Sloat and Stockton and General Kearney, planted the Stars and

Stripes on the Pacific slope.

In February, 1848, the Mexicans came to terms, ceding to the victor

California, Arizona, New Mexico, and more--a domain greater in extent

than the combined areas of France and Germany. As a salve to the wound,

the vanquished received fifteen million dollars in cash and the

cancellation of many claims held by American citizens. Five years later,

through the negotiations of James Gadsden, a further cession of lands

along the southern border of Arizona and New Mexico was secured on

payment of ten million dollars.

=General Taylor Elected President.=--The ink was hardly dry upon the

treaty that closed the war before "rough and ready" General Taylor, a

slave owner from Louisiana, "a Whig," as he said, "but not an ultra

Whig," was put forward as the Whig candidate for President. He himself

had not voted for years and he was fairly innocent in matters political.

The tariff, the currency, and internal improvements, with a magnificent

gesture he referred to the people's representatives in Congress,

offering to enforce the laws as made, if elected. Clay's followers

mourned. Polk stormed but could not win even a renomination at the hands

of the Democrats. So it came about that the hero of Buena Vista,

celebrated for his laconic order, "Give 'em a little more grape, Captain

Bragg," became President of the United States.

THE PACIFIC COAST AND UTAH

=Oregon.=--Closely associated in the popular mind with the contest about

the affairs of Texas was a dispute with Great Britain over the

possession of territory in Oregon. In their presidential campaign of

1844, the Democrats had coupled with the slogan, "The Reannexation of

Texas," two other cries, "The Reoccupation of Oregon," and "Fifty-four

Forty or Fight." The last two slogans were founded on American

discoveries and explorations in the Far Northwest. Their appearance in

politics showed that the distant Oregon country, larger in area than New

England, New York, and Pennsylvania combined, was at last receiving from

the nation the attention which its importance warranted.

\_Joint Occupation and Settlement.\_--Both England and the United States

had long laid claim to Oregon and in 1818 they had agreed to occupy the

territory jointly--a contract which was renewed ten years later for an

indefinite period. Under this plan, citizens of both countries were free

to hunt and settle anywhere in the region. The vanguard of British fur

traders and Canadian priests was enlarged by many new recruits, with

Americans not far behind them. John Jacob Astor, the resourceful New

York merchant, sent out trappers and hunters who established a trading

post at Astoria in 1811. Some twenty years later, American

missionaries--among them two very remarkable men, Jason Lee and Marcus

Whitman--were preaching the gospel to the Indians.

Through news from the fur traders and missionaries, Eastern farmers

heard of the fertile lands awaiting their plows on the Pacific slope;

those with the pioneering spirit made ready to take possession of the

new country. In 1839 a band went around by Cape Horn. Four years later a

great expedition went overland. The way once broken, others followed

rapidly. As soon as a few settlements were well established, the

pioneers held a mass meeting and agreed upon a plan of government. "We,

the people of Oregon territory," runs the preamble to their compact,

"for the purposes of mutual protection and to secure peace and

prosperity among ourselves, agree to adopt the following laws and

regulations until such time as the United States of America extend their

jurisdiction over us." Thus self-government made its way across the

Rocky Mountains.

[Illustration: THE OREGON COUNTRY AND THE DISPUTED BOUNDARY]

\_The Boundary Dispute with England Adjusted.\_--By this time it was

evident that the boundaries of Oregon must be fixed. Having made the

question an issue in his campaign, Polk, after his election in 1844,

pressed it upon the attention of the country. In his inaugural address

and his first message to Congress he reiterated the claim of the

Democratic platform that "our title to the whole territory of Oregon is

clear and unquestionable." This pretension Great Britain firmly

rejected, leaving the President a choice between war and compromise.

Polk, already having the contest with Mexico on his hands, sought and

obtained a compromise. The British government, moved by a hint from the

American minister, offered a settlement which would fix the boundary at

the forty-ninth parallel instead of "fifty-four forty," and give it

Vancouver Island. Polk speedily chose this way out of the dilemma.

Instead of making the decision himself, however, and drawing up a

treaty, he turned to the Senate for "counsel." As prearranged with party

leaders, the advice was favorable to the plan. The treaty, duly drawn in

1846, was ratified by the Senate after an acrimonious debate. "Oh!

mountain that was delivered of a mouse," exclaimed Senator Benton, "thy

name shall be fifty-four forty!" Thirteen years later, the southern part

of the territory was admitted to the union as the state of Oregon,

leaving the northern and eastern sections in the status of a territory.

=California.=--With the growth of the northwestern empire, dedicated by

nature to freedom, the planting interests might have been content, had

fortune not wrested from them the fair country of California. Upon this

huge territory they had set their hearts. The mild climate and fertile

soil seemed well suited to slavery and the planters expected to extend

their sway to the entire domain. California was a state of more than

155,000 square miles--about seventy times the size of the state of

Delaware. It could readily be divided into five or six large states, if

that became necessary to preserve the Southern balance of power.

\_Early American Relations with California.\_--Time and tide, it seems,

were not on the side of the planters. Already Americans of a far

different type were invading the Pacific slope. Long before Polk ever

dreamed of California, the Yankee with his cargo of notions had been

around the Horn. Daring skippers had sailed out of New England harbors

with a variety of goods, bent their course around South America to

California, on to China and around the world, trading as they went and

leaving pots, pans, woolen cloth, guns, boots, shoes, salt fish, naval

stores, and rum in their wake. "Home from Californy!" rang the cry in

many a New England port as a good captain let go his anchor on his

return from the long trading voyage in the Pacific.

[Illustration: THE OVERLAND TRAILS]

\_The Overland Trails.\_--Not to be outdone by the mariners of the deep,

western scouts searched for overland routes to the Pacific. Zebulon

Pike, explorer and pathfinder, by his expedition into the Southwest

during Jefferson's administration, had discovered the resources of New

Spain and had shown his countrymen how easy it was to reach Santa Fe

from the upper waters of the Arkansas River. Not long afterward, traders

laid open the route, making Franklin, Missouri, and later Fort

Leavenworth the starting point. Along the trail, once surveyed, poured

caravans heavily guarded by armed men against marauding Indians. Sand

storms often wiped out all signs of the route; hunger and thirst did

many a band of wagoners to death; but the lure of the game and the

profits at the end kept the business thriving. Huge stocks of cottons,

glass, hardware, and ammunition were drawn almost across the continent

to be exchanged at Santa Fe for furs, Indian blankets, silver, and

mules; and many a fortune was made out of the traffic.

\_Americans in California.\_--Why stop at Santa Fe? The question did not

long remain unanswered. In 1829, Ewing Young broke the path to Los

Angeles. Thirteen years later Fremont made the first of his celebrated

expeditions across plain, desert, and mountain, arousing the interest of

the entire country in the Far West. In the wake of the pathfinders went

adventurers, settlers, and artisans. By 1847, more than one-fifth of the

inhabitants in the little post of two thousand on San Francisco Bay were

from the United States. The Mexican War, therefore, was not the

beginning but the end of the American conquest of California--a conquest

initiated by Americans who went to till the soil, to trade, or to follow

some mechanical pursuit.

\_The Discovery of Gold.\_--As if to clinch the hold on California already

secured by the friends of free soil, there came in 1848 the sudden

discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in the Sacramento Valley. When this

exciting news reached the East, a mighty rush began to California, over

the trails, across the Isthmus of Panama, and around Cape Horn. Before

two years had passed, it is estimated that a hundred thousand people, in

search of fortunes, had arrived in California--mechanics, teachers,

doctors, lawyers, farmers, miners, and laborers from the four corners of

the earth.

[Illustration: \_From an old print\_
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\_California a Free State.\_--With this increase in population there

naturally resulted the usual demand for admission to the union. Instead

of waiting for authority from Washington, the Californians held a

convention in 1849 and framed their constitution. With impatience, the

delegates brushed aside the plea that "the balance of power between the

North and South" required the admission of their state as a slave

commonwealth. Without a dissenting voice, they voted in favor of freedom

and boldly made their request for inclusion among the United States.

President Taylor, though a Southern man, advised Congress to admit the

applicant. Robert Toombs of Georgia vowed to God that he preferred

secession. Henry Clay, the great compromiser, came to the rescue and in

1850 California was admitted as a free state.

=Utah.=--On the long road to California, in the midst of forbidding and

barren wastes, a religious sect, the Mormons, had planted a colony

destined to a stormy career. Founded in 1830 under the leadership of

Joseph Smith of New York, the sect had suffered from many cruel buffets

of fortune. From Ohio they had migrated into Missouri where they were

set upon and beaten. Some of them were murdered by indignant neighbors.

Harried out of Missouri, they went into Illinois only to see their

director and prophet, Smith, first imprisoned by the authorities and

then shot by a mob. Having raised up a cloud of enemies on account of

both their religious faith and their practice of allowing a man to have

more than one wife, they fell in heartily with the suggestion of a new

leader, Brigham Young, that they go into the Far West beyond the plains

of Kansas--into the forlorn desert where the wicked would cease from

troubling and the weary could be at rest, as they read in the Bible. In

1847, Young, with a company of picked men, searched far and wide until

he found a suitable spot overlooking the Salt Lake Valley. Returning to

Illinois, he gathered up his followers, now numbering several thousand,

and in one mighty wagon caravan they all went to their distant haven.

\_Brigham Young and His Economic System.\_--In Brigham Young the Mormons

had a leader of remarkable power who gave direction to the redemption of

the arid soil, the management of property, and the upbuilding of

industry. He promised them to make the desert blossom as the rose, and

verily he did it. He firmly shaped the enterprise of the colony along

co-operative lines, holding down the speculator and profiteer with one

hand and giving encouragement to the industrious poor with the other.

With the shrewdness befitting a good business man, he knew how to draw

the line between public and private interest. Land was given outright to

each family, but great care was exercised in the distribution so that

none should have great advantage over another. The purchase of supplies

and the sale of produce were carried on through a cooperative store, the

profits of which went to the common good. Encountering for the first

time in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race the problem of aridity, the

Mormons surmounted the most perplexing obstacles with astounding skill.

They built irrigation works by cooperative labor and granted water

rights to all families on equitable terms.

\_The Growth of Industries.\_--Though farming long remained the major

interest of the colony, the Mormons, eager to be self-supporting in

every possible way, bent their efforts also to manufacturing and later

to mining. Their missionaries, who hunted in the highways and byways of

Europe for converts, never failed to stress the economic advantages of

the sect. "We want," proclaimed President Young to all the earth, "a

company of woolen manufacturers to come with machinery and take the wool

from the sheep and convert it into the best clothes. We want a company

of potters; we need them; the clay is ready and the dishes wanted.... We

want some men to start a furnace forthwith; the iron, coal, and molders

are waiting.... We have a printing press and any one who can take good

printing and writing paper to the Valley will be a blessing to

themselves and the church." Roads and bridges were built; millions were

spent in experiments in agriculture and manufacturing; missionaries at a

huge cost were maintained in the East and in Europe; an army was kept

for defense against the Indians; and colonies were planted in the

outlying regions. A historian of Deseret, as the colony was called by

the Mormons, estimated in 1895 that by the labor of their hands the

people had produced nearly half a billion dollars in wealth since the

coming of the vanguard.

\_Polygamy Forbidden.\_--The hope of the Mormons that they might forever

remain undisturbed by outsiders was soon dashed to earth, for hundreds

of farmers and artisans belonging to other religious sects came to

settle among them. In 1850 the colony was so populous and prosperous

that it was organized into a territory of the United States and brought

under the supervision of the federal government. Protests against

polygamy were raised in the colony and at the seat of authority three

thousand miles away at Washington. The new Republican party in 1856

proclaimed it "the right and duty of Congress to prohibit in the

Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery." In

due time the Mormons had to give up their marriage practices which were

condemned by the common opinion of all western civilization; but they

kept their religious faith. Monuments to their early enterprise are seen

in the Temple and the Tabernacle, the irrigation works, and the great

wealth of the Church.

SUMMARY OF WESTERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL POLITICS

While the statesmen of the old generation were solving the problems of

their age, hunters, pioneers, and home seekers were preparing new

problems beyond the Alleghanies. The West was rising in population and

wealth. Between 1783 and 1829, eleven states were added to the original

thirteen. All but two were in the West. Two of them were in the

Louisiana territory beyond the Mississippi. Here the process of

colonization was repeated. Hardy frontier people cut down the forests,

built log cabins, laid out farms, and cut roads through the wilderness.

They began a new civilization just as the immigrants to Virginia or

Massachusetts had done two centuries earlier.

Like the seaboard colonists before them, they too cherished the spirit

of independence and power. They had not gone far upon their course

before they resented the monopoly of the presidency by the East. In 1829

they actually sent one of their own cherished leaders, Andrew Jackson,

to the White House. Again in 1840, in 1844, in 1848, and in 1860, the

Mississippi Valley could boast that one of its sons had been chosen for

the seat of power at Washington. Its democratic temper evoked a cordial

response in the towns of the East where the old aristocracy had been put

aside and artisans had been given the ballot.

For three decades the West occupied the interest of the nation. Under

Jackson's leadership, it destroyed the second United States Bank. When

he smote nullification in South Carolina, it gave him cordial support.

It approved his policy of parceling out government offices among party

workers--"the spoils system" in all its fullness. On only one point did

it really dissent. The West heartily favored internal improvements, the

appropriation of federal funds for highways, canals, and railways.

Jackson had misgivings on this question and awakened sharp criticism by

vetoing a road improvement bill.

From their point of vantage on the frontier, the pioneers pressed on

westward. They pushed into Texas, created a state, declared their

independence, demanded a place in the union, and precipitated a war with

Mexico. They crossed the trackless plain and desert, laying out trails

to Santa Fe, to Oregon, and to California. They were upon the scene when

the Mexican War brought California under the Stars and Stripes. They had

laid out their farms in the Willamette Valley when the slogan

"Fifty-Four Forty or Fight" forced a settlement of the Oregon boundary.

California and Oregon were already in the union when there arose the

Great Civil War testing whether this nation or any nation so conceived

and so dedicated could long endure.
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=Questions=

1. Give some of the special features in the history of Missouri,

Arkansas, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota.

2. Contrast the climate and soil of the Middle West and the Far West.

3. How did Mexico at first encourage American immigration?

4. What produced the revolution in Texas? Who led in it?

5. Narrate some of the leading events in the struggle over annexation to

the United States.

6. What action by President Polk precipitated war?

7. Give the details of the peace settlement with Mexico.

8. What is meant by the "joint occupation" of Oregon?

9. How was the Oregon boundary dispute finally settled?

10. Compare the American "invasion" of California with the migration

into Texas.

11. Explain how California became a free state.

12. Describe the early economic policy of the Mormons.
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PART V. SECTIONAL CONFLICT AND RECONSTRUCTION

CHAPTER XIII

THE RISE OF THE INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM

If Jefferson could have lived to see the Stars and Stripes planted on

the Pacific Coast, the broad empire of Texas added to the planting

states, and the valley of the Willamette waving with wheat sown by

farmers from New England, he would have been more than fortified in his

faith that the future of America lay in agriculture. Even a stanch old

Federalist like Gouverneur Morris or Josiah Quincy would have mournfully

conceded both the prophecy and the claim. Manifest destiny never seemed

more clearly written in the stars.

As the farmers from the Northwest and planters from the Southwest poured

in upon the floor of Congress, the party of Jefferson, christened anew

by Jackson, grew stronger year by year. Opponents there were, no doubt,

disgruntled critics and Whigs by conviction; but in 1852 Franklin

Pierce, the Democratic candidate for President, carried every state in

the union except Massachusetts, Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee. This

victory, a triumph under ordinary circumstances, was all the more

significant in that Pierce was pitted against a hero of the Mexican War,

General Scott, whom the Whigs, hoping to win by rousing the martial

ardor of the voters, had nominated. On looking at the election returns,

the new President calmly assured the planters that "the general

principle of reduction of duties with a view to revenue may now be

regarded as the settled policy of the country." With equal confidence,

he waved aside those agitators who devoted themselves "to the supposed

interests of the relatively few Africans in the United States." Like a

watchman in the night he called to the country: "All's well."

The party of Hamilton and Clay lay in the dust.

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

As pride often goeth before a fall, so sanguine expectation is sometimes

the symbol of defeat. Jackson destroyed the bank. Polk signed the tariff

bill of 1846 striking an effective blow at the principle of protection

for manufactures. Pierce promised to silence the abolitionists. His

successor was to approve a drastic step in the direction of free trade.

Nevertheless all these things left untouched the springs of power that

were in due time to make America the greatest industrial nation on the

earth; namely, vast national resources, business enterprise, inventive

genius, and the free labor supply of Europe. Unseen by the thoughtless,

unrecorded in the diaries of wiseacres, rarely mentioned in the speeches

of statesmen, there was swiftly rising such a tide in the affairs of

America as Jefferson and Hamilton never dreamed of in their little

philosophies.

=The Inventors.=--Watt and Boulton experimenting with steam in England,

Whitney combining wood and steel into a cotton gin, Fulton and Fitch

applying the steam engine to navigation, Stevens and Peter Cooper trying

out the "iron horse" on "iron highways," Slater building spinning mills

in Pawtucket, Howe attaching the needle to the flying wheel, Morse

spanning a continent with the telegraph, Cyrus Field linking the markets

of the new world with the old along the bed of the Atlantic, McCormick

breaking the sickle under the reaper--these men and a thousand more were

destroying in a mighty revolution of industry the world of the

stagecoach and the tallow candle which Washington and Franklin had

inherited little changed from the age of Caesar. Whitney was to make

cotton king. Watt and Fulton were to make steel and steam masters of the

world. Agriculture was to fall behind in the race for supremacy.

=Industry Outstrips Planting.=--The story of invention, that tribute to

the triumph of mind over matter, fascinating as a romance, need not be

treated in detail here. The effects of invention on social and political

life, multitudinous and never-ending, form the very warp and woof of

American progress from the days of Andrew Jackson to the latest hour.

Neither the great civil conflict--the clash of two systems--nor the

problems of the modern age can be approached without an understanding of

the striking phases of industrialism.

[Illustration: A NEW ENGLAND MILL BUILT IN 1793]

First and foremost among them was the uprush of mills managed by

captains of industry and manned by labor drawn from farms, cities, and

foreign lands. For every planter who cleared a domain in the Southwest

and gathered his army of bondmen about him, there rose in the North a

magician of steam and steel who collected under his roof an army of free

workers.

In seven league boots this new giant strode ahead of the Southern giant.

Between 1850 and 1859, to use dollars and cents as the measure of

progress, the value of domestic manufactures including mines and

fisheries rose from $1,019,106,616 to $1,900,000,000, an increase of

eighty-six per cent in ten years. In this same period the total

production of naval stores, rice, sugar, tobacco, and cotton, the

staples of the South, went only from $165,000,000, in round figures, to

$204,000,000. At the halfway point of the century, the capital invested

in industry, commerce, and cities far exceeded the value of all the farm

land between the Atlantic and the Pacific; thus the course of economy

had been reversed in fifty years. Tested by figures of production, King

Cotton had shriveled by 1860 to a petty prince in comparison, for each

year the captains of industry turned out goods worth nearly twenty times

all the bales of cotton picked on Southern plantations. Iron, boots and

shoes, and leather goods pouring from Northern mills surpassed in value

the entire cotton output.

=The Agrarian West Turns to Industry.=--Nor was this vast enterprise

confined to the old Northeast where, as Madison had sagely remarked,

commerce was early dominant. "Cincinnati," runs an official report in

1854, "appears to be a great central depot for ready-made clothing and

its manufacture for the Western markets may be said to be one of the

great trades of that city." There, wrote another traveler, "I heard the

crack of the cattle driver's whip and the hum of the factory: the West

and the East meeting." Louisville and St. Louis were already famous for

their clothing trades and the manufacture of cotton bagging. Five

hundred of the two thousand woolen mills in the country in 1860 were in

the Western states. Of the output of flour and grist mills, which almost

reached in value the cotton crop of 1850, the Ohio Valley furnished a

rapidly growing share. The old home of Jacksonian democracy, where

Federalists had been almost as scarce as monarchists, turned slowly

backward, as the needle to the pole, toward the principle of protection

for domestic industry, espoused by Hamilton and defended by Clay.

=The Extension of Canals and Railways.=--As necessary to mechanical

industry as steel and steam power was the great market, spread over a

wide and diversified area and knit together by efficient means of

transportation. This service was supplied to industry by the steamship,

which began its career on the Hudson in 1807; by the canals, of which

the Erie opened in 1825 was the most noteworthy; and by the railways,

which came into practical operation about 1830.

[Illustration: \_From an old print\_
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With sure instinct the Eastern manufacturer reached out for the markets

of the Northwest territory where free farmers were producing annually

staggering crops of corn, wheat, bacon, and wool. The two great canal

systems--the Erie connecting New York City with the waterways of the

Great Lakes and the Pennsylvania chain linking Philadelphia with the

headwaters of the Ohio--gradually turned the tide of trade from New

Orleans to the Eastern seaboard. The railways followed the same paths.

By 1860, New York had rail connections with Chicago and St. Louis, one

of the routes running through the Hudson and Mohawk valleys and along

the Great Lakes, the other through Philadelphia and Pennsylvania and

across the rich wheat fields of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Baltimore,

not to be outdone by her two rivals, reached out over the mountains for

the Western trade and in 1857 had trains running into St. Louis.

In railway enterprise the South took more interest than in canals, and

the friends of that section came to its aid. To offset the magnet

drawing trade away from the Mississippi Valley, lines were built from

the Gulf to Chicago, the Illinois Central part of the project being a

monument to the zeal and industry of a Democrat, better known in

politics than in business, Stephen A. Douglas. The swift movement of

cotton and tobacco to the North or to seaports was of common concern to

planters and manufacturers. Accordingly lines were flung down along the

Southern coast, linking Richmond, Charleston, and Savannah with the

Northern markets. Other lines struck inland from the coast, giving a

rail outlet to the sea for Raleigh, Columbia, Atlanta, Chattanooga,

Nashville, and Montgomery. Nevertheless, in spite of this enterprise,

the mileage of all the Southern states in 1860 did not equal that of

Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois combined.

=Banking and Finance.=--Out of commerce and manufactures and the

construction and operation of railways came such an accumulation of

capital in the Northern states as merchants of old never imagined. The

banks of the four industrial states of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New

York, and Pennsylvania in 1860 had funds greater than the banks in all

the other states combined. New York City had become the money market of

America, the center to which industrial companies, railway promoters,

farmers, and planters turned for capital to initiate and carry on their

operations. The banks of Louisiana, South Carolina, Georgia, and

Virginia, it is true, had capital far in excess of the banks of the

Northwest; but still they were relatively small compared with the

financial institutions of the East.

=The Growth of the Industrial Population.=--A revolution of such

magnitude in industry, transport, and finance, overturning as it did the

agrarian civilization of the old Northwest and reaching out to the very

borders of the country, could not fail to bring in its train

consequences of a striking character. Some were immediate and obvious.

Others require a fullness of time not yet reached to reveal their

complete significance. Outstanding among them was the growth of an

industrial population, detached from the land, concentrated in cities,

and, to use Jefferson's phrase, dependent upon "the caprices and

casualties of trade" for a livelihood. This was a result, as the great

Virginian had foreseen, which flowed inevitably from public and private

efforts to stimulate industry as against agriculture.
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It was estimated in 1860, on the basis of the census figures, that

mechanical production gave employment to 1,100,000 men and 285,000

women, making, if the average number of dependents upon them be

reckoned, nearly six million people or about one-sixth of the population

of the country sustained from manufactures. "This," runs the official

record, "was exclusive of the number engaged in the production of many

of the raw materials and of the food for manufacturers; in the

distribution of their products, such as merchants, clerks, draymen,

mariners, the employees of railroads, expresses, and steamboats; of

capitalists, various artistic and professional classes, as well as

carpenters, bricklayers, painters, and the members of other mechanical

trades not classed as manufactures. It is safe to assume, then, that

one-third of the whole population is supported, directly, or indirectly,

by manufacturing industry." Taking, however, the number of persons

directly supported by manufactures, namely about six millions, reveals

the astounding fact that the white laboring population, divorced from

the soil, already exceeded the number of slaves on Southern farms and

plantations.

\_Immigration.\_--The more carefully the rapid growth of the industrial

population is examined, the more surprising is the fact that such an

immense body of free laborers could be found, particularly when it is

recalled to what desperate straits the colonial leaders were put in

securing immigrants,--slavery, indentured servitude, and kidnapping

being the fruits of their necessities. The answer to the enigma is to be

found partly in European conditions and partly in the cheapness of

transportation after the opening of the era of steam navigation. Shrewd

observers of the course of events had long foreseen that a flood of

cheap labor was bound to come when the way was made easy. Some, among

them Chief Justice Ellsworth, went so far as to prophesy that white

labor would in time be so abundant that slavery would disappear as the

more costly of the two labor systems. The processes of nature were aided

by the policies of government in England and Germany.

\_The Coming of the Irish.\_--The opposition of the Irish people to the

English government, ever furious and irrepressible, was increased in the

mid forties by an almost total failure of the potato crop, the main

support of the peasants. Catholic in religion, they had been compelled

to support a Protestant church. Tillers of the soil by necessity, they

were forced to pay enormous tributes to absentee landlords in England

whose claim to their estates rested upon the title of conquest and

confiscation. Intensely loyal to their race, the Irish were subjected in

all things to the Parliament at London, in which their small minority of

representatives had little influence save in holding a balance of power

between the two contending English parties. To the constant political

irritation, the potato famine added physical distress beyond

description. In cottages and fields and along the highways the victims

of starvation lay dead by the hundreds, the relief which charity

afforded only bringing misery more sharply to the foreground. Those who

were fortunate enough to secure passage money sought escape to America.

In 1844 the total immigration into the United States was less than

eighty thousand; in 1850 it had risen by leaps and bounds to more than

three hundred thousand. Between 1820 and 1860 the immigrants from the

United Kingdom numbered 2,750,000, of whom more than one-half were

Irish. It has been said with a touch of exaggeration that the American

canals and railways of those days were built by the labor of Irishmen.

\_The German Migration.\_--To political discontent and economic distress,

such as was responsible for the coming of the Irish, may likewise be

traced the source of the Germanic migration. The potato blight that fell

upon Ireland visited the Rhine Valley and Southern Germany at the same

time with results as pitiful, if less extensive. The calamity inflicted

by nature was followed shortly by another inflicted by the despotic

conduct of German kings and princes. In 1848 there had occurred

throughout Europe a popular uprising in behalf of republics and

democratic government. For a time it rode on a full tide of success.

Kings were overthrown, or compelled to promise constitutional

government, and tyrannical ministers fled from their palaces. Then came

reaction. Those who had championed the popular cause were imprisoned,

shot, or driven out of the land. Men of attainments and distinction,

whose sole offense was opposition to the government of kings and

princes, sought an asylum in America, carrying with them to the land of

their adoption the spirit of liberty and democracy. In 1847 over fifty

thousand Germans came to America, the forerunners of a migration that

increased, almost steadily, for many years. The record of 1860 showed

that in the previous twenty years nearly a million and a half had found

homes in the United States. Far and wide they scattered, from the mills

and shops of the seacoast towns to the uttermost frontiers of Wisconsin

and Minnesota.

\_The Labor of Women and Children.\_--If the industries, canals, and

railways of the country were largely manned by foreign labor, still

important native sources must not be overlooked; above all, the women

and children of the New England textile districts. Spinning and weaving,

by a tradition that runs far beyond the written records of mankind,

belonged to women. Indeed it was the dexterous housewives, spinsters,

and boys and girls that laid the foundations of the textile industry in

America, foundations upon which the mechanical revolution was built. As

the wheel and loom were taken out of the homes to the factories operated

by water power or the steam engine, the women and, to use Hamilton's

phrase, "the children of tender years," followed as a matter of course.

"The cotton manufacture alone employs six thousand persons in Lowell,"

wrote a French observer in 1836; "of this number nearly five thousand

are young women from seventeen to twenty-four years of age, the

daughters of farmers from the different New England states." It was not

until after the middle of the century that foreign lands proved to be

the chief source from which workers were recruited for the factories of

New England. It was then that the daughters of the Puritans, outdone by

the competition of foreign labor, both of men and women, left the

spinning jenny and the loom to other hands.

=The Rise of Organized Labor.=--The changing conditions of American

life, marked by the spreading mill towns of New England, New York, and

Pennsylvania and the growth of cities like Buffalo, Cincinnati,

Louisville, St. Louis, Detroit, and Chicago in the West, naturally

brought changes, as Jefferson had prophesied, in "manners and morals." A

few mechanics, smiths, carpenters, and masons, widely scattered through

farming regions and rural villages, raise no such problems as tens of

thousands of workers collected in one center in daily intercourse,

learning the power of cooperation and union.

Even before the coming of steam and machinery, in the "good old days" of

handicrafts, laborers in many trades--printers, shoemakers, carpenters,

for example--had begun to draw together in the towns for the advancement

of their interests in the form of higher wages, shorter days, and

milder laws. The shoemakers of Philadelphia, organized in 1794,

conducted a strike in 1799 and held together until indicted seven years

later for conspiracy. During the twenties and thirties, local labor

unions sprang up in all industrial centers and they led almost

immediately to city federations of the several crafts.

As the thousands who were dependent upon their daily labor for their

livelihood mounted into the millions and industries spread across the

continent, the local unions of craftsmen grew into national craft

organizations bound together by the newspapers, the telegraph, and the

railways. Before 1860 there were several such national trade unions,

including the plumbers, printers, mule spinners, iron molders, and stone

cutters. All over the North labor leaders arose--men unknown to general

history but forceful and resourceful characters who forged links binding

scattered and individual workers into a common brotherhood. An attempt

was even made in 1834 to federate all the crafts into a permanent

national organization; but it perished within three years through lack

of support. Half a century had to elapse before the American Federation

of Labor was to accomplish this task.

All the manifestations of the modern labor movement had appeared, in

germ at least, by the time the mid-century was reached: unions, labor

leaders, strikes, a labor press, a labor political program, and a labor

political party. In every great city industrial disputes were a common

occurrence. The papers recorded about four hundred in two years,

1853-54, local affairs but forecasting economic struggles in a larger

field. The labor press seems to have begun with the founding of the

\_Mechanics' Free Press\_ in Philadelphia in 1828 and the establishment of

the New York \_Workingman's Advocate\_ shortly afterward. These

semi-political papers were in later years followed by regular trade

papers designed to weld together and advance the interests of particular

crafts. Edited by able leaders, these little sheets with limited

circulation wielded an enormous influence in the ranks of the workers.

=Labor and Politics.=--As for the political program of labor, the main

planks were clear and specific: the abolition of imprisonment for debt,

manhood suffrage in states where property qualifications still

prevailed, free and universal education, laws protecting the safety and

health of workers in mills and factories, abolition of lotteries, repeal

of laws requiring militia service, and free land in the West.

Into the labor papers and platforms there sometimes crept a note of

hostility to the masters of industry, a sign of bitterness that excited

little alarm while cheap land in the West was open to the discontented.

The Philadelphia workmen, in issuing a call for a local convention,

invited "all those of our fellow citizens who live by their own labor

and none other." In Newcastle county, Delaware, the association of

working people complained in 1830: "The poor have no laws; the laws are

made by the rich and of course for the rich." Here and there an

extremist went to the length of advocating an equal division of wealth

among all the people--the crudest kind of communism.

Agitation of this character produced in labor circles profound distrust

of both Whigs and Democrats who talked principally about tariffs and

banks; it resulted in attempts to found independent labor parties. In

Philadelphia, Albany, New York City, and New England, labor candidates

were put up for elections in the early thirties and in a few cases were

victorious at the polls. "The balance of power has at length got into

the hands of the working people, where it properly belongs,"

triumphantly exclaimed the \_Mechanics' Free Press\_ of Philadelphia in

1829. But the triumph was illusory. Dissensions appeared in the labor

ranks. The old party leaders, particularly of Tammany Hall, the

Democratic party organization in New York City, offered concessions to

labor in return for votes. Newspapers unsparingly denounced "trade union

politicians" as "demagogues," "levellers," and "rag, tag, and bobtail";

and some of them, deeming labor unrest the sour fruit of manhood

suffrage, suggested disfranchisement as a remedy. Under the influence

of concessions and attacks the political fever quickly died away, and

the end of the decade left no remnant of the labor political parties.

Labor leaders turned to a task which seemed more substantial and

practical, that of organizing workingmen into craft unions for the

definite purpose of raising wages and reducing hours.

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND NATIONAL POLITICS

=Southern Plans for Union with the West.=--It was long the design of

Southern statesmen like Calhoun to hold the West and the South together

in one political party. The theory on which they based their hope was

simple. Both sections were agricultural--the producers of raw materials

and the buyers of manufactured goods. The planters were heavy purchasers

of Western bacon, pork, mules, and grain. The Mississippi River and its

tributaries formed the natural channel for the transportation of heavy

produce southward to the plantations and outward to Europe. Therefore,

ran their political reasoning, the interests of the two sections were

one. By standing together in favor of low tariffs, they could buy their

manufactures cheaply in Europe and pay for them in cotton, tobacco, and

grain. The union of the two sections under Jackson's management seemed

perfect.

=The East Forms Ties with the West.=--Eastern leaders were not blind to

the ambitions of Southern statesmen. On the contrary, they also

recognized the importance of forming strong ties with the agrarian West

and drawing the produce of the Ohio Valley to Philadelphia and New York.

The canals and railways were the physical signs of this economic union,

and the results, commercial and political, were soon evident. By the

middle of the century, Southern economists noted the change, one of

them, De Bow, lamenting that "the great cities of the North have

severally penetrated the interior with artificial lines until they have

taken from the open and untaxed current of the Mississippi the commerce

produced on its borders." To this writer it was an astounding thing to

behold "the number of steamers that now descend the upper Mississippi

River, loaded to the guards with produce, as far as the mouth of the

Illinois River and then turn up that stream with their cargoes to be

shipped to New York \_via\_ Chicago. The Illinois canal has not only swept

the whole produce along the line of the Illinois River to the East, but

it is drawing the products of the upper Mississippi through the same

channel; thus depriving New Orleans and St. Louis of a rich portion of

their former trade."

If to any shippers the broad current of the great river sweeping down to

New Orleans offered easier means of physical communication to the sea

than the canals and railways, the difference could be overcome by the

credit which Eastern bankers were able to extend to the grain and

produce buyers, in the first instance, and through them to the farmers

on the soil. The acute Southern observer just quoted, De Bow, admitted

with evident regret, in 1852, that "last autumn, the rich regions of

Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois were flooded with the local bank notes of

the Eastern States, advanced by the New York houses on produce to be

shipped by way of the canals in the spring.... These moneyed facilities

enable the packer, miller, and speculator to hold on to their produce

until the opening of navigation in the spring and they are no longer

obliged, as formerly, to hurry off their shipments during the winter by

the way of New Orleans in order to realize funds by drafts on their

shipments. The banking facilities at the East are doing as much to draw

trade from us as the canals and railways which Eastern capital is

constructing." Thus canals, railways, and financial credit were swiftly

forging bonds of union between the old home of Jacksonian Democracy in

the West and the older home of Federalism in the East. The nationalism

to which Webster paid eloquent tribute became more and more real with

the passing of time. The self-sufficiency of the pioneer was broken down

as he began to watch the produce markets of New York and Philadelphia

where the prices of corn and hogs fixed his earnings for the year.

=The West and Manufactures.=--In addition to the commercial bonds

between the East and the West there was growing up a common interest in

manufactures. As skilled white labor increased in the Ohio Valley, the

industries springing up in the new cities made Western life more like

that of the industrial East than like that of the planting South.

Moreover, the Western states produced some important raw materials for

American factories, which called for protection against foreign

competition, notably, wool, hemp, and flax. As the South had little or

no foreign competition in cotton and tobacco, the East could not offer

protection for her raw materials in exchange for protection for

industries. With the West, however, it became possible to establish

reciprocity in tariffs; that is, for example, to trade a high rate on

wool for a high rate on textiles or iron.

=The South Dependent on the North.=--While East and West were drawing

together, the distinctions between North and South were becoming more

marked; the latter, having few industries and producing little save raw

materials, was being forced into the position of a dependent section. As

a result of the protective tariff, Southern planters were compelled to

turn more and more to Northern mills for their cloth, shoes, hats, hoes,

plows, and machinery. Nearly all the goods which they bought in Europe

in exchange for their produce came overseas to Northern ports, whence

transshipments were made by rail and water to Southern points of

distribution. Their rice, cotton, and tobacco, in as far as they were

not carried to Europe in British bottoms, were transported by Northern

masters. In these ways, a large part of the financial operations

connected with the sale of Southern produce and the purchase of goods in

exchange passed into the hands of Northern merchants and bankers who,

naturally, made profits from their transactions. Finally, Southern

planters who wanted to buy more land and more slaves on credit borrowed

heavily in the North where huge accumulations made the rates of interest

lower than the smaller banks of the South could afford.

=The South Reckons the Cost of Economic Dependence.=--As Southern

dependence upon Northern capital became more and more marked, Southern

leaders began to chafe at what they regarded as restraints laid upon

their enterprise. In a word, they came to look upon the planter as a

tribute-bearer to the manufacturer and financier. "The South,"

expostulated De Bow, "stands in the attitude of feeding ... a vast

population of [Northern] merchants, shipowners, capitalists, and others

who, without claims on her progeny, drink up the life blood of her

trade.... Where goes the value of our labor but to those who, taking

advantage of our folly, ship for us, buy for us, sell to us, and, after

turning our own capital to their profitable account, return laden with

our money to enjoy their easily earned opulence at home."

Southern statisticians, not satisfied with generalities, attempted to

figure out how great was this tribute in dollars and cents. They

estimated that the planters annually lent to Northern merchants the full

value of their exports, a hundred millions or more, "to be used in the

manipulation of foreign imports." They calculated that no less than

forty millions all told had been paid to shipowners in profits. They

reckoned that, if the South were to work up her own cotton, she would

realize from seventy to one hundred millions a year that otherwise went

North. Finally, to cap the climax, they regretted that planters spent

some fifteen millions a year pleasure-seeking in the alluring cities and

summer resorts of the North.

=Southern Opposition to Northern Policies.=--Proceeding from these

premises, Southern leaders drew the logical conclusion that the entire

program of economic measures demanded in the North was without exception

adverse to Southern interests and, by a similar chain of reasoning,

injurious to the corn and wheat producers of the West. Cheap labor

afforded by free immigration, a protective tariff raising prices of

manufactures for the tiller of the soil, ship subsidies increasing the

tonnage of carrying trade in Northern hands, internal improvements

forging new economic bonds between the East and the West, a national

banking system giving strict national control over the currency as a

safeguard against paper inflation--all these devices were regarded in

the South as contrary to the planting interest. They were constantly

compared with the restrictive measures by which Great Britain more than

half a century before had sought to bind American interests.

As oppression justified a war for independence once, statesmen argued,

so it can justify it again. "It is curious as it is melancholy and

distressing," came a broad hint from South Carolina, "to see how

striking is the analogy between the colonial vassalage to which the

manufacturing states have reduced the planting states and that which

formerly bound the Anglo-American colonies to the British empire....

England said to her American colonies: 'You shall not trade with the

rest of the world for such manufactures as are produced in the mother

country.' The manufacturing states say to their Southern colonies: 'You

shall not trade with the rest of the world for such manufactures as we

produce.'" The conclusion was inexorable: either the South must control

the national government and its economic measures, or it must declare,

as America had done four score years before, its political and economic

independence. As Northern mills multiplied, as railways spun their

mighty web over the face of the North, and as accumulated capital rose

into the hundreds of millions, the conviction of the planters and their

statesmen deepened into desperation.

=Efforts to Start Southern Industries Fail.=--A few of them, seeing the

predominance of the North, made determined efforts to introduce

manufactures into the South. To the leaders who were averse to secession

and nullification this seemed the only remedy for the growing disparity

in the power of the two sections. Societies for the encouragement of

mechanical industries were formed, the investment of capital was sought,

and indeed a few mills were built on Southern soil. The results were

meager. The natural resources, coal and water power, were abundant; but

the enterprise for direction and the skilled labor were wanting. The

stream of European immigration flowed North and West, not South. The

Irish or German laborer, even if he finally made his home in a city, had

before him, while in the North, the alternative of a homestead on

Western land. To him slavery was a strange, if not a repelling,

institution. He did not take to it kindly nor care to fix his home where

it flourished. While slavery lasted, the economy of the South was

inevitably agricultural. While agriculture predominated, leadership with

equal necessity fell to the planting interest. While the planting

interest ruled, political opposition to Northern economy was destined to

grow in strength.

=The Southern Theory of Sectionalism.=--In the opinion of the statesmen

who frankly represented the planting interest, the industrial system was

its deadly enemy. Their entire philosophy of American politics was

summed up in a single paragraph by McDuffie, a spokesman for South

Carolina: "Owing to the federative character of our government, the

great geographical extent of our territory, and the diversity of the

pursuits of our citizens in different parts of the union, it has so

happened that two great interests have sprung up, standing directly

opposed to each other. One of these consists of those manufactures which

the Northern and Middle states are capable of producing but which, owing

to the high price of labor and the high profits of capital in those

states, cannot hold competition with foreign manufactures without the

aid of bounties, directly or indirectly given, either by the general

government or by the state governments. The other of these interests

consists of the great agricultural staples of the Southern states which

can find a market only in foreign countries and which can be

advantageously sold only in exchange for foreign manufactures which come

in competition with those of the Northern and Middle states.... These

interests then stand diametrically and irreconcilably opposed to each

other. The interest, the pecuniary interest of the Northern

manufacturer, is directly promoted by every increase of the taxes

imposed upon Southern commerce; and it is unnecessary to add that the

interest of the Southern planter is promoted by every diminution of

taxes imposed upon the productions of their industry. If, under these

circumstances, the manufacturers were clothed with the power of imposing

taxes, at their pleasure, upon the foreign imports of the planter, no

doubt would exist in the mind of any man that it would have all the

characteristics of an absolute and unqualified despotism." The economic

soundness of this reasoning, a subject of interesting speculation for

the economist, is of little concern to the historian. The historical

point is that this opinion was widely held in the South and with the

progress of time became the prevailing doctrine of the planting

statesmen.

Their antagonism was deepened because they also became convinced, on

what grounds it is not necessary to inquire, that the leaders of the

industrial interest thus opposed to planting formed a consolidated

"aristocracy of wealth," bent upon the pursuit and attainment of

political power at Washington. "By the aid of various associated

interests," continued McDuffie, "the manufacturing capitalists have

obtained a complete and permanent control over the legislation of

Congress on this subject [the tariff].... Men confederated together upon

selfish and interested principles, whether in pursuit of the offices or

the bounties of the government, are ever more active and vigilant than

the great majority who act from disinterested and patriotic impulses.

Have we not witnessed it on this floor, sir? Who ever knew the tariff

men to divide on any question affecting their confederated interests?...

The watchword is, stick together, right or wrong upon every question

affecting the common cause. Such, sir, is the concert and vigilance and

such the combinations by which the manufacturing party, acting upon the

interests of some and the prejudices of others, have obtained a decided

and permanent control over public opinion in all the tariff states."

Thus, as the Southern statesman would have it, the North, in matters

affecting national policies, was ruled by a "confederated interest"

which menaced the planting interest. As the former grew in magnitude and

attached to itself the free farmers of the West through channels of

trade and credit, it followed as night the day that in time the planters

would be overshadowed and at length overborne in the struggle of giants.

Whether the theory was sound or not, Southern statesmen believed it and

acted upon it.
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=Questions=

1. What signs pointed to a complete Democratic triumph in 1852?

2. What is the explanation of the extraordinary industrial progress of

America?

3. Compare the planting system with the factory system.

4. In what sections did industry flourish before the Civil War? Why?

5. Show why transportation is so vital to modern industry and

agriculture.

6. Explain how it was possible to secure so many people to labor in

American industries.

7. Trace the steps in the rise of organized labor before 1860.

8. What political and economic reforms did labor demand?

9. Why did the East and the South seek closer ties with the West?

10. Describe the economic forces which were drawing the East and the

West together.

11. In what way was the South economically dependent upon the North?

12 State the national policies generally favored in the North and

condemned in the South.

13. Show how economic conditions in the South were unfavorable to

industry.

14. Give the Southern explanation of the antagonism between the North

and the South.

=Research Topics=

=The Inventions.=--Assign one to each student. Satisfactory accounts are

to be found in any good encyclopedia, especially the Britannica.

=River and Lake Commerce.=--Callender, \_Economic History of the United

States\_, pp. 313-326.

=Railways and Canals.=--Callender, pp. 326-344; 359-387. Coman,

\_Industrial History of the United States\_, pp. 216-225.

=The Growth of Industry, 1815-1840.=--Callender, pp. 459-471. From 1850

to 1860, Callender, pp. 471-486.

=Early Labor Conditions.=--Callender, pp. 701-718.

=Early Immigration.=--Callender, pp. 719-732.

=Clay's Home Market Theory of the Tariff.=--Callender, pp. 498-503.

=The New England View of the Tariff.=--Callender, pp. 503-514.

CHAPTER XIV

THE PLANTING SYSTEM AND NATIONAL POLITICS

James Madison, the father of the federal Constitution, after he had

watched for many days the battle royal in the national convention of

1787, exclaimed that the contest was not between the large and the small

states, but between the commercial North and the planting South. From

the inauguration of Washington to the election of Lincoln the sectional

conflict, discerned by this penetrating thinker, exercised a profound

influence on the course of American politics. It was latent during the

"era of good feeling" when the Jeffersonian Republicans adopted

Federalist policies; it flamed up in the contest between the Democrats

and Whigs. Finally it raged in the angry political quarrel which

culminated in the Civil War.

SLAVERY--NORTH AND SOUTH

=The Decline of Slavery in the North.=--At the time of the adoption of

the Constitution, slavery was lawful in all the Northern states except

Massachusetts. There were almost as many bondmen in New York as in

Georgia. New Jersey had more than Delaware or Tennessee, indeed nearly

as many as both combined. All told, however, there were only about forty

thousand in the North as against nearly seven hundred thousand in the

South. Moreover, most of the Northern slaves were domestic servants, not

laborers necessary to keep mills going or fields under cultivation.

There was, in the North, a steadily growing moral sentiment against the

system. Massachusetts abandoned it in 1780. In the same year,

Pennsylvania provided for gradual emancipation. New Hampshire, where

there had been only a handful, Connecticut with a few thousand

domestics, and New Jersey early followed these examples. New York, in

1799, declared that all children born of slaves after July 4 of that

year should be free, though held for a term as apprentices; and in 1827

it swept away the last vestiges of slavery. So with the passing of the

generation that had framed the Constitution, chattel servitude

disappeared in the commercial states, leaving behind only such

discriminations as disfranchisement or high property qualifications on

colored voters.

=The Growth of Northern Sentiment against Slavery.=--In both sections of

the country there early existed, among those more or less

philosophically inclined, a strong opposition to slavery on moral as

well as economic grounds. In the constitutional convention of 1787,

Gouverneur Morris had vigorously condemned it and proposed that the

whole country should bear the cost of abolishing it. About the same time

a society for promoting the abolition of slavery, under the presidency

of Benjamin Franklin, laid before Congress a petition that serious

attention be given to the emancipation of "those unhappy men who alone

in this land of freedom are degraded into perpetual bondage." When

Congress, acting on the recommendations of President Jefferson, provided

for the abolition of the foreign slave trade on January 1, 1808, several

Northern members joined with Southern members in condemning the system

as well as the trade. Later, colonization societies were formed to

encourage the emancipation of slaves and their return to Africa. James

Madison was president and Henry Clay vice president of such an

organization.

The anti-slavery sentiment of which these were the signs was

nevertheless confined to narrow circles and bore no trace of bitterness.

"We consider slavery your calamity, not your crime," wrote a

distinguished Boston clergyman to his Southern brethren, "and we will

share with you the burden of putting an end to it. We will consent that

the public lands shall be appropriated to this object.... I deprecate

everything which sows discord and exasperating sectional animosities."

=Uncompromising Abolition.=--In a little while the spirit of generosity

was gone. Just as Jacksonian Democracy rose to power there appeared a

new kind of anti-slavery doctrine--the dogmatism of the abolition

agitator. For mild speculation on the evils of the system was

substituted an imperious and belligerent demand for instant

emancipation. If a date must be fixed for its appearance, the year 1831

may be taken when William Lloyd Garrison founded in Boston his

anti-slavery paper, \_The Liberator\_. With singleness of purpose and

utter contempt for all opposing opinions and arguments, he pursued his

course of passionate denunciation. He apologized for having ever

"assented to the popular but pernicious doctrine of gradual abolition."

He chose for his motto: "Immediate and unconditional emancipation!" He

promised his readers that he would be "harsh as truth and uncompromising

as justice"; that he would not "think or speak or write with

moderation." Then he flung out his defiant call: "I am in earnest--I

will not equivocate--I will not excuse--I will not retreat a single

inch--and I will be heard....

'Such is the vow I take, so help me God.'"

Though Garrison complained that "the apathy of the people is enough to

make every statue leap from its pedestal," he soon learned how alive the

masses were to the meaning of his propaganda. Abolition orators were

stoned in the street and hissed from the platform. Their meeting places

were often attacked and sometimes burned to the ground. Garrison himself

was assaulted in the streets of Boston, finding refuge from the angry

mob behind prison bars. Lovejoy, a publisher in Alton, Illinois, for his

willingness to give abolition a fair hearing, was brutally murdered; his

printing press was broken to pieces as a warning to all those who

disturbed the nation's peace of mind. The South, doubly frightened by a

slave revolt in 1831 which ended in the murder of a number of men,

women, and children, closed all discussion of slavery in that section.

"Now," exclaimed Calhoun, "it is a question which admits of neither

concession nor compromise."

As the opposition hardened, the anti-slavery agitation gathered in force

and intensity. Whittier blew his blast from the New England hills:

"No slave-hunt in our borders--no pirate on our strand;

No fetters in the Bay State--no slave upon our land."

Lowell, looking upon the espousal of a great cause as the noblest aim of

his art, ridiculed and excoriated bondage in the South. Those

abolitionists, not gifted as speakers or writers, signed petitions

against slavery and poured them in upon Congress. The flood of them was

so continuous that the House of Representatives, forgetting its

traditions, adopted in 1836 a "gag rule" which prevented the reading of

appeals and consigned them to the waste basket. Not until the Whigs were

in power nearly ten years later was John Quincy Adams able, after a

relentless campaign, to carry a motion rescinding the rule.

How deep was the impression made upon the country by this agitation for

immediate and unconditional emancipation cannot be measured. If the

popular vote for those candidates who opposed not slavery, but its

extension to the territories, be taken as a standard, it was slight

indeed. In 1844, the Free Soil candidate, Birney, polled 62,000 votes

out of over a million and a half; the Free Soil vote of the next

campaign went beyond a quarter of a million, but the increase was due to

the strength of the leader, Martin Van Buren; four years afterward it

receded to 156,000, affording all the outward signs for the belief that

the pleas of the abolitionist found no widespread response among the

people. Yet the agitation undoubtedly ran deeper than the ballot box.

Young statesmen of the North, in whose hands the destiny of frightful

years was to lie, found their indifference to slavery broken and their

consciences stirred by the unending appeal and the tireless reiteration.

Charles Sumner afterward boasted that he read the \_Liberator\_ two years

before Wendell Phillips, the young Boston lawyer who cast aside his

profession to take up the dangerous cause.

=Early Southern Opposition to Slavery.=--In the South, the sentiment

against slavery was strong; it led some to believe that it would also

come to an end there in due time. Washington disliked it and directed in

his will that his own slaves should be set free after the death of his

wife. Jefferson, looking into the future, condemned the system by which

he also lived, saying: "Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure

when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of

the people that their liberties are the gift of God? Are they not to be

violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I

reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever." Nor

did Southern men confine their sentiments to expressions of academic

opinion. They accepted in 1787 the Ordinance which excluded slavery from

the Northwest territory forever and also the Missouri Compromise, which

shut it out of a vast section of the Louisiana territory.

=The Revolution in the Slave System.=--Among the representatives of

South Carolina and Georgia, however, the anti-slavery views of

Washington and Jefferson were by no means approved; and the drift of

Southern economy was decidedly in favor of extending and perpetuating,

rather than abolishing, the system of chattel servitude. The invention

of the cotton gin and textile machinery created a market for cotton

which the planters, with all their skill and energy, could hardly

supply. Almost every available acre was brought under cotton culture as

the small farmers were driven steadily from the seaboard into the

uplands or to the Northwest.

The demand for slaves to till the swiftly expanding fields was enormous.

The number of bondmen rose from 700,000 in Washington's day to more than

three millions in 1850. At the same time slavery itself was transformed.

Instead of the homestead where the same family of masters kept the same

families of slaves from generation to generation, came the plantation

system of the Far South and Southwest where masters were ever moving and

ever extending their holdings of lands and slaves. This in turn reacted

on the older South where the raising of slaves for the market became a

regular and highly profitable business.
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=Slavery Defended as a Positive Good.=--As the abolition agitation

increased and the planting system expanded, apologies for slavery became

fainter and fainter in the South. Then apologies were superseded by

claims that slavery was a beneficial scheme of labor control. Calhoun,

in a famous speech in the Senate in 1837, sounded the new note by

declaring slavery "instead of an evil, a good--a positive good." His

reasoning was as follows: in every civilized society one portion of the

community must live on the labor of another; learning, science, and the

arts are built upon leisure; the African slave, kindly treated by his

master and mistress and looked after in his old age, is better off than

the free laborers of Europe; and under the slave system conflicts

between capital and labor are avoided. The advantages of slavery in this

respect, he concluded, "will become more and more manifest, if left

undisturbed by interference from without, as the country advances in

wealth and numbers."

=Slave Owners Dominate Politics.=--The new doctrine of Calhoun was

eagerly seized by the planters as they came more and more to overshadow

the small farmers of the South and as they beheld the menace of

abolition growing upon the horizon. It formed, as they viewed matters, a

moral defense for their labor system--sound, logical, invincible. It

warranted them in drawing together for the protection of an institution

so necessary, so inevitable, so beneficent.

Though in 1850 the slave owners were only about three hundred and fifty

thousand in a national population of nearly twenty million whites, they

had an influence all out of proportion to their numbers. They were knit

together by the bonds of a common interest. They had leisure and wealth.

They could travel and attend conferences and conventions. Throughout the

South and largely in the North, they had the press, the schools, and the

pulpits on their side. They formed, as it were, a mighty union for the

protection and advancement of their common cause. Aided by those

mechanics and farmers of the North who stuck by Jacksonian Democracy

through thick and thin, the planters became a power in the federal

government. "We nominate Presidents," exultantly boasted a Richmond

newspaper; "the North elects them."

This jubilant Southern claim was conceded by William H. Seward, a

Republican Senator from New York, in a speech describing the power of

slavery in the national government. "A party," he said, "is in one sense

a joint stock association, in which those who contribute most direct the

action and management of the concern.... The slaveholders, contributing

in an overwhelming proportion to the strength of the Democratic party,

necessarily dictate and prescribe its policy." He went on: "The

slaveholding class has become the governing power in each of the

slaveholding states and it practically chooses thirty of the sixty-two

members of the Senate, ninety of the two hundred and thirty-three

members of the House of Representatives, and one hundred and five of the

two hundred and ninety-five electors of President and Vice-President of

the United States." Then he considered the slave power in the Supreme

Court. "That tribunal," he exclaimed, "consists of a chief justice and

eight associate justices. Of these, five were called from slave states

and four from free states. The opinions and bias of each of them were

carefully considered by the President and Senate when he was appointed.

Not one of them was found wanting in soundness of politics, according to

the slaveholder's exposition of the Constitution." Such was the Northern

view of the planting interest that, from the arena of national politics,

challenged the whole country in 1860.

[Illustration: DISTRIBUTION OF SLAVES IN THE SOUTHERN STATES]

SLAVERY IN NATIONAL POLITICS

=National Aspects of Slavery.=--It may be asked why it was that slavery,

founded originally on state law and subject to state government, was

drawn into the current of national affairs. The answer is simple. There

were, in the first place, constitutional reasons. The Congress of the

United States had to make all needful rules for the government of the

territories, the District of Columbia, the forts and other property

under national authority; so it was compelled to determine whether

slavery should exist in the places subject to its jurisdiction. Upon

Congress was also conferred the power of admitting new states; whenever

a territory asked for admission, the issue could be raised as to whether

slavery should be sanctioned or excluded. Under the Constitution,

provision was made for the return of runaway slaves; Congress had the

power to enforce this clause by appropriate legislation. Since the

control of the post office was vested in the federal government, it had

to face the problem raised by the transmission of abolition literature

through the mails. Finally citizens had the right of petition; it

inheres in all free government and it is expressly guaranteed by the

first amendment to the Constitution. It was therefore legal for

abolitionists to present to Congress their petitions, even if they asked

for something which it had no right to grant. It was thus impossible,

constitutionally, to draw a cordon around the slavery issue and confine

the discussion of it to state politics.

There were, in the second place, economic reasons why slavery was

inevitably drawn into the national sphere. It was the basis of the

planting system which had direct commercial relations with the North and

European countries; it was affected by federal laws respecting tariffs,

bounties, ship subsidies, banking, and kindred matters. The planters of

the South, almost without exception, looked upon the protective tariff

as a tribute laid upon them for the benefit of Northern industries. As

heavy borrowers of money in the North, they were generally in favor of

"easy money," if not paper currency, as an aid in the repayment of their

debts. This threw most of them into opposition to the Whig program for a

United States Bank. All financial aids to American shipping they stoutly

resisted, preferring to rely upon the cheaper service rendered by

English shippers. Internal improvements, those substantial ties that

were binding the West to the East and turning the traffic from New

Orleans to Philadelphia and New York, they viewed with alarm. Free

homesteads from the public lands, which tended to overbalance the South

by building free states, became to them a measure dangerous to their

interests. Thus national economic policies, which could not by any twist

or turn be confined to state control, drew the slave system and its

defenders into the political conflict that centered at Washington.

=Slavery and the Territories--the Missouri Compromise (1820).=--Though

men continually talked about "taking slavery out of politics," it could

not be done. By 1818 slavery had become so entrenched and the

anti-slavery sentiment so strong, that Missouri's quest for admission

brought both houses of Congress into a deadlock that was broken only by

compromise. The South, having half the Senators, could prevent the

admission of Missouri stripped of slavery; and the North, powerful in

the House of Representatives, could keep Missouri with slavery out of

the union indefinitely. An adjustment of pretensions was the last

resort. Maine, separated from the parent state of Massachusetts, was

brought into the union with freedom and Missouri with bondage. At the

same time it was agreed that the remainder of the vast Louisiana

territory north of the parallel of 36 o 30' should be, like the old

Northwest, forever free; while the southern portion was left to slavery.

In reality this was an immense gain for liberty. The area dedicated to

free farmers was many times greater than that left to the planters. The

principle was once more asserted that Congress had full power to prevent

slavery in the territories.

[Illustration: THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE]

=The Territorial Question Reopened by the Wilmot Proviso.=--To the

Southern leaders, the annexation of Texas and the conquest of Mexico

meant renewed security to the planting interest against the increasing

wealth and population of the North. Texas, it was said, could be divided

into four slave states. The new territories secured by the treaty of

peace with Mexico contained the promise of at least three more. Thus, as

each new free soil state knocked for admission into the union, the

South could demand as the price of its consent a new slave state. No

wonder Southern statesmen saw, in the annexation of Texas and the

conquest of Mexico, slavery and King Cotton triumphant--secure for all

time against adverse legislation. Northern leaders were equally

convinced that the Southern prophecy was true. Abolitionists and

moderate opponents of slavery alike were in despair. Texas, they

lamented, would fasten slavery upon the country forevermore. "No living

man," cried one, "will see the end of slavery in the United States!"

It so happened, however, that the events which, it was thought, would

secure slavery let loose a storm against it. A sign appeared first on

August 6, 1846, only a few months after war was declared on Mexico. On

that day, David Wilmot, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, introduced into

the House of Representatives a resolution to the effect that, as an

express and fundamental condition to the acquisition of any territory

from the republic of Mexico, slavery should be forever excluded from

every part of it. "The Wilmot Proviso," as the resolution was popularly

called, though defeated on that occasion, was a challenge to the South.

The South answered the challenge. Speaking in the House of

Representatives, Robert Toombs of Georgia boldly declared: "In the

presence of the living God, if by your legislation you seek to drive us

from the territories of California and New Mexico ... I am for

disunion." South Carolina announced that the day for talk had passed and

the time had come to join her sister states "in resisting the

application of the Wilmot Proviso at any and all hazards." A conference,

assembled at Jackson, Mississippi, in the autumn of 1849, called a

general convention of Southern states to meet at Nashville the following

summer. The avowed purpose was to arrest "the course of aggression" and,

if that was not possible, to provide "in the last resort for their

separate welfare by the formation of a compact and union that will

afford protection to their liberties and rights." States that had

spurned South Carolina's plea for nullification in 1832 responded to

this new appeal with alacrity--an augury of the secession to come.
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=The Great Debate of 1850.=--The temper of the country was white hot

when Congress convened in December, 1849. It was a memorable session,

memorable for the great men who took part in the debates and memorable

for the grand Compromise of 1850 which it produced. In the Senate sat

for the last time three heroic figures: Webster from the North, Calhoun

from the South, and Clay from a border state. For nearly forty years

these three had been leaders of men. All had grown old and gray in

service. Calhoun was already broken in health and in a few months was to

be borne from the political arena forever. Clay and Webster had but two

more years in their allotted span.

Experience, learning, statecraft--all these things they now marshaled in

a mighty effort to solve the slavery problem. On January 29, 1850, Clay

offered to the Senate a compromise granting concessions to both sides;

and a few days later, in a powerful oration, he made a passionate appeal

for a union of hearts through mutual sacrifices. Calhoun relentlessly

demanded the full measure of justice for the South: equal rights in the

territories bought by common blood; the return of runaway slaves as

required by the Constitution; the suppression of the abolitionists; and

the restoration of the balance of power between the North and the South.

Webster, in his notable "Seventh of March speech," condemned the Wilmot

Proviso, advocated a strict enforcement of the fugitive slave law,

denounced the abolitionists, and made a final plea for the Constitution,

union, and liberty. This was the address which called forth from

Whittier the poem, "Ichabod," deploring the fall of the mighty one whom

he thought lost to all sense of faith and honor.

=The Terms of the Compromise of 1850.=--When the debates were closed,

the results were totaled in a series of compromise measures, all of

which were signed in September, 1850, by the new President, Millard

Fillmore, who had taken office two months before on the death of Zachary

Taylor. By these acts the boundaries of Texas were adjusted and the

territory of New Mexico created, subject to the provision that all or

any part of it might be admitted to the union "with or without slavery

as their constitution may provide at the time of their admission." The

Territory of Utah was similarly organized with the same conditions as to

slavery, thus repudiating the Wilmot Proviso without guaranteeing

slavery to the planters. California was admitted as a free state under a

constitution in which the people of the territory had themselves

prohibited slavery.

The slave trade was abolished in the District of Columbia, but slavery

itself existed as before at the capital of the nation. This concession

to anti-slavery sentiment was more than offset by a fugitive slave law,

drastic in spirit and in letter. It placed the enforcement of its terms

in the hands of federal officers appointed from Washington and so

removed it from the control of authorities locally elected. It provided

that masters or their agents, on filing claims in due form, might

summarily remove their escaped slaves without affording their "alleged

fugitives" the right of trial by jury, the right to witness, the right

to offer any testimony in evidence. Finally, to "put teeth" into the

act, heavy penalties were prescribed for all who obstructed or assisted

in obstructing the enforcement of the law. Such was the Great Compromise

of 1850.
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=The Pro-slavery Triumph in the Election of 1852.=--The results of the

election of 1852 seemed to show conclusively that the nation was weary

of slavery agitation and wanted peace. Both parties, Whigs and

Democrats, endorsed the fugitive slave law and approved the Great

Compromise. The Democrats, with Franklin Pierce as their leader, swept

the country against the war hero, General Winfield Scott, on whom the

Whigs had staked their hopes. Even Webster, broken with grief at his

failure to receive the nomination, advised his friends to vote for

Pierce and turned away from politics to meditate upon approaching death.

The verdict of the voters would seem to indicate that for the time

everybody, save a handful of disgruntled agitators, looked upon Clay's

settlement as the last word. "The people, especially the business men of

the country," says Elson, "were utterly weary of the agitation and they

gave their suffrages to the party that promised them rest." The Free

Soil party, condemning slavery as "a sin against God and a crime against

man," and advocating freedom for the territories, failed to carry a

single state. In fact it polled fewer votes than it had four years

earlier--156,000 as against nearly 3,000,000, the combined vote of the

Whigs and Democrats. It is not surprising, therefore, that President

Pierce, surrounded in his cabinet by strong Southern sympathizers, could

promise to put an end to slavery agitation and to crush the abolition

movement in the bud.

=Anti-slavery Agitation Continued.=--The promise was more difficult to

fulfill than to utter. In fact, the vigorous execution of one measure

included in the Compromise--the fugitive slave law--only made matters

worse. Designed as security for the planters, it proved a powerful

instrument in their undoing. Slavery five hundred miles away on a

Louisiana plantation was so remote from the North that only the

strongest imagination could maintain a constant rage against it. "Slave

catching," "man hunting" by federal officers on the streets of

Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Chicago, or Milwaukee and in the hamlets

and villages of the wide-stretching farm lands of the North was another

matter. It brought the most odious aspects of slavery home to thousands

of men and women who would otherwise have been indifferent to the

system. Law-abiding business men, mechanics, farmers, and women, when

they saw peaceful negroes, who had resided in their neighborhoods

perhaps for years, torn away by federal officers and carried back to

bondage, were transformed into enemies of the law. They helped slaves to

escape; they snatched them away from officers who had captured them;

they broke open jails and carried fugitives off to Canada.

Assistance to runaway slaves, always more or less common in the North,

was by this time organized into a system. Regular routes, known as

"underground railways," were laid out across the free states into

Canada, and trusted friends of freedom maintained "underground stations"

where fugitives were concealed in the daytime between their long night

journeys. Funds were raised and secret agents sent into the South to

help negroes to flee. One negro woman, Harriet Tubman, "the Moses of her

people," with headquarters at Philadelphia, is accredited with nineteen

invasions into slave territory and the emancipation of three hundred

negroes. Those who worked at this business were in constant peril. One

underground operator, Calvin Fairbank, spent nearly twenty years in

prison for aiding fugitives from justice. Yet perils and prisons did not

stay those determined men and women who, in obedience to their

consciences, set themselves to this lawless work.
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From thrilling stories of adventure along the underground railways came

some of the scenes and themes of the novel by Harriet Beecher Stowe,

"Uncle Tom's Cabin," published two years after the Compromise of 1850.

Her stirring tale set forth the worst features of slavery in vivid word

pictures that caught and held the attention of millions of readers.

Though the book was unfair to the South and was denounced as a hideous

distortion of the truth, it was quickly dramatized and played in every

city and town throughout the North. Topsy, Little Eva, Uncle Tom, the

fleeing slave, Eliza Harris, and the cruel slave driver, Simon Legree,

with his baying blood hounds, became living specters in many a home that

sought to bar the door to the "unpleasant and irritating business of

slavery agitation."

THE DRIFT OF EVENTS TOWARD THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT

=Repeal of the Missouri Compromise.=--To practical men, after all, the

"rub-a-dub" agitation of a few abolitionists, an occasional riot over

fugitive slaves, and the vogue of a popular novel seemed of slight or

transient importance. They could point with satisfaction to the election

returns of 1852; but their very security was founded upon shifting

sands. The magnificent triumph of the pro-slavery Democrats in 1852

brought a turn in affairs that destroyed the foundations under their

feet. Emboldened by their own strength and the weakness of their

opponents, they now dared to repeal the Missouri Compromise. The leader

in this fateful enterprise was Stephen A. Douglas, Senator from

Illinois, and the occasion for the deed was the demand for the

organization of territorial government in the regions west of Iowa and

Missouri.

Douglas, like Clay and Webster before him, was consumed by a strong

passion for the presidency, and, to reach his goal, it was necessary to

win the support of the South. This he undoubtedly sought to do when he

introduced on January 4, 1854, a bill organizing the Nebraska territory

on the principle of the Compromise of 1850; namely, that the people in

the territory might themselves decide whether they would have slavery or

not. Unwittingly the avalanche was started.

After a stormy debate, in which important amendments were forced on

Douglas, the Kansas-Nebraska Bill became a law on May 30, 1854. The

measure created two territories, Kansas and Nebraska, and provided that

they, or territories organized out of them, could come into the union as

states "with or without slavery as their constitutions may prescribe at

the time of their admission." Not content with this, the law went on to

declare the Missouri Compromise null and void as being inconsistent with

the principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the states

and territories. Thus by a single blow the very heart of the continent,

dedicated to freedom by solemn agreement, was thrown open to slavery. A

desperate struggle between slave owners and the advocates of freedom was

the outcome in Kansas.

If Douglas fancied that the North would receive the overthrow of the

Missouri Compromise in the same temper that it greeted Clay's

settlement, he was rapidly disillusioned. A blast of rage, terrific in

its fury, swept from Maine to Iowa. Staid old Boston hanged him in

effigy with an inscription--"Stephen A. Douglas, author of the infamous

Nebraska bill: the Benedict Arnold of 1854." City after city burned him

in effigy until, as he himself said, he could travel from the Atlantic

coast to Chicago in the light of the fires. Thousands of Whigs and

Free-soil Democrats deserted their parties which had sanctioned or at

least tolerated the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, declaring that the startling

measure showed an evident resolve on the part of the planters to rule

the whole country. A gage of defiance was thrown down to the

abolitionists. An issue was set even for the moderate and timid who had

been unmoved by the agitation over slavery in the Far South. That issue

was whether slavery was to be confined within its existing boundaries or

be allowed to spread without interference, thereby placing the free

states in the minority and surrendering the federal government wholly to

the slave power.

=The Rise of the Republican Party.=--Events of terrible significance,

swiftly following, drove the country like a ship before a gale straight

into civil war. The Kansas-Nebraska Bill rent the old parties asunder

and called into being the Republican party. While that bill was pending

in Congress, many Northern Whigs and Democrats had come to the

conclusion that a new party dedicated to freedom in the territories must

follow the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Several places claim to be

the original home of the Republican party; but historians generally

yield it to Wisconsin. At Ripon in that state, a mass meeting of Whigs

and Democrats assembled in February, 1854, and resolved to form a new

party if the Kansas-Nebraska Bill should pass. At a second meeting a

fusion committee representing Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats was

formed and the name Republican--the name of Jefferson's old party--was

selected. All over the country similar meetings were held and political

committees were organized.

When the presidential campaign of 1856 began the Republicans entered the

contest. After a preliminary conference in Pittsburgh in February, they

held a convention in Philadelphia at which was drawn up a platform

opposing the extension of slavery to the territories. John C. Fremont,

the distinguished explorer, was named for the presidency. The results

of the election were astounding as compared with the Free-soil failure

of the preceding election. Prominent men like Longfellow, Washington

Irving, William Cullen Bryant, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and George William

Curtis went over to the new party and 1,341,264 votes were rolled up for

"free labor, free speech, free men, free Kansas, and Fremont."

Nevertheless the victory of the Democrats was decisive. Their candidate,

James Buchanan of Pennsylvania, was elected by a majority of 174 to 114

electoral votes.
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=The Dred Scott Decision (1857).=--In his inaugural, Buchanan vaguely

hinted that in a forthcoming decision the Supreme Court would settle one

of the vital questions of the day. This was a reference to the Dred

Scott case then pending. Scott was a slave who had been taken by his

master into the upper Louisiana territory, where freedom had been

established by the Missouri Compromise, and then carried back into his

old state of Missouri. He brought suit for his liberty on the ground

that his residence in the free territory made him free. This raised the

question whether the law of Congress prohibiting slavery north of 36 o

30' was authorized by the federal Constitution or not. The Court might

have avoided answering it by saying that even though Scott was free in

the territory, he became a slave again in Missouri by virtue of the law

of that state. The Court, however, faced the issue squarely. It held

that Scott had not been free anywhere and that, besides, the Missouri

Compromise violated the Constitution and was null and void.

The decision was a triumph for the South. It meant that Congress after

all had no power to abolish slavery in the territories. Under the decree

of the highest court in the land, that could be done only by an

amendment to the Constitution which required a two-thirds vote in

Congress and the approval of three-fourths of the states. Such an

amendment was obviously impossible--the Southern states were too

numerous; but the Republicans were not daunted. "We know," said Lincoln,

"the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we

shall do what we can to have it overrule this." Legislatures of Northern

states passed resolutions condemning the decision and the Republican

platform of 1860 characterized the dogma that the Constitution carried

slavery into the territories as "a dangerous political heresy at

variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself ... with

legislative and judicial precedent ... revolutionary in tendency and

subversive of the peace and harmony of the country."

=The Panic of 1857.=--In the midst of the acrimonious dispute over the

Dred Scott decision, came one of the worst business panics which ever

afflicted the country. In the spring and summer of 1857, fourteen

railroad corporations, including the Erie, Michigan Central, and the

Illinois Central, failed to meet their obligations; banks and insurance

companies, some of them the largest and strongest institutions in the

North, closed their doors; stocks and bonds came down in a crash on the

markets; manufacturing was paralyzed; tens of thousands of working

people were thrown out of employment; "hunger meetings" of idle men were

held in the cities and banners bearing the inscription, "We want

bread," were flung out. In New York, working men threatened to invade

the Council Chamber to demand "work or bread," and the frightened mayor

called for the police and soldiers. For this distressing state of

affairs many remedies were offered; none with more zeal and persistence

than the proposal for a higher tariff to take the place of the law of

March, 1857, a Democratic measure making drastic reductions in the rates

of duty. In the manufacturing districts of the North, the panic was

ascribed to the "Democratic assault on business." So an old issue was

again vigorously advanced, preparatory to the next presidential

campaign.

=The Lincoln-Douglas Debates.=--The following year the interest of the

whole country was drawn to a series of debates held in Illinois by

Lincoln and Douglas, both candidates for the United States Senate. In

the course of his campaign Lincoln had uttered his trenchant saying that

"a house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government

cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." At the same time he

had accused Douglas, Buchanan, and the Supreme Court of acting in

concert to make slavery national. This daring statement arrested the

attention of Douglas, who was making his campaign on the doctrine of

"squatter sovereignty;" that is, the right of the people of each

territory "to vote slavery up or down." After a few long-distance shots

at each other, the candidates agreed to meet face to face and discuss

the issues of the day. Never had such crowds been seen at political

meetings in Illinois. Farmers deserted their plows, smiths their forges,

and housewives their baking to hear "Honest Abe" and "the Little Giant."

The results of the series of debates were momentous. Lincoln clearly

defined his position. The South, he admitted, was entitled under the

Constitution to a fair, fugitive slave law. He hoped that there might be

no new slave states; but he did not see how Congress could exclude the

people of a territory from admission as a state if they saw fit to adopt

a constitution legalizing the ownership of slaves. He favored the

gradual abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and the total

exclusion of it from the territories of the United States by act of

Congress.

Moreover, he drove Douglas into a hole by asking how he squared

"squatter sovereignty" with the Dred Scott decision; how, in other

words, the people of a territory could abolish slavery when the Court

had declared that Congress, the superior power, could not do it under

the Constitution? To this baffling question Douglas lamely replied that

the inhabitants of a territory, by "unfriendly legislation," might make

property in slaves insecure and thus destroy the institution. This

answer to Lincoln's query alienated many Southern Democrats who believed

that the Dred Scott decision settled the question of slavery in the

territories for all time. Douglas won the election to the Senate; but

Lincoln, lifted into national fame by the debates, beat him in the

campaign for President two years later.

=John Brown's Raid.=--To the abolitionists the line of argument pursued

by Lincoln, including his proposal to leave slavery untouched in the

states where it existed, was wholly unsatisfactory. One of them, a grim

and resolute man, inflamed by a hatred for slavery in itself, turned

from agitation to violence. "These men are all talk; what is needed is

action--action!" So spoke John Brown of New York. During the sanguinary

struggle in Kansas he hurried to the frontier, gun and dagger in hand,

to help drive slave owners from the free soil of the West. There he

committed deeds of such daring and cruelty that he was outlawed and a

price put upon his head. Still he kept on the path of "action." Aided by

funds from Northern friends, he gathered a small band of his followers

around him, saying to them: "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

He went into Virginia in the autumn of 1859, hoping, as he explained,

"to effect a mighty conquest even though it be like the last victory of

Samson." He seized the government armory at Harper's Ferry, declared

free the slaves whom he found, and called upon them to take up arms in

defense of their liberty. His was a hope as forlorn as it was desperate.

Armed forces came down upon him and, after a hard battle, captured him.

Tried for treason, Brown was condemned to death. The governor of

Virginia turned a deaf ear to pleas for clemency based on the ground

that the prisoner was simply a lunatic. "This is a beautiful country,"

said the stern old Brown glancing upward to the eternal hills on his way

to the gallows, as calmly as if he were returning home from a long

journey. "So perish all such enemies of Virginia. All such enemies of

the Union. All such foes of the human race," solemnly announced the

executioner as he fulfilled the judgment of the law.

The raid and its grim ending deeply moved the country. Abolitionists

looked upon Brown as a martyr and tolled funeral bells on the day of his

execution. Longfellow wrote in his diary: "This will be a great day in

our history; the date of a new revolution as much needed as the old

one." Jefferson Davis saw in the affair "the invasion of a state by a

murderous gang of abolitionists bent on inciting slaves to murder

helpless women and children"--a crime for which the leader had met a

felon's death. Lincoln spoke of the raid as absurd, the deed of an

enthusiast who had brooded over the oppression of a people until he

fancied himself commissioned by heaven to liberate them--an attempt

which ended in "little else than his own execution." To Republican

leaders as a whole, the event was very embarrassing. They were taunted

by the Democrats with responsibility for the deed. Douglas declared his

"firm and deliberate conviction that the Harper's Ferry crime was the

natural, logical, inevitable result of the doctrines and teachings of

the Republican party." So persistent were such attacks that the

Republicans felt called upon in 1860 to denounce Brown's raid "as among

the gravest of crimes."

=The Democrats Divided.=--When the Democratic convention met at

Charleston in the spring of 1860, a few months after Brown's execution,

it soon became clear that there was danger ahead. Between the extreme

slavery advocates of the Far South and the so-called pro-slavery

Democrats of the Douglas type, there was a chasm which no appeals to

party loyalty could bridge. As the spokesman of the West, Douglas knew

that, while the North was not abolitionist, it was passionately set

against an extension of slavery into the territories by act of Congress;

that squatter sovereignty was the mildest kind of compromise acceptable

to the farmers whose votes would determine the fate of the election.

Southern leaders would not accept his opinion. Yancey, speaking for

Alabama, refused to palter with any plan not built on the proposition

that slavery was in itself right. He taunted the Northern Democrats with

taking the view that slavery was wrong, but that they could not do

anything about it. That, he said, was the fatal error--the cause of all

discord, the source of "Black Republicanism," as well as squatter

sovereignty. The gauntlet was thus thrown down at the feet of the

Northern delegates: "You must not apologize for slavery; you must

declare it right; you must advocate its extension." The challenge, so

bluntly put, was as bluntly answered. "Gentlemen of the South,"

responded a delegate from Ohio, "you mistake us. You mistake us. We will

not do it."

For ten days the Charleston convention wrangled over the platform and

balloted for the nomination of a candidate. Douglas, though in the lead,

could not get the two-thirds vote required for victory. For more than

fifty times the roll of the convention was called without a decision.

Then in sheer desperation the convention adjourned to meet later at

Baltimore. When the delegates again assembled, their passions ran as

high as ever. The division into two irreconcilable factions was

unchanged. Uncompromising delegates from the South withdrew to Richmond,

nominated John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky for President, and put forth

a platform asserting the rights of slave owners in the territories and

the duty of the federal government to protect them. The delegates who

remained at Baltimore nominated Douglas and endorsed his doctrine of

squatter sovereignty.

=The Constitutional Union Party.=--While the Democratic party was being

disrupted, a fragment of the former Whig party, known as the

Constitutional Unionists, held a convention at Baltimore and selected

national candidates: John Bell from Tennessee and Edward Everett from

Massachusetts. A melancholy interest attached to this assembly. It was

mainly composed of old men whose political views were those of Clay and

Webster, cherished leaders now dead and gone. In their platform they

sought to exorcise the evil spirit of partisanship by inviting their

fellow citizens to "support the Constitution of the country, the union

of the states, and the enforcement of the laws." The party that

campaigned on this grand sentiment only drew laughter from the Democrats

and derision from the Republicans and polled less than one-fourth the

votes.

=The Republican Convention.=--With the Whigs definitely forced into a

separate group, the Republican convention at Chicago was fated to be

sectional in character, although five slave states did send delegates.

As the Democrats were split, the party that had led a forlorn hope four

years before was on the high road to success at last. New and powerful

recruits were found. The advocates of a high protective tariff and the

friends of free homesteads for farmers and workingmen mingled with

enthusiastic foes of slavery. While still firm in their opposition to

slavery in the territories, the Republicans went on record in favor of a

homestead law granting free lands to settlers and approved customs

duties designed "to encourage the development of the industrial

interests of the whole country." The platform was greeted with cheers

which, according to the stenographic report of the convention, became

loud and prolonged as the protective tariff and homestead planks were

read.

Having skillfully drawn a platform to unite the North in opposition to

slavery and the planting system, the Republicans were also adroit in

their selection of a candidate. The tariff plank might carry

Pennsylvania, a Democratic state; but Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois were

equally essential to success at the polls. The southern counties of

these states were filled with settlers from Virginia, North Carolina,

and Kentucky who, even if they had no love for slavery, were no friends

of abolition. Moreover, remembering the old fight on the United States

Bank in Andrew Jackson's day, they were suspicious of men from the East.

Accordingly, they did not favor the candidacy of Seward, the leading

Republican statesman and "favorite son" of New York.

After much trading and discussing, the convention came to the conclusion

that Abraham Lincoln of Illinois was the most "available" candidate. He

was of Southern origin, born in Kentucky in 1809, a fact that told

heavily in the campaign in the Ohio Valley. He was a man of the soil,

the son of poor frontier parents, a pioneer who in his youth had labored

in the fields and forests, celebrated far and wide as "honest Abe, the

rail-splitter." It was well-known that he disliked slavery, but was no

abolitionist. He had come dangerously near to Seward's radicalism in his

"house-divided-against-itself" speech but he had never committed himself

to the reckless doctrine that there was a "higher law" than the

Constitution. Slavery in the South he tolerated as a bitter fact;

slavery in the territories he opposed with all his strength. Of his

sincerity there could be no doubt. He was a speaker and writer of

singular power, commanding, by the use of simple and homely language,

the hearts and minds of those who heard him speak or read his printed

words. He had gone far enough in his opposition to slavery; but not too

far. He was the man of the hour! Amid lusty cheers from ten thousand

throats, Lincoln was nominated for the presidency by the Republicans. In

the ensuing election, he carried all the free states except New Jersey.
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=Questions=

1. Trace the decline of slavery in the North and explain it.

2. Describe the character of early opposition to slavery.

3. What was the effect of abolition agitation?

4. Why did anti-slavery sentiment practically disappear in the South?

5. On what grounds did Calhoun defend slavery?

6. Explain how slave owners became powerful in politics.

7. Why was it impossible to keep the slavery issue out of national

politics?

8. Give the leading steps in the long controversy over slavery in the

territories.

9. State the terms of the Compromise of 1850 and explain its failure.

10. What were the startling events between 1850 and 1860?

11. Account for the rise of the Republican party. What party had used

the title before?

12. How did the Dred Scott decision become a political issue?

13. What were some of the points brought out in the Lincoln-Douglas

debates?

14. Describe the party division in 1860.

15. What were the main planks in the Republican platform?
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CHAPTER XV

THE CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION

"The irrepressible conflict is about to be visited upon us through the

Black Republican nominee and his fanatical, diabolical Republican

party," ran an appeal to the voters of South Carolina during the

campaign of 1860. If that calamity comes to pass, responded the governor

of the state, the answer should be a declaration of independence. In a

few days the suspense was over. The news of Lincoln's election came

speeding along the wires. Prepared for the event, the editor of the

Charleston \_Mercury\_ unfurled the flag of his state amid wild cheers

from an excited throng in the streets. Then he seized his pen and wrote:

"The tea has been thrown overboard; the revolution of 1860 has been

initiated." The issue was submitted to the voters in the choice of

delegates to a state convention called to cast off the yoke of the

Constitution.

THE SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY

=Secession.=--As arranged, the convention of South Carolina assembled in

December and without a dissenting voice passed the ordinance of

secession withdrawing from the union. Bells were rung exultantly, the

roar of cannon carried the news to outlying counties, fireworks lighted

up the heavens, and champagne flowed. The crisis so long expected had

come at last; even the conservatives who had prayed that they might

escape the dreadful crash greeted it with a sigh of relief.
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The border states (in purple) remained loyal.]

South Carolina now sent forth an appeal to her sister states--states

that had in Jackson's day repudiated nullification as leading to "the

dissolution of the union." The answer that came this time was in a

different vein. A month had hardly elapsed before five other

states--Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana--had

withdrawn from the union. In February, Texas followed. Virginia,

hesitating until the bombardment of Fort Sumter forced a conclusion,

seceded in April; but fifty-five of the one hundred and forty-three

delegates dissented, foreshadowing the creation of the new state of West

Virginia which Congress admitted to the union in 1863. In May, North

Carolina, Arkansas, and Tennessee announced their independence.

=Secession and the Theories of the Union.=--In severing their relations

with the union, the seceding states denied every point in the Northern

theory of the Constitution. That theory, as every one knows, was

carefully formulated by Webster and elaborated by Lincoln. According to

it, the union was older than the states; it was created before the

Declaration of Independence for the purpose of common defense. The

Articles of Confederation did but strengthen this national bond and the

Constitution sealed it forever. The federal government was not a

creature of state governments. It was erected by the people and derived

its powers directly from them. "It is," said Webster, "the people's

Constitution, the people's government; made for the people; made by the

people; and answerable to the people. The people of the United States

have declared that this Constitution shall be the supreme law." When a

state questions the lawfulness of any act of the federal government, it

cannot nullify that act or withdraw from the union; it must abide by the

decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. The union of these

states is perpetual, ran Lincoln's simple argument in the first

inaugural; the federal Constitution has no provision for its own

termination; it can be destroyed only by some action not provided for in

the instrument itself; even if it is a compact among all the states the

consent of all must be necessary to its dissolution; therefore no state

can lawfully get out of the union and acts of violence against the

United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary. This was the system

which he believed himself bound to defend by his oath of office

"registered in heaven."

All this reasoning Southern statesmen utterly rejected. In their opinion

the thirteen original states won their independence as separate and

sovereign powers. The treaty of peace with Great Britain named them all

and acknowledged them "to be free, sovereign, and independent states."

The Articles of Confederation very explicitly declared that "each state

retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence." The Constitution

was a "league of nations" formed by an alliance of thirteen separate

powers, each one of which ratified the instrument before it was put into

effect. They voluntarily entered the union under the Constitution and

voluntarily they could leave it. Such was the constitutional doctrine of

Hayne, Calhoun, and Jefferson Davis. In seceding, the Southern states

had only to follow legal methods, and the transaction would be correct

in every particular. So conventions were summoned, elections were held,

and "sovereign assemblies of the people" set aside the Constitution in

the same manner as it had been ratified nearly four score years before.

Thus, said the Southern people, the moral judgment was fulfilled and the

letter of the law carried into effect.
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=The Formation of the Confederacy.=--Acting on the call of Mississippi,

a congress of delegates from the seceded states met at Montgomery,

Alabama, and on February 8, 1861, adopted a temporary plan of union. It

selected, as provisional president, Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, a

man well fitted by experience and moderation for leadership, a graduate

of West Point, who had rendered distinguished service on the field of

battle in the Mexican War, in public office, and as a member of

Congress.

In March, a permanent constitution of the Confederate states was

drafted. It was quickly ratified by the states; elections were held in

November; and the government under it went into effect the next year.

This new constitution, in form, was very much like the famous instrument

drafted at Philadelphia in 1787. It provided for a President, a Senate,

and a House of Representatives along almost identical lines. In the

powers conferred upon them, however, there were striking differences.

The right to appropriate money for internal improvements was expressly

withheld; bounties were not to be granted from the treasury nor import

duties so laid as to promote or foster any branch of industry. The

dignity of the state, if any might be bold enough to question it, was

safeguarded in the opening line by the declaration that each acted "in

its sovereign and independent character" in forming the Southern union.

=Financing the Confederacy.=--No government ever set out upon its career

with more perplexing tasks in front of it. The North had a monetary

system; the South had to create one. The North had a scheme of taxation

that produced large revenues from numerous sources; the South had to

formulate and carry out a financial plan. Like the North, the

Confederacy expected to secure a large revenue from customs duties,

easily collected and little felt among the masses. To this expectation

the blockade of Southern ports inaugurated by Lincoln in April, 1861,

soon put an end. Following the precedent set by Congress under the

Articles of Confederation, the Southern Congress resorted to a direct

property tax apportioned among the states, only to meet the failure that

might have been foretold.

The Confederacy also sold bonds, the first issue bringing into the

treasury nearly all the specie available in the Southern banks. This

specie by unhappy management was early sent abroad to pay for supplies,

sapping the foundations of a sound currency system. Large amounts of

bonds were sold overseas, commanding at first better terms than those

of the North in the markets of London, Paris, and Amsterdam, many an

English lord and statesman buying with enthusiasm and confidence to

lament within a few years the proofs of his folly. The difficulties of

bringing through the blockade any supplies purchased by foreign bond

issues, however, nullified the effect of foreign credit and forced the

Confederacy back upon the device of paper money. In all approximately

one billion dollars streamed from the printing presses, to fall in value

at an alarming rate, reaching in January, 1863, the astounding figure of

fifty dollars in paper money for one in gold. Every known device was

used to prevent its depreciation, without result. To the issues of the

Confederate Congress were added untold millions poured out by the states

and by private banks.

=Human and Material Resources.=--When we measure strength for strength

in those signs of power--men, money, and supplies--it is difficult to

see how the South was able to embark on secession and war with such

confidence in the outcome. In the Confederacy at the final reckoning

there were eleven states in all, to be pitted against twenty-two; a

population of nine millions, nearly one-half servile, to be pitted

against twenty-two millions; a land without great industries to produce

war supplies and without vast capital to furnish war finances, joined in

battle with a nation already industrial and fortified by property worth

eleven billion dollars. Even after the Confederate Congress authorized

conscription in 1862, Southern man power, measured in numbers, was

wholly inadequate to uphold the independence which had been declared.

How, therefore, could the Confederacy hope to sustain itself against

such a combination of men, money, and materials as the North could

marshal?

=Southern Expectations.=--The answer to this question is to be found in

the ideas that prevailed among Southern leaders. First of all, they

hoped, in vain, to carry the Confederacy up to the Ohio River; and, with

the aid of Missouri, to gain possession of the Mississippi Valley, the

granary of the nation. In the second place, they reckoned upon a large

and continuous trade with Great Britain--the exchange of cotton for war

materials. They likewise expected to receive recognition and open aid

from European powers that looked with satisfaction upon the breakup of

the great American republic. In the third place, they believed that

their control over several staples so essential to Northern industry

would enable them to bring on an industrial crisis in the manufacturing

states. "I firmly believe," wrote Senator Hammond, of South Carolina, in

1860, "that the slave-holding South is now the controlling power of the

world; that no other power would face us in hostility. Cotton, rice,

tobacco, and naval stores command the world; and we have the sense to

know it and are sufficiently Teutonic to carry it out successfully. The

North without us would be a motherless calf, bleating about, and die of

mange and starvation."

There were other grounds for confidence. Having seized all of the

federal military and naval supplies in the South, and having left the

national government weak in armed power during their possession of the

presidency, Southern leaders looked to a swift war, if it came at all,

to put the finishing stroke to independence. "The greasy mechanics of

the North," it was repeatedly said, "will not fight." As to disparity in

numbers they drew historic parallels. "Our fathers, a mere handful,

overcame the enormous power of Great Britain," a saying of ex-President

Tyler, ran current to reassure the doubtful. Finally, and this point

cannot be too strongly emphasized, the South expected to see a weakened

and divided North. It knew that the abolitionists and the Southern

sympathizers were ready to let the Confederate states go in peace; that

Lincoln represented only a little more than one-third the voters of the

country; and that the vote for Douglas, Bell, and Breckinridge meant a

decided opposition to the Republicans and their policies.

=Efforts at Compromise.=--Republican leaders, on reviewing the same

facts, were themselves uncertain as to the outcome of a civil war and

made many efforts to avoid a crisis. Thurlow Weed, an Albany journalist

and politician who had done much to carry New York for Lincoln, proposed

a plan for extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific.

Jefferson Davis, warning his followers that a war if it came would be

terrible, was prepared to accept the offer; but Lincoln, remembering his

campaign pledges, stood firm as a rock against it. His followers in

Congress took the same position with regard to a similar settlement

suggested by Senator Crittenden of Kentucky.

Though unwilling to surrender his solemn promises respecting slavery in

the territories, Lincoln was prepared to give to Southern leaders a

strong guarantee that his administration would not interfere directly or

indirectly with slavery in the states. Anxious to reassure the South on

this point, the Republicans in Congress proposed to write into the

Constitution a declaration that no amendment should ever be made

authorizing the abolition of or interference with slavery in any state.

The resolution, duly passed, was sent forth on March 4, 1861, with the

approval of Lincoln; it was actually ratified by three states before the

storm of war destroyed it. By the irony of fate the thirteenth amendment

was to abolish, not guarantee, slavery.

THE WAR MEASURES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

=Raising the Armies.=--The crisis at Fort Sumter, on April 12-14, 1861,

forced the President and Congress to turn from negotiations to problems

of warfare. Little did they realize the magnitude of the task before

them. Lincoln's first call for volunteers, issued on April 15, 1861,

limited the number to 75,000, put their term of service at three months,

and prescribed their duty as the enforcement of the law against

combinations too powerful to be overcome by ordinary judicial process.

Disillusionment swiftly followed. The terrible defeat of the Federals at

Bull Run on July 21 revealed the serious character of the task before

them; and by a series of measures Congress put the entire man power of

the country at the President's command. Under these acts, he issued new

calls for volunteers. Early in August, 1862, he ordered a draft of

militiamen numbering 300,000 for nine months' service. The results were

disappointing--ominous--for only about 87,000 soldiers were added to the

army. Something more drastic was clearly necessary.

In March, 1863, Lincoln signed the inevitable draft law; it enrolled in

the national forces liable to military duty all able-bodied male

citizens and persons of foreign birth who had declared their intention

to become citizens, between the ages of twenty and forty-five

years--with exemptions on grounds of physical weakness and dependency.

From the men enrolled were drawn by lot those destined to active

service. Unhappily the measure struck a mortal blow at the principle of

universal liability by excusing any person who found a substitute for

himself or paid into the war office a sum, not exceeding three hundred

dollars, to be fixed by general order. This provision, so crass and so

obviously favoring the well-to-do, sowed seeds of bitterness which

sprang up a hundredfold in the North.

[Illustration: THE DRAFT RIOTS IN NEW YORK CITY]

The beginning of the drawings under the draft act in New York City, on

Monday, July 13, 1863, was the signal for four days of rioting. In the

course of this uprising, draft headquarters were destroyed; the office

of the \_Tribune\_ was gutted; negroes were seized, hanged, and shot; the

homes of obnoxious Unionists were burned down; the residence of the

mayor of the city was attacked; and regular battles were fought in the

streets between the rioters and the police. Business stopped and a large

part of the city passed absolutely into the control of the mob. Not

until late the following Wednesday did enough troops arrive to restore

order and enable the residents of the city to resume their daily

activities. At least a thousand people had been killed or wounded and

more than a million dollars' worth of damage done to property. The draft

temporarily interrupted by this outbreak was then resumed and carried

out without further trouble.

The results of the draft were in the end distinctly disappointing to the

government. The exemptions were numerous and the number who preferred

and were able to pay $300 rather than serve exceeded all expectations.

Volunteering, it is true, was stimulated, but even that resource could

hardly keep the thinning ranks of the army filled. With reluctance

Congress struck out the $300 exemption clause, but still favored the

well-to-do by allowing them to hire substitutes if they could find them.

With all this power in its hands the administration was able by January,

1865, to construct a union army that outnumbered the Confederates two to

one.

=War Finance.=--In the financial sphere the North faced immense

difficulties. The surplus in the treasury had been dissipated by 1861

and the tariff of 1857 had failed to produce an income sufficient to

meet the ordinary expenses of the government. Confronted by military and

naval expenditures of appalling magnitude, rising from $35,000,000 in

the first year of the war to $1,153,000,000 in the last year, the

administration had to tap every available source of income. The duties

on imports were increased, not once but many times, producing huge

revenues and also meeting the most extravagant demands of the

manufacturers for protection. Direct taxes were imposed on the states

according to their respective populations, but the returns were

meager--all out of proportion to the irritation involved. Stamp taxes

and taxes on luxuries, occupations, and the earnings of corporations

were laid with a weight that, in ordinary times, would have drawn forth

opposition of ominous strength. The whole gamut of taxation was run.

Even a tax on incomes and gains by the year, the first in the history of

the federal government, was included in the long list.

Revenues were supplemented by bond issues, mounting in size and interest

rate, until in October, at the end of the war, the debt stood at

$2,208,000,000. The total cost of the war was many times the money value

of all the slaves in the Southern states. To the debt must be added

nearly half a billion dollars in "greenbacks"--paper money issued by

Congress in desperation as bond sales and revenues from taxes failed to

meet the rising expenditures. This currency issued at par on

questionable warrant from the Constitution, like all such paper, quickly

began to decline until in the worst fortunes of 1864 one dollar in gold

was worth nearly three in greenbacks.

=The Blockade of Southern Ports.=--Four days after his call for

volunteers, April 19, 1861, President Lincoln issued a proclamation

blockading the ports of the Southern Confederacy. Later the blockade was

extended to Virginia and North Carolina, as they withdrew from the

union. Vessels attempting to enter or leave these ports, if they

disregarded the warnings of a blockading ship, were to be captured and

brought as prizes to the nearest convenient port. To make the order

effective, immediate steps were taken to increase the naval forces,

depleted by neglect, until the entire coast line was patrolled with such

a number of ships that it was a rare captain who ventured to run the

gantlet. The collision between the \_Merrimac\_ and the \_Monitor\_ in

March, 1862, sealed the fate of the Confederacy. The exploits of the

union navy are recorded in the falling export of cotton: $202,000,000 in

1860; $42,000,000 in 1861; and $4,000,000 in 1862.

The deadly effect of this paralysis of trade upon Southern war power may

be readily imagined. Foreign loans, payable in cotton, could be

negotiated but not paid off. Supplies could be purchased on credit but

not brought through the drag net. With extreme difficulty could the

Confederate government secure even paper for the issue of money and

bonds. Publishers, in despair at the loss of supplies, were finally

driven to the use of brown wrapping paper and wall paper. As the

railways and rolling stock wore out, it became impossible to renew them

from England or France. Unable to export their cotton, planters on the

seaboard burned it in what were called "fires of patriotism." In their

lurid light the fatal weakness of Southern economy stood revealed.
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=Diplomacy.=--The war had not advanced far before the federal government

became involved in many perplexing problems of diplomacy in Europe. The

Confederacy early turned to England and France for financial aid and for

recognition as an independent power. Davis believed that the industrial

crisis created by the cotton blockade would in time literally compel

Europe to intervene in order to get this essential staple. The crisis

came as he expected but not the result. Thousands of English textile

workers were thrown out of employment; and yet, while on the point of

starvation, they adopted resolutions favoring the North instead of

petitioning their government to aid the South by breaking the blockade.

With the ruling classes it was far otherwise. Napoleon III, the Emperor

of the French, was eager to help in disrupting the American republic; if

he could have won England's support, he would have carried out his

designs. As it turned out he found plenty of sympathy across the Channel

but not open and official cooperation. According to the eminent

historian, Rhodes, "four-fifths of the British House of Lords and most

members of the House of Commons were favorable to the Confederacy and

anxious for its triumph." Late in 1862 the British ministers, thus

sustained, were on the point of recognizing the independence of the

Confederacy. Had it not been for their extreme caution, for the constant

and harassing criticism by English friends of the United States--like

John Bright--and for the victories of Vicksburg and Gettysburg, both

England and France would have doubtless declared the Confederacy to be

one of the independent powers of the earth.
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While stopping short of recognizing its independence, England and France

took several steps that were in favor of the South. In proclaiming

neutrality, they early accepted the Confederates as "belligerents" and

accorded them the rights of people at war--a measure which aroused anger

in the North at first but was later admitted to be sound. Otherwise

Confederates taken in battle would have been regarded as "rebels" or

"traitors" to be hanged or shot. Napoleon III proposed to Russia in 1861

a coalition of powers against the North, only to meet a firm refusal.

The next year he suggested intervention to Great Britain, encountering

this time a conditional rejection of his plans. In 1863, not daunted by

rebuffs, he offered his services to Lincoln as a mediator, receiving in

reply a polite letter declining his proposal and a sharp resolution from

Congress suggesting that he attend to his own affairs.

In both England and France the governments pursued a policy of

friendliness to the Confederate agents. The British ministry, with

indifference if not connivance, permitted rams and ships to be built in

British docks and allowed them to escape to play havoc under the

Confederate flag with American commerce. One of them, the \_Alabama\_,

built in Liverpool by a British firm and paid for by bonds sold in

England, ran an extraordinary career and threatened to break the

blockade. The course followed by the British government, against the

protests of the American minister in London, was later regretted. By an

award of a tribunal of arbitration at Geneva in 1872, Great Britain was

required to pay the huge sum of $15,500,000 to cover the damages wrought

by Confederate cruisers fitted out in England.
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In all fairness it should be said that the conduct of the North

contributed to the irritation between the two countries. Seward, the

Secretary of State, was vindictive in dealing with Great Britain; had it

not been for the moderation of Lincoln, he would have pursued a course

verging in the direction of open war. The New York and Boston papers

were severe in their attacks on England. Words were, on one occasion at

least, accompanied by an act savoring of open hostility. In November,

1861, Captain Wilkes, commanding a union vessel, overhauled the British

steamer \_Trent\_, and carried off by force two Confederate agents, Mason

and Slidell, sent by President Davis to represent the Confederacy at

London and Paris respectively. This was a clear violation of the right

of merchant vessels to be immune from search and impressment; and, in

answer to the demand of Great Britain for the release of the two men,

the United States conceded that it was in the wrong. It surrendered the

two Confederate agents to a British vessel for safe conduct abroad, and

made appropriate apologies.

=Emancipation.=--Among the extreme war measures adopted by the Northern

government must be counted the emancipation of the slaves in the states

in arms against the union. This step was early and repeatedly suggested

to Lincoln by the abolitionists; but was steadily put aside. He knew

that the abolitionists were a mere handful, that emancipation might

drive the border states into secession, and that the Northern soldiers

had enlisted to save the union. Moreover, he had before him a solemn

resolution passed by Congress on July 22, 1861, declaring the sole

purpose of the war to be the salvation of the union and disavowing any

intention of interfering with slavery.

The federal government, though pledged to the preservation of slavery,

soon found itself beaten back upon its course and out upon a new tack.

Before a year had elapsed, namely on April 10, 1862, Congress resolved

that financial aid should be given to any state that might adopt gradual

emancipation. Six days later it abolished slavery in the District of

Columbia. Two short months elapsed. On June 19, 1862, it swept slavery

forever from the territories of the United States. Chief Justice Taney

still lived, the Dred Scott decision stood as written in the book, but

the Constitution had been re-read in the light of the Civil War. The

drift of public sentiment in the North was being revealed.

While these measures were pending in Congress, Lincoln was slowly making

up his mind. By July of that year he had come to his great decision.

Near the end of that month he read to his cabinet the draft of a

proclamation of emancipation; but he laid it aside until a military

achievement would make it something more than an idle gesture. In

September, the severe check administered to Lee at Antietam seemed to

offer the golden opportunity. On the 22d, the immortal document was

given to the world announcing that, unless the states in arms returned

to the union by January 1, 1863, the fatal blow at their "peculiar

institution" would be delivered. Southern leaders treated it with slight

regard, and so on the date set the promise was fulfilled. The

proclamation was issued as a war measure, adopted by the President as

commander-in-chief of the armed forces, on grounds of military

necessity. It did not abolish slavery. It simply emancipated slaves in

places then in arms against federal authority. Everywhere else slavery,

as far as the Proclamation was concerned, remained lawful.
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To seal forever the proclamation of emancipation, and to extend freedom

to the whole country, Congress, in January, 1865, on the urgent

recommendation of Lincoln, transmitted to the states the thirteenth

amendment, abolishing slavery throughout the United States. By the end

of 1865 the amendment was ratified. The house was not divided against

itself; it did not fall; it was all free.

=The Restraint of Civil Liberty.=--As in all great wars, particularly

those in the nature of a civil strife, it was found necessary to use

strong measures to sustain opinion favorable to the administration's

military policies and to frustrate the designs of those who sought to

hamper its action. Within two weeks of his first call for volunteers,

Lincoln empowered General Scott to suspend the writ of \_habeas corpus\_

along the line of march between Philadelphia and Washington and thus to

arrest and hold without interference from civil courts any one whom he

deemed a menace to the union. At a later date the area thus ruled by

military officers was extended by executive proclamation. By an act of

March 3, 1863, Congress, desiring to lay all doubts about the

President's power, authorized him to suspend the writ throughout the

United States or in any part thereof. It also freed military officers

from the necessity of surrendering to civil courts persons arrested

under their orders, or even making answers to writs issued from such

courts. In the autumn of that year the President, acting under the terms

of this law, declared this ancient and honorable instrument for the

protection of civil liberties, the \_habeas corpus\_, suspended throughout

the length and breadth of the land. The power of the government was also

strengthened by an act defining and punishing certain conspiracies,

passed on July 31, 1861--a measure which imposed heavy penalties on

those who by force, intimidation, or threat interfered with the

execution of the law.

Thus doubly armed, the military authorities spared no one suspected of

active sympathy with the Southern cause. Editors were arrested and

imprisoned, their papers suspended, and their newsboys locked up. Those

who organized "peace meetings" soon found themselves in the toils of the

law. Members of the Maryland legislature, the mayor of Baltimore, and

local editors suspected of entertaining secessionist opinions, were

imprisoned on military orders although charged with no offense, and were

denied the privilege of examination before a civil magistrate. A Vermont

farmer, too outspoken in his criticism of the government, found himself

behind the bars until the government, in its good pleasure, saw fit to

release him. These measures were not confined to the theater of war nor

to the border states where the spirit of secession was strong enough to

endanger the cause of union. They were applied all through the Northern

states up to the very boundaries of Canada. Zeal for the national cause,

too often supplemented by a zeal for persecution, spread terror among

those who wavered in the singleness of their devotion to the union.

These drastic operations on the part of military authorities, so foreign

to the normal course of civilized life, naturally aroused intense and

bitter hostility. Meetings of protest were held throughout the country.

Thirty-six members of the House of Representatives sought to put on

record their condemnation of the suspension of the \_habeas corpus\_ act,

only to meet a firm denial by the supporters of the act. Chief Justice

Taney, before whom the case of a man arrested under the President's

military authority was brought, emphatically declared, in a long and

learned opinion bristling with historical examples, that the President

had no power to suspend the writ of \_habeas corpus\_. In Congress and

out, Democrats, abolitionists, and champions of civil liberty denounced

Lincoln and his Cabinet in unsparing terms. Vallandigham, a Democratic

leader of Ohio, afterward banished to the South for his opposition to

the war, constantly applied to Lincoln the epithet of "Caesar." Wendell

Phillips saw in him "a more unlimited despot than the world knows this

side of China."

Sensitive to such stinging thrusts and no friend of wanton persecution,

Lincoln attempted to mitigate the rigors of the law by paroling many

political prisoners. The general policy, however, he defended in homely

language, very different in tone and meaning from the involved reasoning

of the lawyers. "Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy who deserts,

while I must not touch a hair of the wily agitator who induces him to

desert?" he asked in a quiet way of some spokesmen for those who

protested against arresting people for "talking against the war." This

summed up his philosophy. He was engaged in a war to save the union, and

all measures necessary and proper to accomplish that purpose were

warranted by the Constitution which he had sworn to uphold.

=Military Strategy--North and South.=--The broad outlines of military

strategy followed by the commanders of the opposing forces are clear

even to the layman who cannot be expected to master the details of a

campaign or, for that matter, the maneuvers of a single great battle.

The problem for the South was one of defense mainly, though even for

defense swift and paralyzing strokes at the North were later deemed

imperative measures. The problem of the North was, to put it baldly, one

of invasion and conquest. Southern territory had to be invaded and

Southern armies beaten on their own ground or worn down to exhaustion

there.

In the execution of this undertaking, geography, as usual, played a

significant part in the disposition of forces. The Appalachian ranges,

stretching through the Confederacy to Northern Alabama, divided the

campaigns into Eastern and Western enterprises. Both were of signal

importance. Victory in the East promised the capture of the Confederate

capital of Richmond, a stroke of moral worth, hardly to be

overestimated. Victory in the West meant severing the Confederacy and

opening the Mississippi Valley down to the Gulf.

As it turned out, the Western forces accomplished their task first,

vindicating the military powers of union soldiers and shaking the

confidence of opposing commanders. In February, 1862, Grant captured

Fort Donelson on the Tennessee River, rallied wavering unionists in

Kentucky, forced the evacuation of Nashville, and opened the way for two

hundred miles into the Confederacy. At Shiloh, Murfreesboro, Vicksburg,

Chickamauga, Chattanooga, desperate fighting followed and, in spite of

varying fortunes, it resulted in the discomfiture and retirement of

Confederate forces to the Southeast into Georgia. By the middle of 1863,

the Mississippi Valley was open to the Gulf, the initiative taken out of

the hands of Southern commanders in the West, and the way prepared for

Sherman's final stroke--the march from Atlanta to the sea--a maneuver

executed with needless severity in the autumn of 1864.
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For the almost unbroken succession of achievements in the West by

Generals Grant, Sherman, Thomas, and Hooker against Albert Sidney

Johnston, Bragg, Pemberton, and Hood, the union forces in the East

offered at first an almost equally unbroken series of misfortunes and

disasters. Far from capturing Richmond, they had been thrown on the

defensive. General after general--McClellan, Pope, Burnside, Hooker, and

Meade--was tried and found wanting. None of them could administer a

crushing defeat to the Confederate troops and more than once the union

soldiers were beaten in a fair battle. They did succeed, however, in

delivering a severe check to advancing Confederates under General Robert

E. Lee, first at Antietam in September, 1862, and then at Gettysburg in

July, 1863--checks reckoned as victories though in each instance the

Confederates escaped without demoralization. Not until the beginning of

the next year, when General Grant, supplied with almost unlimited men

and munitions, began his irresistible hammering at Lee's army, did the

final phase of the war commence. The pitiless drive told at last.

General Lee, on April 9, 1865, seeing the futility of further conflict,

surrendered an army still capable of hard fighting, at Appomattox, not

far from the capital of the Confederacy.
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=Abraham Lincoln.=--The services of Lincoln to the cause of union defy

description. A judicial scrutiny of the war reveals his thought and

planning in every part of the varied activity that finally crowned

Northern arms with victory. Is it in the field of diplomacy? Does

Seward, the Secretary of State, propose harsh and caustic measures

likely to draw England's sword into the scale? Lincoln counsels

moderation. He takes the irritating message and with his own hand

strikes out, erases, tones down, and interlines, exchanging for words

that sting and burn the language of prudence and caution. Is it a matter

of compromise with the South, so often proposed by men on both sides

sick of carnage? Lincoln is always ready to listen and turns away only

when he is invited to surrender principles essential to the safety of

the union. Is it high strategy of war, a question of the general best

fitted to win Gettysburg--Hooker, Sedgwick, or Meade? Lincoln goes in

person to the War Department in the dead of night to take counsel with

his Secretary and to make the fateful choice.

Is it a complaint from a citizen, deprived, as he believes, of his civil

liberties unjustly or in violation of the Constitution? Lincoln is ready

to hear it and anxious to afford relief, if warrant can be found for it.

Is a mother begging for the life of a son sentenced to be shot as a

deserter? Lincoln hears her petition, and grants it even against the

protests made by his generals in the name of military discipline. Do

politicians sow dissensions in the army and among civilians? Lincoln

grandly waves aside their petty personalities and invites them to think

of the greater cause. Is it a question of securing votes to ratify the

thirteenth amendment abolishing slavery? Lincoln thinks it not beneath

his dignity to traffic and huckster with politicians over the trifling

jobs asked in return by the members who hold out against him. Does a New

York newspaper call him an ignorant Western boor? Lincoln's reply is a

letter to a mother who has given her all--her sons on the field of

battle--and an address at Gettysburg, both of which will live as long as

the tongue in which they were written. These are tributes not only to

his mastery of the English language but also to his mastery of all those

sentiments of sweetness and strength which are the finest flowers of

culture.

Throughout the entire span of service, however, Lincoln was beset by

merciless critics. The fiery apostles of abolition accused him of

cowardice when he delayed the bold stroke at slavery. Anti-war Democrats

lashed out at every step he took. Even in his own party he found no

peace. Charles Sumner complained: "Our President is now dictator,

\_imperator\_--whichever you like; but how vain to have the power of a

god and not to use it godlike." Leaders among the Republicans sought to

put him aside in 1864 and place Chase in his chair. "I hope we may never

have a worse man," was Lincoln's quiet answer.

Wide were the dissensions in the North during that year and the

Republicans, while selecting Lincoln as their candidate again, cast off

their old name and chose the simple title of the "Union party."

Moreover, they selected a Southern man, Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, to

be associated with him as candidate for Vice President. This combination

the Northern Democrats boldly confronted with a platform declaring that

"after four years of failure to restore the union by the experiment of

war, during which, under the pretence of military necessity or war power

higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been

disregarded in every part and public liberty and private right alike

trodden down ... justice, humanity, liberty, and public welfare demand

that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, to the

end that peace may be restored on the basis of the federal union of the

states." It is true that the Democratic candidate, General McClellan,

sought to break the yoke imposed upon him by the platform, saying that

he could not look his old comrades in the face and pronounce their

efforts vain; but the party call to the nation to repudiate Lincoln and

his works had gone forth. The response came, giving Lincoln 2,200,000

votes against 1,800,000 for his opponent. The bitter things said about

him during the campaign, he forgot and forgave. When in April, 1865, he

was struck down by the assassin's hand, he above all others in

Washington was planning measures of moderation and healing.

THE RESULTS OF THE CIVIL WAR

There is a strong and natural tendency on the part of writers to stress

the dramatic and heroic aspects of war; but the long judgment of history

requires us to include all other significant phases as well. Like every

great armed conflict, the Civil War outran the purposes of those who

took part in it. Waged over the nature of the union, it made a

revolution in the union, changing public policies and constitutional

principles and giving a new direction to agriculture and industry.

=The Supremacy of the Union.=--First and foremost, the war settled for

all time the long dispute as to the nature of the federal system. The

doctrine of state sovereignty was laid to rest. Men might still speak of

the rights of states and think of their commonwealths with affection,

but nullification and secession were destroyed. The nation was supreme.

=The Destruction of the Slave Power.=--Next to the vindication of

national supremacy was the destruction of the planting aristocracy of

the South--that great power which had furnished leadership of undoubted

ability and had so long contested with the industrial and commercial

interests of the North. The first paralyzing blow at the planters was

struck by the abolition of slavery. The second and third came with the

fourteenth (1868) and fifteenth (1870) amendments, giving the ballot to

freedmen and excluding from public office the Confederate

leaders--driving from the work of reconstruction the finest talents of

the South. As if to add bitterness to gall and wormwood, the fourteenth

amendment forbade the United States or any state to pay any debts

incurred in aid of the Confederacy or in the emancipation of the

slaves--plunging into utter bankruptcy the Southern financiers who had

stripped their section of capital to support their cause. So the

Southern planters found themselves excluded from public office and ruled

over by their former bondmen under the tutelage of Republican leaders.

Their labor system was wrecked and their money and bonds were as

worthless as waste paper. The South was subject to the North. That which

neither the Federalists nor the Whigs had been able to accomplish in the

realm of statecraft was accomplished on the field of battle.

=The Triumph of Industry.=--The wreck of the planting system was

accompanied by a mighty upswing of Northern industry which made the old

Whigs of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania stare in wonderment. The demands

of the federal government for manufactured goods at unrestricted prices

gave a stimulus to business which more than replaced the lost markets of

the South. Between 1860 and 1870 the number of manufacturing

establishments increased 79.6 per cent as against 14.2 for the previous

decade; while the number of persons employed almost doubled. There was

no doubt about the future of American industry.

=The Victory for the Protective Tariff.=--Moreover, it was henceforth to

be well protected. For many years before the war the friends of

protection had been on the defensive. The tariff act of 1857 imposed

duties so low as to presage a tariff for revenue only. The war changed

all that. The extraordinary military expenditures, requiring heavy taxes

on all sources, justified tariffs so high that a follower of Clay or

Webster might well have gasped with astonishment. After the war was over

the debt remained and both interest and principal had to be paid.

Protective arguments based on economic reasoning were supported by a

plain necessity for revenue which admitted no dispute.

=A Liberal Immigration Policy.=--Linked with industry was the labor

supply. The problem of manning industries became a pressing matter, and

Republican leaders grappled with it. In the platform of the Union party

adopted in 1864 it was declared "that foreign immigration, which in the

past has added so much to the wealth, the development of resources, and

the increase of power to this nation--the asylum of the oppressed of all

nations--should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just

policy." In that very year Congress, recognizing the importance of the

problem, passed a measure of high significance, creating a bureau of

immigration, and authorizing a modified form of indentured labor, by

making it legal for immigrants to pledge their wages in advance to pay

their passage over. Though the bill was soon repealed, the practice

authorized by it was long continued. The cheapness of the passage

shortened the term of service; but the principle was older than the

days of William Penn.

=The Homestead Act of 1862.=--In the immigration measure guaranteeing a

continuous and adequate labor supply, the manufacturers saw an offset to

the Homestead Act of 1862 granting free lands to settlers. The Homestead

law they had resisted in a long and bitter congressional battle.

Naturally, they had not taken kindly to a scheme which lured men away

from the factories or enabled them to make unlimited demands for higher

wages as the price of remaining. Southern planters likewise had feared

free homesteads for the very good reason that they only promised to add

to the overbalancing power of the North.

In spite of the opposition, supporters of a liberal land policy made

steady gains. Free-soil Democrats,--Jacksonian farmers and

mechanics,--labor reformers, and political leaders, like Stephen A.

Douglas of Illinois and Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, kept up the

agitation in season and out. More than once were they able to force a

homestead bill through the House of Representatives only to have it

blocked in the Senate where Southern interests were intrenched. Then,

after the Senate was won over, a Democratic President, James Buchanan,

vetoed the bill. Still the issue lived. The Republicans, strong among

the farmers of the Northwest, favored it from the beginning and pressed

it upon the attention of the country. Finally the manufacturers yielded;

they received their compensation in the contract labor law. In 1862

Congress provided for the free distribution of land in 160-acre lots

among men and women of strong arms and willing hearts ready to build

their serried lines of homesteads to the Rockies and beyond.

=Internal Improvements.=--If farmers and manufacturers were early

divided on the matter of free homesteads, the same could hardly be said

of internal improvements. The Western tiller of the soil was as eager

for some easy way of sending his produce to market as the manufacturer

was for the same means to transport his goods to the consumer on the

farm. While the Confederate leaders were writing into their

constitution a clause forbidding all appropriations for internal

improvements, the Republican leaders at Washington were planning such

expenditures from the treasury in the form of public land grants to

railways as would have dazed the authors of the national road bill half

a century earlier.

=Sound Finance--National Banking.=--From Hamilton's day to Lincoln's,

business men in the East had contended for a sound system of national

currency. The experience of the states with paper money, painfully

impressive in the years before the framing of the Constitution, had been

convincing to those who understood the economy of business. The

Constitution, as we have seen, bore the signs of this experience. States

were forbidden to emit bills of credit: paper money, in short. This

provision stood clear in the document; but judicial ingenuity had

circumvented it in the age of Jacksonian Democracy. The states had

enacted and the Supreme Court, after the death of John Marshall, had

sustained laws chartering banking companies and authorizing them to

issue paper money. So the country was beset by the old curse, the banks

of Western and Southern states issuing reams of paper notes to help

borrowers pay their debts.

In dealing with war finances, the Republicans attacked this ancient

evil. By act of Congress in 1864, they authorized a series of national

banks founded on the credit of government bonds and empowered to issue

notes. The next year they stopped all bank paper sent forth under the

authority of the states by means of a prohibitive tax. In this way, by

two measures Congress restored federal control over the monetary system

although it did not reestablish the United States Bank so hated by

Jacksonian Democracy.

=Destruction of States' Rights by Fourteenth Amendment.=--These acts and

others not cited here were measures of centralization and consolidation

at the expense of the powers and dignity of the states. They were all of

high import, but the crowning act of nationalism was the fourteenth

amendment which, among other things, forbade states to "deprive any

person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." The

immediate occasion, though not the actual cause of this provision, was

the need for protecting the rights of freedmen against hostile

legislatures in the South. The result of the amendment, as was

prophesied in protests loud and long from every quarter of the

Democratic party, was the subjection of every act of state, municipal,

and county authorities to possible annulment by the Supreme Court at

Washington. The expected happened.

Few negroes ever brought cases under the fourteenth amendment to the

attention of the courts; but thousands of state laws, municipal

ordinances, and acts of local authorities were set aside as null and

void under it. Laws of states regulating railway rates, fixing hours of

labor in bakeshops, and taxing corporations were in due time to be

annulled as conflicting with an amendment erroneously supposed to be

designed solely for the protection of negroes. As centralized power over

tariffs, railways, public lands, and other national concerns went to

Congress, so centralized power over the acts of state and local

authorities involving an infringement of personal and property rights

was conferred on the federal judiciary, the apex of which was the

Supreme Court at Washington. Thus the old federation of "independent

states," all equal in rights and dignity, each wearing the "jewel of

sovereignty" so celebrated in Southern oratory, had gone the way of all

flesh under the withering blasts of Civil War.