



## To the Electors of the Southern District of the State of New York <http://edsitement.neh.gov>

Annotated excerpts from the EDSITEment resource [American Memory](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=rbpe&fileName=rbpe11/rbpe113/11300200/rbpe11300200page.db&recNum=0) [<http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=rbpe&fileName=rbpe11/rbpe113/11300200/rbpe11300200page.db&recNum=0>]. NOTE: The language in the following is from the original. However, some spelling and punctuation has been standardized to avoid confusion. Words in italics are defined in the parentheses that follow. Periods of ellipsis represent gaps in the text.

Being *responsible* means having a program. The paragraph beginning with “Examine the history of the general Government for the last four years” implies the Republican program through its criticism of Federalist policies. The author goes on to outline the general Republican program in the second paragraph.

Examine the history of the general Government for the last four years. What does it exhibit but a series of *usurpation* (power grabs) and extravagance? Nothing was heard of but war or preparations for war. A navy was established to protect our commerce against the attacks of one power, but permitted to yield to the insolence, rapacity and arbitrary pretensions of another. Army establishments were introduced—the public debt accumulated—offices multiplied, and those who possessed the patriotism and firmness to disapprove of their pernicious measures, reproached & treated as enemies of their country. Taxes were increased--monies borrowed at an exorbitant interest—monarchical doctrines *countenanced* (tolerated) & encouraged—republican principles censured & *traduced* (criticized)—the powers of the President augmented beyond the limits of the constitution—Alien and Sedition laws enacted, and our citizens prosecuted and imprisoned for censuring the encroachments of the administration, and advocating with fidelity and firmness, the rights of the people.

Happily for the United States, the good sense of the people has prevailed. The election of Mr. Jefferson and Col. Burr, to the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States, has established a publican administration. It will be their honorable task to maintain the general and state constitutions in purity, to secure the rights of their fellow citizens, to restore a state of quiet and prosperity; to diminish the unnecessary expenses of the government, and to alleviate the *excessive burdens* (taxes) which have been improperly imposed upon the public.

Being *responsible* means having personnel with the potential to carry out that program. The six paragraphs beginning “Governor Clinton will be the firm supporter of the administration” offer a slate of candidates and review their qualifications. There is also criticism of the opposition candidate, Mr. Van Rensselaer.

Governor Clinton will be the firm supporter of the administration of the federal government; he will cordially unite and co-operate with Mr. Jefferson. Harmony will be

restored throughout every department of our public councils—the rights of the people will be protected and respected—the prosperity of the farmer, as well as the interests of the merchant encouraged, and economy, frugality and moderation promote the general welfare of the community.

Mr. Stephen Van Rensselaer, will probably pursue a different line of conduct; and on account of his opposition to Mr. Jefferson, impede the measures of the general government, and prevent the establishment of that harmony, conciliation and prosperity which would result from the election of a republican Governor.

In point of talents and experience, Mr. Van Rensselaer can never pretend to stand a competition with Governor Clinton. The latter has, for many years, exercised the office of chief magistrate of this state, with honor to himself, and usefulness to his country. His services have been long tried. We can calculate with certainty upon the benefits of his administration—we know his principles—we have had evidences of his attachment to the rights of his fellow citizens. We are convinced that he will administer the government with a spirit of economy—that he is the enemy of extravagance and unnecessary taxation, and that whilst he will yield a proper support to the administration of the general government—he will equally support the independence and respectability of the state establishments.

As a General Committee appointed in the city of New-York, to correspond with our fellow citizens in the Southern District, we feel it our duty to inform them, that Mr. Jeremiah Van Rensselaer, of Albany, is the Republican candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor, and Mr. Ezra L’Hommedien, is our candidate for senator for this district.

Mr. Jeremiah Van Rensselaer is a respectable inhabitant of the city of Albany. He is a man of found political principles, and highly respected for his services, his talents and integrity; and our republican fellow citizens of all the other districts have agreed to unite in his support.

Mr. L’Hommedieu, your present senator, is already well known to you. He has so often been your successful candidate, and so uniformly served you with fidelity, that encomiums respecting his personal merits are rendered wholly unnecessary.

Being *effective* in a democracy means garnering enough public support to assume office. That requires communication of your program. “To the electors of the Southern district of the State of New-York” was a broadside, defined in American Memory as a “Single-sheet notice(s) or announcement(s) printed on one or both sides, intended to be read unfolded.” Other methods of communication are exemplified by the following documents:

- **Newspapers:** “[Speech of Mr. Jefferson at his inaugural, Washington, March 4, 1801](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=rbpe&fileName=rbpe19/rbpe190/1900040a/rbpe1900040a.page.db&recNum=0)” [http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=rbpe&fileName=rbpe19/rbpe190/1900040a/rbpe1900040a.page.db&recNum=0], published in the *National Intelligencer*, an organ of the Republican party.

- **Pamphlets:** “[To the electors of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1799](#)” [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/rbpebib:@field\(NUMBER+@band\(rbpe+1490240a\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/rbpebib:@field(NUMBER+@band(rbpe+1490240a)))], a Federalist pamphlet opposing the election of Thomas M’Kean as Governor of Pennsylvania.
- **Leaflets/Letters:** “[Circular, New York](#)” [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/rbpebib:@field\(NUMBER+@band\(rbpe+1130070c\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/rbpebib:@field(NUMBER+@band(rbpe+1130070c)))], a leaflet—in this case, from a Committee of Correspondence, another organizational tool—addressed to a set of specific recipients. This copy of the leaflet went to a Capt. Joseph Mowle.

Being *effective* also requires an institutional structure, an organization. The extended title of the document mentions the General Committee of New York, an arm of the Republican Party at the state level.

To the electors of the Southern district of the State of New-York. Friends and fellow citizens. The approaching election of a chief magistrate of the State of New-York, is entitled to peculiar attention ... By order of the General Committee in New-York, William Edgar, Chairman. Daniel D. Tompkins, Sec’ry New-York, April 7, 1801

Being *constitutional* means parties in and out of power both abide by the same ground rules, the Constitution. The passage and application of the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 by the Federalists in power threatened legitimate opposition. Note the sentence in the document beginning, “Taxes were increased.”

Taxes were increased—monies borrowed at an exorbitant interest—monarchical doctrines countenanced & encouraged—republican principles censured & traduced—the powers of the President augmented beyond the limits of the constitution—Alien and Sedition laws enacted, and our citizens prosecuted and imprisoned for censuring the encroachments of the administration, and advocating with fidelity and firmness, the rights of the people.



## Timeline of Events Related to the Development of the U.S. Party System

This timeline is based on the Basic Chronology section of the *Encyclopedia of American History*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., by Jeffrey B. and Richard B. Morris (New York: Harper Collins, 1996). Unless otherwise specified, documents are from the EDSITEment resource **American Memory**.

### Part I

#### 1788: Constitution Ratified

Though “during the ratification struggle, the Federalists were functioning as a surprisingly well coordinated political group” (Kerber, Linda K. “The Federalist Party.” *History of U.S. Political Parties*. Ed. Arthur M/ Schlesinger. 4 vols. New York: Chelsea, 1973. p. 9) with publications, campaign-like meetings, behind the scene maneuvers, and a national scope, they were not yet a political party. Their goal was limited, and certainly not the political party that formed around Alexander Hamilton during Washington’s presidency. James Madison—who later helped Jefferson start the Democratic-Republican Party—worked closely with Hamilton, helping the Federalists promote the ratification of the Constitution. The Federalist Papers, authored by Hamilton, Madison, and John Jay, “stressed the inadequacy of the Confederation, the need for a strong government, and the conformity of the Constitution with the best principles of republican government” (Morris, Jeffrey B. and Morris, Richard B. *Encyclopedia of American History*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Harper Collins, 1996. p.134).

- **Primary Document:** [Edward Rutledge in Defense of the Constitution](#) [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(ed0045\)\):](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(ed0045)):)] (Scroll to or use Find to locate pp. 274-277), an example of Federalist arguments.
- **Secondary Account:** Ratifying the Constitution [[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article\\_display.cfm?HHID=294](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=294)] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITEment resource **History Matters**.

The Constitution encountered stiff opposition. The vote was 187 to 168 in Massachusetts, 57 to 47 in New Hampshire, 30 to 27 in New York, and 89 to 79 in Virginia. Two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify the new plan of government.

Those who opposed the adoption of the Constitution were known as the Anti-Federalists. Many feared centralized power. Many doubted the ability of Americans to sustain a continental republic. Some Anti-Federalists were upset that the Constitution lacked a religious test for office holding. Others were concerned that the Constitution failed to guarantee a right to counsel and a right not to incriminate oneself in criminal trials, or to prohibit cruel and unusual punishments.

Several arguments were voiced repeatedly during the ratification debates:

- ❑ That the Convention had exceeded its authority in producing a new constitution;
- ❑ That the Constitution established the basis for a monarchical regime;

- That the Constitution lacked explicit protections for individual and states rights.
- **Primary Document:** [Massachusetts' Suggested Amendments to the Constitution](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/const/ratma.htm) [<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/const/ratma.htm>] on the EDSITement resource **The Avalon Project**. The suggested amendments are examples of Anti-Federalist arguments.

## Part II

### 1789 April: Washington Becomes President

#### 1789, July 14: Bastille Day, The French Revolution

At first, many Americans are sympathetic to the French Revolution, especially those who later aligned themselves with Jefferson and Madison.

- **Secondary Account:** [The Contests of European Nations](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents_p2.cfm?doc=327) [[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents\\_p2.cfm?doc=327](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents_p2.cfm?doc=327)] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITement resource **History Matters**.

On July 14, 1789, 20,000 French men and women stormed the Bastille, a hated royal fortress, marking the beginning of the French Revolution. For three years, France experimented with a constitutional monarchy. But in 1792, Austria and Prussia invaded France and French revolutionaries responded by deposing King Louis XVI, placing him on trial, and executing him. A general war erupted in Europe pitting revolutionary France against a coalition of monarchies, led by Britain. With two brief interruptions, this war lasted 23 years.

Many Americans reacted enthusiastically to the overthrow of the king and the creation of a French republic. France appeared to have joined America in a historical struggle against royal absolutism and aristocratic privilege. More cautious gentlemen, however, expressed horror; they viewed the French Revolution as an assault against property and Christianity.

#### 1789: Executive Departments Established

Foreign Affairs (later Department of State) headed by Thomas Jefferson

War Department headed by Henry Knox

Treasury Department headed by Alexander Hamilton

Post Office Department with Postmaster Samuel Osgood

- **Secondary Account:** [Grolier's Biography of George Washington](http://gi.grolier.com/presidents/ea/bios/01pwash.html) [<http://gi.grolier.com/presidents/ea/bios/01pwash.html>], a link from the EDSITement resource **Internet Public Library**

In forming his cabinet Washington chose two liberals—Jefferson and Randolph—and two conservatives—Hamilton and Knox. The liberals looked to the South and West, the conservatives to the Northeast. On subjects in dispute, Washington could secure advice from each side and so make informed decisions.

### 1790-1792: Alexander Hamilton's Fiscal Program

The chief issue of Washington's first term was the fiscal program devised by Alexander Hamilton and submitted to the House of Representatives in a series of reports on national and state debt, an excise tax, and a national bank. Controversy over these proposals ultimately led to the party cleavage between Federalists and Republicans (Morris and Morris, p. 138).

### 1790, Jan. 14: Debt

- **Primary Document:** [Report on Public Credit](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=002/llac002.db&recNum=382) [<http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=002/llac002.db&recNum=382>]
- **Secondary Account:** [Alexander Hamilton's Financial Program](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=6) [[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article\\_display.cfm?HHID=6](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=6)] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**.

As Treasury Secretary, Hamilton designed a financial system that made the United States the best credit risk in the western world. The paramount problem facing Hamilton was a huge national debt. He proposed that the government assume the entire debt of the federal government and the states. His plan was to retire the old depreciated obligations by borrowing new money at a lower interest rate.

States like Maryland, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Virginia, which had already paid off their debts, saw no reason why they should be taxed by the federal government to pay off the debts of other states like Massachusetts and South Carolina. Hamilton's critics claimed that his scheme because it would provide enormous profits to speculators who had bought bonds from Revolutionary War veterans for as little as 10 or 15 cents on the dollar.

For six months, a bitter debate raged in Congress, until James Madison and Thomas Jefferson engineered a compromise. In exchange for southern votes, Hamilton promised to support locating the national capital on the banks of the Potomac River, the border between two southern states, Virginia and Maryland.

(NOTE: Read the primary document [Thomas Jefferson to George Washington, May 23, 1792](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj060237))) [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(tj060237\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj060237)))], starting with the paragraph beginning "It has been urged then that a public debt," for Jefferson's point of view on the assumption of public debt expressed two years after Hamilton's Report on Public Credit.)

### 1791, Feb. 25: National Bank

From [Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History](http://www.gilderlehrman.org/) [<http://www.gilderlehrman.org/>], a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**:

...modeled after the Bank of England, to issue currency, collect taxes, hold government securities, regulate the nation's financial system, provide funds in the event of a national emergency, handle government debt payments to foreign and domestic creditors, and make loans to the government and private borrowers. This proposal, like the debt scheme, unleashed a storm of protest.

Critics charged that the bank threatened the nation's republican values by encouraging speculation and corruption. They also contended that the bank was unconstitutional, since the Constitution did not give Congress the power to create a bank. Other grounds for criticism were that the bank would subject America to foreign influences (because foreigners would have to purchase a high proportion of the bank's stock) and give a propertied elite disproportionate influence over the nation's fiscal policies (since private investors would control the bank's board of directors). Despite the bitter opposition of such figures as Jefferson and Madison, Congress succeeded in chartering a Bank of the United States.

- **Primary Document:** [Jefferson's Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/amerdoc/bank-tj.htm) (Feb. 15, 1791) [<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/amerdoc/bank-tj.htm>] on the EDSITEMent resource **The Avalon Project**. (Digitized image of the original is available on the website of the Library of Congress [<http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson/images/vc129.jpg>].)

Jefferson's opinion maintaining the bill was unconstitutional advanced the doctrine commonly known as "strict constructionist."...The incorporation of a bank, he argued, was not among the powers specifically delegated to Congress (Morris and Morris, P. 139).

- **Primary Document:** [Hamilton's argument for The Constitutionality of a National Bank](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(fr003283))) (Feb. 23, 1791) [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(fr003283\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(fr003283)))]

Hamilton's opinion elaborated the doctrine of "implied powers" (the so-called "loose constructionist" view of the Constitution). He contended that the proposed bank was related to congressional power to collect taxes and regulate trade: a delegated power implied the employment of such means as were proper for its execution (Morris and Morris, P. 139).

### **1791 March: Congress Passes Excise Tax on Whiskey, an Important Part of Hamilton's Financial Plan**

#### **1791, Dec. 5: Report on Manufactures**

**Primary Document Excerpts and Annotation:** [Hamilton: Report on Manufactures](http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326) (Dec. 5, 1791) [<http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326>] on Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**

The final plank in Hamilton's economic program was a proposal to aid the nation's infant industries. Through high tariffs designed to protect American industry from foreign competition, government bounties and subsidies, and internal improvements and transportation, Hamilton hoped to break Britain's manufacturing hold on America. ...Although Jefferson and his followers successfully painted Hamilton as an elitist defender of a deferential social order and an admirer of monarchical Britain, in fact Hamilton offered a remarkably modern economic vision based on investment, industry,

and expanded commerce. Most strikingly, it was an economic vision with no place for slavery. Before the 1790s, the American economy, North and South, was tied to a trans-Atlantic system of slavery. A member of New York's first anti-slavery society, Hamilton wanted to reorient the American economy away from slavery and trade with the slave colonies of the Caribbean.

The most eloquent opposition to Hamilton's proposals came from Thomas Jefferson, who believed that the growth of manufacturing threatened the values of an agrarian way of life. Hamilton's vision of America's future directly challenged Jefferson's ideal of a nation of farmers communing with nature and maintaining personal freedom by virtue of landownership. Like slaves, Jefferson feared, factory workers would be manipulated by their masters, who would make it impossible for them to think and act as independent citizens.

### Part III

#### 1792: Jefferson-Hamilton Feud

- **Secondary Account:** The [Birth of Political Parties](#) [[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents\\_p2.cfm?doc=416](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents_p2.cfm?doc=416)] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**

Despite a belief that parties were evil and that they posed a threat to republican government, leaders in Washington's first administration created the first modern political parties. Divisions first emerged in 1791 over Hamilton's proposals to fund the federal and state debts, to establish a national bank, and to provide government assistance to manufacturing.

On the grounds that Hamilton's fiscal plans threatened his vision of the Republic, James Madison organized congressional opposition and retained the poet Philip Freneau to edit a newspaper, the National Gazette, to warn the populace about Hamilton's designs. Madison and his ally Thomas Jefferson saw in Hamilton's program an effort to establish the kind of patronage society that existed in Britain, with a huge public debt, a standing army, high taxes, and government-subsidized monopolies.

Hamilton responded in kind. He secured John Fenno to publish the Gazette of the United States, claiming that his opponents wanted to return the national government to its weak condition under the Articles of Confederation. By 1794, his faction had evolved into the Federalist Party, the first national political party in history capable of nominating candidates, coordinating votes in Congress, staging public meetings, organizing petition campaigns, and disseminating propaganda.

- **Primary Documents**
  - [President Washington to Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson](#), Aug. 23, 1792 [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mgw:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(gw320114\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mgw:@field(DOCID+@lit(gw320114)))] (Read from "How unfortunate" to "producing unhappy consequences at home and abroad.")

- ❑ [President Washington to Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton](#), Aug. 26, 1792 [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mgw:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(gw320115\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mgw:@field(DOCID+@lit(gw320115)))] (Read from “Differences in political opinion” to “I hope will go well.”)
- ❑ [Thomas Jefferson To George Washington](#), Sept. 9, 1792 [<http://odur.let.rug.nl/~usa/P/tj3/writings/brf/jefl100.htm>] on From Revolution to Reconstruction, a link from the EDSITEment resource **American Studies at the University of Virginia**. (Read from “I now take liberty” to “present business of the department.”)

### 1792, Sept. 21: French Republic Proclaimed

American sympathy toward France begins to weaken. Even Jefferson, who was very sympathetic to the revolutionary cause in France “deplored the excesses of violence that took place” (from [Thomas Jefferson on the French Revolution](#) [<http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/592/>]), though he also said, “The liberty of the whole earth was depending on the issue of the contest, and was ever such a prize won with so little innocent blood?”

- **Primary Document with Brief Introduction:** [Thomas Jefferson on the French Revolution](#), Jan. 3, 1793 [<http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/592/>], available via a link from the EDSITEment resource **History Matters**. (Begin with “In the struggle” and end with “staff of their hope.”)

### 1793, Feb. 1: France Declares War on Great Britain, Spain, and Holland

- **Secondary Account:** [Grolier’s Biography of George Washington](#) [<http://gi.grolier.com/presidents/ea/bios/01pwash.html>], a link from the EDSITEment resource **Internet Public Library**

The foreign policy of Washington took shape under the pressure of a war between Britain and revolutionary France. At the war’s inception Washington had to decide whether two treaties of the French-American alliance of 1778 were still in force. Hamilton held that they were not, because they had been made with the now-defunct government of Louis XVI. Washington, however, accepted Jefferson’s opinion that they were still valid because they had been made by an enduring nation—a principle that has since prevailed in American diplomacy.

### 1793, April 22: Washington Issues Proclamation of Neutrality

- **Primary Document:** [The Proclamation of Neutrality 1793](#) [<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/neutra93.htm>] on the EDSITEment resource **The Avalon Project**
- **Secondary Account:** [Years of Crisis](#) [[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article\\_display.cfm?HHID=8](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=8)] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITEment resource **History Matters**.

In 1793 and 1794 a series of crises threatened to destroy the new national government: France tried to entangle America in its war with England; Armed rebellion erupted in western Pennsylvania; Indians in Ohio threatened American expansion; and War with Britain appeared imminent...

### 1793, August 1-2: Citizen Genet Affair

- **Secondary Account and Links to Digitized Original:** [Journal of the Proceedings of the President](#), August 1-2, 1793 [<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/gwhtml/gwlet8.html>]

The entries for August 1 and 2, 1793, revolve around one of the earliest foreign policy crises of the new government. President Washington wanted French Minister Edmond Genet sent home, because of Genet's continued violations of United States laws and regulations in his efforts to recruit men, ships, and supplies for France's war against Great Britain. Washington's cabinet, like the nation, was divided between supporters of France and Great Britain. The issue was a key factor in the rivalry of Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson. As a result of the cabinet meetings of August 1 and 2, even Jefferson had to support a request to the French government for the recall of Genet.

### 1793: Differences of Opinion About France and Great Britain

Differences of opinion over France and Great Britain make "party lines more definite" (Morris, p. 142).

- [Alexander Hamilton on the French Revolution](#), 1794 [<http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/593/>], available via a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**. (Begin with "It is not among" and end with "causes that have served to mislead the public judgment" or read the complete document.)

### 1793, December 31: Jefferson Resigns from the Cabinet

According to Chapter 25 of [The Life of Thomas Jefferson](#) [<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/jefferson/biog/lj26.htm>], an 1834 biography by B. L. Rayner on the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **The American President**:

On the last day of December 1, 1793, Mr. Jefferson resigned the office of Secretary of State and retired from political life. This was not a sudden resolution on his part, nor unexpected to his country. The political disagreement between himself and the Secretary of the Treasury, added to his general disinclination to holding office, was the cause of his retirement. This disagreement, originating in a fundamental difference of opinion and aggravated by subsequent collisions in the cabinet, was reflected back upon the people and aggravated in turn the agitations and animosities between the republicans and federalists, of which they were respectively the leaders.

### 1794, Nov. 19: Jay's Treaty Signed

- **Primary Document:** [The Jay Treaty of 1794](#) [<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/diplomacy/britian/jaymenu.htm>] on the EDSITEMent resource **The Avalon Project**
- **Secondary Account:** [John Jay's Treaty](#) [<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/nr/14318.htm>] on Foreign Relations of the United States (U.S. Department of State), a link from the EDSITEMent resource **Internet Public Library**

The only concessions Jay obtained were a surrender of the northwestern posts—already agreed to in 1783—and a commercial treaty with Great Britain that granted

the United States “most favored nation” status, but seriously restricted U.S. commercial access to the British West Indies. All other outstanding issues—the Canadian-Maine boundary, compensation for pre-revolutionary debts, and British seizures of American ships—were to be resolved by arbitration. Jay even conceded that the British could seize U.S. goods bound for France if they paid for them and could confiscate without payment French goods on American ships. The treaty was immensely unpopular...

### 1794 July: The Whiskey Rebellion

- **Secondary Account:** [Washington and the Whiskey Rebellion](#) [[http://edsitement.neh.gov/view\\_lesson\\_plan.asp?ID=311](http://edsitement.neh.gov/view_lesson_plan.asp?ID=311)] on **EDSITEment**

Following unsuccessful petitions against the excise tax, an armed group in western Pennsylvania attacks a federal marshal when he attempts to serve papers on those who have not registered their stills as required by law. Two days later, insurgents burn the home of the local tax collector. As the uprising spreads, government agents and local citizens sympathetic to the government become the target of violence and harassment.

...The excise tax had been a Federalist measure... designed to help pay the costs of Hamilton’s financial policies, and its opponents included those who were organizing what would soon become the Democratic-Republican Party under Jefferson. Antagonism between these groups deepened over Washington’s handling of the Whiskey Rebellion: “An insurrection was announced and proclaimed and armed against, but could never be found,” Jefferson said of it, whereas Hamilton argued that suppressing the rebellion “will do us a great deal of good and add to the solidity of everything in this country.”

### 1795: Washington’s Cabinet Reorganized

The cabinet as reorganized by Washington included only Federalists. After Adams took office as president, he retained Washington’s cabinet (Morris and Morris, p. 144).

### 1796, Sept. 17: Washington’s Farewell Address

- **Primary Document:** [Washington’s Farewell Address](#) [<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/washing.htm>] on the **EDSITEment** resource **The Avalon Project**

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible.

... the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

- **Secondary Account:** [Washington’s Farewell Address](#) [<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/nr/14319.htm>] on Foreign Relations of the United States

Frustrated by French meddling in U.S. politics, Washington warned the nation to avoid permanent alliances with foreign nations and to rely instead on temporary alliances for emergencies. Washington's efforts to protect the fragile young republic by steering a neutral course between England and France during the French Revolutionary Wars was made extremely difficult by the intense rhetoric flowing from the pro-English Federalists, led by Alexander Hamilton, and the pro-French, personified by Thomas Jefferson.

## Part IV

### 1796: December Presidential Election

#### 1797 April: John Adams Becomes President

- **Secondary Account:** [The Presidency of John Adams](#) [[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article\\_display.cfm?HHID=10](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=10)] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITEment resource **History Matters** (Start with “During Adams’ presidency...”)

During Adams’ presidency, the United States faced its most serious international crisis yet: an undeclared naval war with France. In the Jay Treaty, France perceived an American tilt toward Britain, especially in a provision permitting the British to seize French goods from American ships in exchange for financial compensation. France retaliated by capturing hundreds of vessels flying the United States flag.

...The Federalist-controlled Congress prepared for war by authorizing a 20,000-man army and calling George Washington out of retirement as commander in chief. During the winter of 1798, an undeclared naval war took place between France and the United States.

### 1798: Democratic-Republican Societies Emerge

- **Primary Documents and Secondary Account:** [Annotations and excerpts in the article Washington on the Democratic-Republican Societies \(1798\)](#) [[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents\\_p2.cfm?doc=341](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents_p2.cfm?doc=341)] on Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, a link from the EDSITEment resource **History Matters**

The letter contains one of Washington’s most outspoken statements of distrust of the Democratic-Republican Societies, which had arisen in support of the French Revolution and which the former President had already blamed for inciting the Whiskey Rebellion in 1794.

### 1798: Alien and Sedition Acts

- **Primary Document:** [Alien and Sedition Acts](#) [<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/statutes/sedact.htm>] on the EDSITEment resource **The Avalon Project**

- **Secondary Account:** [Chart: Alien and Sedition Acts, 1798](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/historyonline/us9.cfm)  
[<http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/historyonline/us9.cfm>] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITEment resource **History Matters**
- **Secondary Account:** [The Presidency of John Adams](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=10)  
[[http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article\\_display.cfm?HHID=10](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/database/article_display.cfm?HHID=10)] on Digital History, a link from the EDSITEment resource **History Matters**

These laws:

- ❑ lengthened the period necessary before immigrants could become citizens from 5 to 14 years;
- ❑ gave the president the power to imprison or deport any foreigner believed to be dangerous to the United States; and
- ❑ made it a crime to attack the government with “false, scandalous, or malicious” statements or writings.

These acts contributed to Thomas Jefferson’s election as president in 1800 and gave the Federalist party a reputation for political repression. Federalist prosecutors used the Sedition Act to convict ten editors and printers.

Republicans accused the Federalists of violating fundamental liberties. The state legislatures of Kentucky and Virginia adopted resolutions written by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison denouncing the Alien and Sedition Acts as an infringement on freedom of expression. The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions advanced the idea that the states had a right to declare federal laws null and void, and helped to establish the theory of states’ rights.

### **Undeclared Naval War (Quasi War) with France**

- **Documents:** [The Quasi War with France; 1791-1800](http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/quasi.htm)  
[<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/quasi.htm>] on the EDSITEment resource **The Avalon Project**

## **Part V**

### **1800: December Presidential Election**

- **Secondary Account:** [Thomas Jefferson: Campaigns and Elections](http://www.americanpresident.org/history/thomasjefferson/biography/CampaignElections.common.shtml)  
[<http://www.americanpresident.org/history/thomasjefferson/biography/CampaignElections.common.shtml>] on the EDSITEment resource **The American President**

Given the intense rivalry and conflict involved, it is not surprising that the 1800 election reached a level of personal animosity seldom equaled in American politics. The Federalists attacked the fifty-seven-year-old Jefferson as a godless Jacobin who would unleash the forces of bloody terror upon the land. With Jefferson as President, so warned one newspaper, “Murder, robbery, rape, adultery, and incest will be openly taught and practiced, the air will be rent with the cries of the distressed, the soil will be soaked with blood, and the nation black with crimes.” Others attacked Jefferson’s deist beliefs as the views of an infidel who “writes aghast the truths of God’s words; who makes not even a

profession of Christianity; who is without Sabbaths; without the sanctuary, and without so much as a decent external respect for the faith and worship of Christians.”

The luckless Adams was ridiculed from two directions: by the Hamiltonians within his own party and by the Jeffersonian-Republicans from the outside. For example, a private letter in which Hamilton depicted Adams as having “great and intrinsic defects in his character” was obtained by Aaron Burr and leaked to the national press. It fueled the Republican attack on Adams as a hypocritical fool and tyrant. His opponents also spread the story that Adams had planned to create an American dynasty by the marriage of one of his sons to a daughter of King George III. According to this unsubstantiated story, only the intervention of George Washington, dressed in his Revolutionary military uniform, and the threat by Washington to use his sword against his former vice president had stopped Adams’s scheme.

### 1801: Thomas Jefferson Becomes President

- **Secondary Account:** [Thomas Jefferson: Campaigns and Elections](http://www.americanpresident.org/history/thomasjefferson/biography/CampaignElections.common.shtml) [<http://www.americanpresident.org/history/thomasjefferson/biography/CampaignElections.common.shtml>] on the EDSITEment resource **The American President**

When the electoral votes came in, Jefferson and Burr had won 73 votes each. Adams and his running mate, Charles C. Pinckney, the brother of Thomas Pinckney who ran in 1796, won 65 and 64 votes respectively.

With no clear majority, the vote was thrown into the Federalist-controlled U.S. Congress. After much intrigue and arguing, and thirty-five ballots, Alexander Hamilton, who despised Burr as an unprincipled scoundrel, convinced a few Federalists who had supported Burr in the balloting to turn in blank ballots rather than vote for either Republican candidate.

### 1801, Nov. 16: Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin’s Tax Plan

- **Primary Document:** [Gallatin to Jefferson](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj090161))) [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(tj090161\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj090161)))]

...if this Administration shall not reduce taxes, they never will be permanently reduced. To strike at the root of the evil and avert the danger of increasing taxes, encroaching government, temptations to offensive wars, &c., nothing can be more effectual than a repeal of *all* internal taxes, but let them all go, and not one remain on which sister taxes may be hereafter engrafted. I agree most fully with you that pretended tax-preparations, treasury-preparations, and army-preparations against contingent wars tend only to encourage wars. If the United States shall unavoidably be drawn into a war, the people will submit to any necessary tax, and the system of internal taxation which, *then*, shall be thought best adapted to the then situation of the country may be created, instead of engrafted on the old or present plan; if there shall be no real necessity for them, their abolition by this Administration will most powerfully deter any other from reviving them. A repeal now will attach as much unpopularity to them as the late direct tax has done to

that mode of taxation. On those grounds, can I ask what, in your opinion, is the minimum of necessary naval and foreign intercourse expenses...?



## Federalist Group Handouts

### Issue 1: Funding the Public Debt

With Hamilton's urging, the early federal government assumed the debts of the states. What was the benefit of doing so? How would the debt be repaid?

- Excerpts from the [Report on Public Credit](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=002/llac002.db&recNum=382) [<http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=002/llac002.db&recNum=382>], beginning on page 2041 of the Appendix to The Annals of Congress for the 1st Congress, on the EDSITEment resource **American Memory**:

...loans in times of public danger, especially from foreign war, are found an indispensable resource, even to the wealthiest of them. And that in a country, which, like this, is possessed of little active wealth, or in other words, little monied capital, the necessity for that resource, must, in such emergencies, be proportionably urgent.

...To justify and preserve their confidence; to promote the encreasing respectability of the American name; to answer the calls of justice; to restore landed property to its due value; to furnish new resources both to agriculture and commerce; to cement more closely the union of the states; to add to their security against foreign attack; to establish public order on the basis of an upright and liberal policy. These are the great and invaluable ends to be secured, by a proper and adequate provision, at the present period, for the support of public credit.

...The benefits... are various and obvious... First. Trade is extended by it; because there is a larger capital to carry it on, and the merchant can at the same time, afford to trade for smaller profits; as his stock, which, when unemployed, brings him in an interest from the government, serves him also as money, when he has a call for it in his commercial operations.

Secondly. Agriculture and manufactures are also promoted by it: For the like reason, that more capital can be commanded to be employed in both; and because the merchant, whose enterprise in foreign trade, gives to them activity and extension, has greater means for enterprise.

Thirdly. The interest of money will be lowered by it; for this is always in a ratio, to the quantity of money, and to the quickness of circulation. This circumstance will enable both the public and individuals to borrow on easier and cheaper terms.

And from the combination of these effects, additional aids will be furnished to labour, to industry, and to arts of every kind.... But these good effects of a public debt are only to be looked for, when, by being well funded, it has acquired an *adequate* and *stable* value.

This sum (to service the national debt) may be obtained from the present duties on imports and tonnage, with the additions, which... may be made on wines, spirits, including those distilled within the United States, teas and coffees.

This decrease, in the value of lands, ought, in a great measure, to be attributed to the scarcity of money. Consequently whatever produces an augmentation (increase) of the monied capital of the country, must have a proportional effect in raising that value. The beneficial tendency of a funded debt, in this respect, has been manifested by the most decisive experience in Great-Britain.

The proprietors of lands would not only feel the benefit of this increase in the value of their property, and of a more prompt and better sale, when they had occasion to sell; but the necessity of selling would be, itself, greatly diminished.

### **Issue 2: U.S. Relations with Great Britain/France**

To fund the debt service, Hamilton proposed an internal tax on some “luxuries” (including spirits) as well as duties on imports. Most of the imports Hamilton proposed to tax came from Great Britain, making the U.S. economically dependent on its former master less than 10 years after the end of the War for Independence.

- Hamilton’s [Report on Public Credit](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=002/llac002.db&recNum=394), January 1790 [http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=002/llac002.db&recNum=394], page 2065 of the Appendix to the Annals of Congress for the 1st Congress, available on the EDSITEMent resource **American Memory**:

This sum (to service the national debt) may be obtained from the present duties on imports and tonnage, with the additions, which... may be made on wines, spirits, including those distilled within the United States, teas and coffees.

- **Letter from Alexander Hamilton to George Washington, April 1794:**

...the cutting off of intercourse with Great Britain... deprives us of... a supply necessary to us in peace and more necessary to us if we are to go to war. It gives a sudden and violent blow to our revenue which cannot easily be repaired from other sources. It will give so great an interruption to commerce as may very possibly interfere with the payment of the duties which have heretofore accrued and bring the Treasury to an absolute stoppage of payment...

### **Issue 3: The National Bank: Implied Powers vs. Strict Interpretation**

The Democratic-Republicans argued that, even if a national bank would be of benefit to the country, nowhere in the Constitution does it specify that the federal government is allowed to be in the banking business. But the Constitution does say that any power not specified in the Constitution is delegated to the states.

- Annotated Excerpts from Hamilton’s [Argument for the Constitutionality of the National Bank](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(fr003283))), Feb. 23, 1791 [http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(fr003283))], the complete text of which is

available on the EDSITEment resource **American Memory**:

Hamilton argues that money in the government's coffers should be regarded as property and therefore the bank is Constitutional because the Constitution authorizes Congress to regulate United States property,

...It remains to show, that the incorporation of a bank is within... the provision which authorizes Congress to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the property of the United States.

...The support of a government, the support of troops for the common defense, the payment of the public debt, are the true final causes for raising money... Suppose the public debt discharged, and the funds now pledged for it liberated. In some instances, it would be found expedient to repeal the taxes; in others, the repeal might injure our own industry--our agriculture and manufactures. In these cases, they would, of course, be retained. Here, then, would be money, arising from the authorized sources of revenue, which would not fall within the rule by which the attorney-general endeavors to except them from other personal property...

Hamilton argues that the Constitution gives the federal government power when a need is national in nature. We need a national bank—for reasons he specifies—and, presumably, the entire country will benefit from its existence.

...The constitutional test of a right application must always be, whether it be for a purpose of general or local nature. If the former, there can be no want of constitutional power.

... the bank has a natural relation to the power of collecting taxes; to that of regulating trade; to that of providing for the common defense

The examples of other nations prove that a national bank is a necessary by-product of the government's need to regulate commerce.

...all the principal commercial nations have made use of trading corporations or companies, for the purpose of external commerce, is a satisfactory proof that the establishment of them is an incident (a necessary by-product) [of the need to regulate] commerce. ...Banks are a usual engine in the administration of national finances, and... the most effectual instrument of loans, and one which, in this country, has been found essential, pleads strongly against the supposition that a government, clothed with most of the important prerogatives of sovereignty, in relation to its revenues, its debt, its credit, its defense, its trade, its intercourse with foreign nations, as forbidden to make use of that instrument, as an appendage to its own authority.

The existence of a national bank does not infringe on the ability of any state (or even any individual) to establish a bank.

It has been usual, as a... test of constitutional authority, to try (see) whether it abridges any

preexisting right of any state, or any individual. Each state may still erect as many banks as it pleases; every individual may still carry on the banking business to any extent he pleases.

In times of war, and in so many other instances, a national bank is essential to the country.

The common defense is decisive in this comparison.

- For more on the national bank, read the first two paragraphs of the annotation to **Hamilton: [Report on Manufactures](http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326)** [<http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326>] on the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History website, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**.

#### **Issue 4: Manufacturing/Agriculture**

Read the last three annotations to **Hamilton: [Report on Manufactures](http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326)** [<http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326>] on the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History website, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**. Using the search function on your web browsers, find and read the excerpts mentioning “agriculture” and “agricultural.” Also read any of the other selected excerpts from Hamilton’s statement of his economic policy—submitted to Congress on Dec. 5, 1791—that follow the annotations.

#### **Issue 5: The Jay Treaty**

- **[From Rebel to President](http://www.nps.gov/thje/rebel/state.htm)** [<http://www.nps.gov/thje/rebel/state.htm>] on the website of the National Park Service, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **Links to the Past**:

What worried Jefferson the most were Hamilton’s pro-British views. How could the United States support and ally itself with the very country that they fought against in order to secure their independence? These issues came to a head in 1795 during the debate over the Jay Treaty.

This treaty was an attempt to keep the two nations from resuming hostilities over violations of the Treaty of Paris. Jefferson could not allow himself to stand idly by as the issue was being debated. The walls of the Jefferson Memorial are lined with the words that had defined not only Jefferson but also the Revolution. Words that eloquently spoke of individual rights...religion, self-government, and education, rights that had been denied under British rule. The Jay Treaty symbolized everything that Jefferson had fought so hard against. Jefferson reentered the realm of politics and resumed his struggle against Hamilton. The ratification of the Jay Treaty provided the ammunition that Jefferson needed for a run at the Presidency in 1796. Although he fell short, Jefferson found himself, as Vice-President, the highest-ranking Republican in the government.

- **[The Duel: The Federalist Party](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/duel/peoplevents/pande05.html)** [<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/duel/peoplevents/pande05.html>] on the PBS website, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **American Memory**:

Largely influenced by the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, the Federalists succeeded in convincing the Washington administration to assume national and state debts, pass tax laws, and create a central bank. These moves undoubtedly saved the fledgling democracy from poverty and even destruction. In foreign policy, Federalists generally favored England over France.

### **Issue 6: The Democratic-Republican Societies**

The Democratic-Republican Societies were clubs that supported the French Revolution. Read the annotations and excerpts in the article [Washington on the Democratic-Republican Societies, 1798](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents_p2.cfm?doc=341) [http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/documents/documents\_p2.cfm?doc=341] on the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History website, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**.

### **Issue 7: The Alien and Sedition Acts**

The Federalists wrote, passed, and enforced the Alien and Sedition Acts, including putting newspaper editors (all Democratic-Republicans) on trial for statements made in their newspapers.

- **Letter from Alexander Hamilton to Theodore Sedgwick, February 2, 1799**

That committee should make a report exhibiting... the reasons which support the constitutionality and expediency of those laws (that is, the Alien and Sedition Acts) (and) the tendency of the doctrines advanced by Virginia and Kentucky to destroy the Constitution of the United States... The government must not merely defend itself but must attack... its enemies.



## The Federalist Party Platform

1. Funding the Public Debt
2. U.S. Relations with Great Britain and France
3. The National Bank: Implied Powers versus Strict Interpretation
4. Manufacturing/Agriculture
5. The Jay Treaty
6. The Democratic-Republican Societies
7. The Alien and Sedition Acts



## Democratic-Republican Group Handouts

### Issue 1: Funding the Public Debt

With Hamilton's urging, the early federal government assumed the debts of the states. The Democratic-Republicans were wary of accumulating debt and of too much government intervention and spending.

- [Letter from Thomas Jefferson to George Washington](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj060237))), May 23, 1792 [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(tj060237\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj060237)))] on the EDSITEMent resource **American Memory**:

It has been urged then that a public debt, greater than we can possibly pay before other causes of adding new debt to it will occur, has been artificially created, by adding together the whole amount of the debtor & creditor sides of accounts, instead of taking only their balances, which could have been paid off in a short time: That this accumulation of debt has taken for ever out of our power those easy sources of revenue, which, applied to the ordinary necessities and exigencies of government, would have answered them habitually, and covered us from habitual murmurings against taxes & tax-gatherers, reserving extraordinary calls, for those extraordinary occasions which would animate the people to meet them: That though the calls for money have been no greater than we must generally expect, for the same or equivalent exigencies, yet we are already obliged to strain the impost till it produces clamour, and will produce evasion, & war on our own citizens to collect it: and even to resort to an *Excise* law, of odious character with the people...

- [Letter from Albert Gallatin to Thomas Jefferson](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj090161))) (feedback on Jefferson's First State of the Union Address, November 16, 1801, on taxation) [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(tj090161\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mtj:@field(DOCID+@lit(tj090161)))] on the EDSITEMent resource **American Memory**:

On the other hand, if this Administration shall not reduce taxes, they never will be permanently reduced. To strike at the root of the evil and avert the danger of increasing taxes, encroaching government, temptations to offensive wars, &c., nothing can be more effectual than a repeal of *all* internal taxes, but let them all go, and not one remain on which sister taxes may be hereafter engrafted. I agree most fully with you that pretended tax-preparations, treasury-preparations, and army-preparations against contingent wars tend only to encourage wars. If the United States shall unavoidably be drawn into a war, the people will submit to any necessary tax, and the system of internal taxation which, *then*, shall be thought best adapted to the then situation of the country may be created, instead of engrafted on the old or present plan; if there shall be no real necessity for them, their abolition by this Administration will most powerfully deter any other from reviving them. A repeal now will attach as much unpopularity to them as the late direct tax has done to that mode of taxation.

## Issue 2: U.S. Relations with Great Britain/France

The Democratic-Republicans were generally more inclined toward France than Britain. They did not approve of the way import duties tended to make the U.S. economically dependent on Great Britain less than 10 years after the end of the War for Independence.

- [James Madison on Great Britain in the \*Aurora General Advertiser\*](http://www.constitution.org/jm/17990123_foreign.htm), January 23, 1799 [http://www.constitution.org/jm/17990123\_foreign.htm] on the website of the Constitution Society, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **Internet Pubic Library**:

The conclusion with me, is, that Great Britain, above all other nations, ought to be dreaded and watched, as most likely to gain an undue and pernicious ascendancy in our country.

...The United States are the greatest and best market for her manufactures. To keep out those of other nations, and to keep down those of our own, is the grand object to which her efforts have ever been directed.

To conclude: Great Britain feels every motive that a foreign power can feel to pinch our growth, and undermine our government; and enjoys greater means of influence for these purposes than ever were possessed by one nation towards another. On Great Britain then our eye at least will be constantly fixt by every real

- **Thomas Jefferson on France** in the Jefferson Cyclopedia, available via a link from the EDSITEMent resource **Internet Pubic Library**:

To these I will add, that I was a sincere well-wisher to the success of the French revolution, and still wish it may end in the establishment of a free & well-ordered republic; but I have not been insensible under the atrocious depredations they have committed on our commerce.

The first object of my heart is my own country. In that is embarked my family, my fortune, & my own existence. I have not... a single motive of preference of any one nation to another, but in proportion as they are more or less friendly to us. But though deeply feeling the injuries of France, I did not think war the surest means of redressing them. I did believe, that a mission sincerely disposed to preserve peace, would obtain for us a peaceable & honorable settlement

## Issue 3: The National Bank: Implied Powers vs. Strict Interpretation

The Democratic-Republicans argued that, even if a national bank would be of benefit to the country, nowhere in the Constitution does it specify that the federal government is allowed to be in the banking business. But the Constitution does say that any power not specified in the Constitution is delegated to the states.

- Excerpts from **Jefferson's Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank**, 1791:

...I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground: That "all powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people." [XIIth amendment.] To take a single step beyond the

boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition.

The incorporation of a bank, and the powers assumed by this bill, have not, in my opinion, been delegated to the United States, by the Constitution.

I. They are not among the powers specially enumerated: for these are: 1st A power to lay taxes for the purpose of paying the debts of the United States; but no debt is paid by this bill, nor any tax laid. Were it a bill to raise money, its origination in the Senate would condemn it by the Constitution.

2. “To borrow money.” But this bill neither borrows money nor ensures the borrowing it...

3. To “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the States, and with the Indian tribes.” To erect a bank, and to regulate commerce, are very different acts...

II. Nor are they within either of the general phrases, which are the two following:

1. To lay taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States, that is to say, “to lay taxes for *the purpose of* providing for the general welfare.” For the laying of taxes is the *power*, and the general welfare the *purpose* for which the power is to be exercised. They are not to lay taxes *ad libitum for any purpose they please*; but only *to pay the debts or provide for the welfare of the Union*. In like manner, they are not *to do anything they please* to provide for the general welfare, but only *to lay taxes* for that purpose. To consider the latter phrase, not as describing the purpose of the first, but as giving a distinct and independent power to do any act they please, which might be for the good of the Union, would render all the preceding and subsequent enumerations of power completely useless.

It would reduce the whole instrument to a single phrase, that of instituting a Congress with power to do whatever would be for the good of the United States; and, as they would be the sole judges of the good or evil, it would be also a power to do whatever evil they please.

2. The second general phrase is, “to make all laws *necessary* and proper for carrying into execution the enumerated powers.” But they can all be carried into execution without a bank. A bank therefore is not *necessary*, and consequently not authorized by this phrase.

If has been urged that a bank will give great facility or convenience in the collection of taxes, Suppose this were true: yet the Constitution allows only the means which are “*necessary*,” not those which are merely “convenient” for effecting the enumerated powers. If such a latitude of construction be allowed to this phrase as to give any non-enumerated power, it will go to everyone, for there is not one which ingenuity may not torture into a *convenience* in some instance *or other*...

Perhaps, indeed, bank bills may be a more *convenient* vehicle than treasury orders. But a little *difference* in the degree of *convenience* cannot constitute the necessity which the Constitution makes the ground for assuming any non-enumerated power...

- For more on the national bank, read the first two paragraphs of the annotation to [Hamilton: Report on Manufactures](http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326) [http://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/document.php?id=326] on the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History website, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **History Matters**. Interested students can also view a digitized image of the original copy of [Jefferson's Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank](http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson/images/vc129.jpg) [http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson/images/vc129.jpg] on The Library of Congress website, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **American Memory**.

#### **Issue 4: Manufacturing/Agriculture**

Hamilton developed economic proposals that Madison thought went beyond the enumerated powers of the Federal government. Madison argued that the doctrines advanced by Hamilton in his Report on Manufactures subverted “the fundamental and characteristic principle” of the federal government.

- [Letter from James Madison to Edmund Pendleton](http://www.jmu.edu/madison/biography/opposition.htm), January 21, 1792 [http://www.jmu.edu/madison/biography/opposition.htm] on the website of the James Madison Center, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **The American President**:

“If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote the General Welfare, the Government is no longer a limited one, possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one, subject to particular exceptions.”

- **Letter from Thomas Jefferson to David Humphreys (FE 5:344)** on the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **The American President**:

“Too little reliance is to be had on a steady and certain course of commerce with the countries of Europe to permit us to depend more on that than we cannot avoid. Our best interest would be to employ our principal labor in agriculture, because to the profits of labor, which is dear, this adds the profits of our lands, which are cheap. But the risk of hanging our prosperity on the fluctuating counsels and caprices of others renders it wise in us to turn seriously to manufactures, and if Europe will not let us carry our provisions to their manufactures, we must endeavor to bring their manufactures to our provision.”

- **Thomas Jefferson: Answers to de Meusnier Questions, 1786 (ME 17:115)** on the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **The American President**:

“The commerce of the States cannot be regulated to the best advantage but by a single body, and no body so proper as Congress.”

- **Letter from Thomas Jefferson to John Jay, 1785 (ME 5:94, Papers 8:426)** on the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive, a link from the EDSITEMent resource **The American President**:

“Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous, and they are tied to their country and wedded to its liberty and interests by the most lasting bonds. As long, therefore, as they can find employment in this line, I would not convert them into mariners, artisans, or anything else.”

- **Thomas Jefferson: 1st Annual Message, 1801** (ME 3:337) on the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive, a link from the EDSITEment resource **The American President:**

“Agriculture, manufactures, commerce and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most thriving when left most free to individual enterprise. Protection from casual embarrassments, however, may sometimes be seasonably interposed.”

### **Issue 5: The Jay Treaty**

The Democratic-Republicans felt that the Jay Treaty disregarded previous agreements with France and tilted the U.S. further toward Great Britain.

- **[The Jay Treaty Controversy, April-August 1795](http://odur.let.rug.nl/~usa/B/hamilton/hamil33.htm)** [<http://odur.let.rug.nl/~usa/B/hamilton/hamil33.htm>], an article on From Revolution to Reconstruction, a link from the EDSITEment resource **American Studies at the University of Virginia:**

When the provisions of Jay’s Treaty were made public in April of 1795, the public uproar was deafening. It seemed that Jay had not accomplished anything he had set out to do, and instead handed over what amounted to an affront to the national dignity. There were no provisions for compensation for wartime damages, illegal captures of ships and impressment of American sailors, or for the protracted Indian wars caused by the British occupation of the western posts. The British agreed to abandon the posts, but only after eighteen months. Especially insulting to the American people was a seventy-ton limit on American ships trading in the British West Indies, effectively locking Americans out of the lucrative lumber trade.

- **[James Madison in Congress on the Jay Treaty](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(ed00429)))**, April 15, 1796 [[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(ed00429\)\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(ed00429)))] on the EDSITEment resource **American Memory:**

Mr. MADISON. The proposition immediately before the committee was, that the treaty with Great Britain ought to be carried into effect by such provisions as depended on the House of Representatives. This was the point immediately in question.

If the propositions for carrying the treaty into effect be agreed to, it must be from one of three considerations: either that the legislature is bound by a constitutional necessity to pass the requisite laws, without examining the merits of the treaty; or that, on such examination, the treaty is deemed in itself a good one; or that there are good extraneous reasons for putting it into force, although it be in itself a bad treaty.

The first consideration being excluded by the decision of the house that they have a right to judge of the expediency or in expediency of passing laws relative to treaties, the question first to be examined must relate to the merits of the treaty.

He mentioned the permission to aliens to hold lands in perpetuity, as a very extraordinary

feature in this part of the treaty. He would not inquire how far this might be authorized by constitutional principles; but he would continue to say, that no example of such a stipulation was to be found in any treaty that ever was made, either where territory was ceded, or where it was acknowledged by one nation or another. Although it was common and right, in such regulation, in favor of the property of the inhabitants, yet he believed that, in every case that ever had happened, the owners of landed property were universally required to swear allegiance to the new sovereign, or to dispose of their landed property within a reasonable time. With respect to the great points in the law of nations, comprehended in the stipulations of the treaty, the same want of real reciprocity, and the same sacrifice of the interests of the United States, were conspicuous.

It is well known to have been a great and favorite object with the United States, “that free ships make free goods.” They had established the principle in their other treaties. They had witnessed, with anxiety, the general efforts, and the successful advances, towards incorporating this principle into the law of nations--a principle friendly to all neutral nations, and particularly interesting to the United States. He knew that, at a former period, it had been conceded, on the part of the United States, that the law of nations stood as the present treaty regulates it. But it did not follow, that more than acquiescence in that doctrine was proper. There was an evident distinction between silently acquiescing in it, and giving it the support of a formal and positive stipulation. The former was all that could have been required, and the latter was more than ought to have been unnecessarily yielded.

#### **Issue 6: The Democratic-Republican Societies**

The Democratic-Republican Societies were clubs that supported the French Revolution; Democratic-Republicans leaned toward France.

- [Letter from Thomas Jefferson to James Madison on Democratic Societies](http://wyllie.lib.virginia.edu:8086/perl/toccer-new?id=JefLett.sgm&images=images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=108&division=div1), December 28, 1794 [http://wyllie.lib.virginia.edu:8086/perl/toccer-new?id=JefLett.sgm&images=images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=108&division=div1], on the Electronic Text Center of the University of Virginia, a link from the EDSITEment resource **Internet Public Library**:

The denunciation of the democratic societies is one of the extraordinary acts of boldness of which we have seen so many from the faction of monocrats. It is wonderful indeed, that the President should have permitted himself to be the organ of such an attack on the freedom of discussion, the freedom of writing, printing & publishing. It must be a matter of rare curiosity to get at the modifications of these rights proposed by them, and to see what line their ingenuity would draw between democratical societies, whose avowed object is the nourishment of the republican principles of our constitution

Their sight must be perfectly dazzled by the glittering of crowns & coronets, not to see the extravagance of the proposition to suppress the friends of general freedom, while those who wish to confine that freedom to the few, are permitted to go on in their principles & practices.

### Issue 7: The Alien and Sedition Acts

The Democratic-Republicans fought against the Alien and Sedition Acts. They believed the Sedition Act's attack on freedom of the press was unconstitutional. They also believed the Alien and Sedition Acts were politically motivated, an attempt to destroy them politically. Immigrants were the target of the Alien Acts; immigrants tended to support the Democratic-Republicans. Democratic-Republicans were the only targets of the Sedition Act—specifically, editors were being put on trial for statements made in their newspapers.

- **Letter from Thomas Jefferson to James Madison** on the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive, a link from the EDSITEment resource **Internet Public Library**:

They have brought into the lower House a sedition bill, which, among other enormities, undertakes to make printing certain matters criminal, though one of the amendments to the Constitution has so expressly taken religion, printing presses, &c. out of their coercion. Indeed this bill, and the [Col 2] alien bill are both so palpably in the teeth of the Constitution as to show they mean to pay no respect to it.

- From the **Virginia Resolutions** [<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/virres.htm>] on the EDSITEment resource **The Avalon Project**:

That the General Assembly doth particularly protest against the palpable and alarming infractions of the Constitution, in the two late cases of the “Alien and Sedition Acts” passed at the last session of Congress; the first of which exercises a power no where delegated to the federal government, and which by uniting legislative and judicial powers to those of executive, subverts the general principles of free government; as well as the particular organization, and positive provisions of the federal constitution; and the other of which acts, exercises in like manner, a power not delegated by the constitution, but on the contrary, expressly and positively forbidden by one of the amendments [JMU editor - 1st amendment] thererto; a power, which more than any other, ought to produce universal alarm, because it is levelled against the right of freely examining public characters and measures, and of free communication among the people thereon, which has ever been justly deemed, the only effectual guardian of every other right.



## The Democratic-Republican Party Platform

1. Funding the Public Debt
2. U.S. Relations with Great Britain and France
3. The National Bank: Implied Powers versus Strict Interpretation
4. Manufacturing/Agriculture
5. The Jay Treaty
6. The Democratic-Republican Societies
7. The Alien and Sedition Acts