

John Randolph of Roanoke

Represented by

Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf

Position Paper for the 8th United States Congress of 1803

Proudly representing the State of Virginia's interests at the House of Representatives of the United States, I, John Randolph of Roanoke, am pleased to have a word to say regarding the decisions the Congress will take about the purchase of Louisiana, our relations with the Barbary States, and the power of the federal state in the juridical system. As my third participation, during this 8th United States Congress, I intend to offer my vision on our nation and give a voice to Americans while coming up with the most innovative ideas with the other congressmen.

1. The purchase of Louisiana

One of the United States' primary ambitions is to expand our lands all the way to the Pacific Ocean. Although America is a very wide continent, conquering it is certainly a realistic objective we can reach. First of all, I am a fervent supporter of the purchase of Louisiana. I believe it could be a valuable asset for our growing economy, as it would allow us to control an incredibly large territory, almost doubling the current area of our country, filled with resources that have yet to be exploited. Not only would we have exclusive rights on one of the richest lands in terms of fur, we would also benefit from the numerous positive impacts that the Mississippi river has to offer. Our companies would benefit from reduced transportation time from northern states to southern ones, increased range, easy access to ports, etc. Economically speaking, long term revenue and advantages would compensate for the short term economic burden, insofar as we manage to operate everything correctly.

More specifically, in order to integrate Louisiana to our country, we would need to subdivide the territory into smaller independent states, and then govern them independently. That would ease the transition of other states' laws to the newly formed states, so that we encounter as less judicial conflicts as possible between northern and southern states policies. In other words, splitting Louisiana into smaller states and governing them appropriately - accordingly to the geographically adjacent states - would allow the new territory to be as homogenous to the current states as possible. As for the governance of the territory, the distribution of power should follow the same democratic structure as our current states.

Furthermore, I believe that slavery in those newly created states should be kept to a minimum. Right now, the economy in many southern states is entirely dependent on slaves which holds us

back from taking any initiative towards an eventual abolition of the immoral practice of slavery. However, if we are able to build an economy from scratch without the use of those inhuman means, it could invite other states to diversify their activities in the future. Thus, slavery should not be allowed on the new territory.

2. The Barbary States

The Barbary States issue should be dealt with adequate diplomacy and without useless waste of our money. It is true that losing tribute every year can get very costly on the long run, but at this point, the war is getting too costly. I suggest we immediately stop sending the navy and focus on other alternatives. Whether it is by ratifying treaties with the Barbary States for the time being, while finding new economic partners, such as the southern spanish colonies, or by adopting a protectionist economic plan, there are other options. “The surest way to prevent war is not to fear it.” Not to fear the enemy, to create and sustain a cooperative agreement, or to go for other opportunities, avoiding the problem intelligently without any fear. If the Congress deems it necessary, we could also invest more into the negotiations with the Barbary States in order to attain a long-lasting stable economic relationship.

3. Arbiter of the constitution

The ultimate arbiter of the constitution should be the US chamber of representatives. In fact, its members have all been elected by the population, meaning they are the ones who, democratically, represent the best the needs of the country. Giving to the SCOTAS the power of revoking any of the legitimate democratically passed laws in the executive and legislative branches would go against the core principle of democracy itself. After all, democracy seeks to give the power and the reins of the country to the people, and putting such a decisive privilege to the SCOTAS goes against this very principle. Let us not betray the ideology that was at the heart of our country’s creation, of our self-fulfillment.