

Major Problems in American History Chapters 4-6

Chapter 4: The American Revolution

Document 1: The Stamp Act Congress Condemns the Stamp Act, 1765

Similar to the Declaration of Independence, this is a document that lists the major grievances, or complaints, of the people of the colonists against Great Britain. After the Stamp Act, the colonists had been peeved by the lack of representation and the restrictions that the Acts had caused, concerns which they had delineated here. The document begins with a preamble that explicitly states the allegiance the colonies have to the crown, a statement that proves their continued respect for their relationship with Britain and a clear sign that division from Britain was not the purpose of this document, but rather to improve the conditions of the relationship with Great Britain that existed at this time. There are thirteen declarations listed, as well as one more at the end. Their grievances included the fact that the colonies were being taxed without consent of the colonial people or the colonial legislatures, the fact that any representatives for the colonists should be chosen by the colonists, that trial by jury is a right of the people and should not be taken away (such as in admiralty courts for smugglers in the colonies), that the most recent acts by Parliament such as the Stamp Act have been restricting the rights of the colonists by extending Britain's power over them, that these new acts will also limit the commercial ability of the colonists and make it difficult for the colonists to pay them back, that the colonies have a right to petition Parliament for changes, and that the repeal of these new acts will be advantageous to both sides and should be considered. The entire document is written in a strict and formal tone, but without an imposing tone or suggestion of rebellion or separation.

Document 4: Abigail and John Adams Debate Women's Rights, 1776

This is an exchange of letters between Abigail Adams and her husband, John Adams, one of the freedom fighters and the future second president of the United States. Abigail's letter begins as one of ordinary content, reporting her status and asking that of her husband. Her letter begins with a series of letters asking where he is and how his troops are doing. She then discusses how her town has fallen somewhat into chaos, with most of the city remaining in order but some being taken with "Ravages." She then expresses her concerns about the future, in which she worries that it will be insecure with all of this conflict and that life would be worse. These sentiments are probably common among the American citizens, who lived in a tumultuous time in which the outcome was uncertain, especially in such early phases of the conflict.

The latter part of her essay begins a discussion of women's rights. She asks her husband to "Remember the Ladies." She claims that men can be "tyrants" and it is necessary to give women some rights. She also says that women have the right to rebel if they are not given representation; in this way, she is imitating the voice of the freedom fighters and fighting for her own independence.

Although her reasoning follows the same course of logic as that of American patriots, her husband mocked her statement by replying that the current system of male dominance was necessary, and that it was not as severe as she had mentioned, being more in name than in practice. He then goes on to say that it was men such as George Washington who were the ones fighting for freedom. This shows that women's rights were very weak back then, with even a husband denying his wife equality.

Document 6: Mohawk Leader Joseph Brant Commits the Loyalty of His People to Britain, 1776

This document expresses the general concern of the Native Americans to the white colonists, and their subsequent allegiance to the British. Brant begins by complimenting the King and stating that there was always an amity towards the British crown, and that the Native Americans were having trouble in the Americas, being deceived in the Americas such as in Canada when many of their warriors were killed. As a result, the Native Americans expressed their desire for the British to set things right in the colonies and prevent more damage done to the Native Americans by lies of the Europeans. Brant then affirms that he will follow through with the King's orders and tell his tribe, the Mohawk, exactly as he is told, as well as saying that the the Mohawks are a respectable tribe. The last paragraph simply restates his gratitude for the British help. Like the declarations of the Stamp Act Congress, this document is very cordial because it asks favors of Great Britain for help; each paragraph even begins with a "Brother," a familiar address. This document explains the common sentiment of many of the Native Americans against the British colonists, which in turn causes the harsh punishment of the Native Americans after the colonial victory.

Document 7: African Americans Petition for Freedom, 1777

African slaves plead for freedom to the Massachusetts Bay colonial legislative body in this speech. They show the inconsistency of the beliefs of the colony, with black slaves in a free white country, specifically citing the "Natural and Unalienable Right to that freedom which [God] hath Bestowed equally on all m[a]nkind and which they have Never forf[ei]ted by any Compact or agreement whatever" that the American freedom fighters argued in their fight against the British. This is similar to Abigail Adams' call to women's rights in that they use the philosophy of the Patriots to fight for their own cause of freedom, and the overall movement of American freedom that was greater than the struggle for independence from Britain. Similarly, this speech argued that "A Life of Slavery ... is far worse than Nonexistence," similar to Patrick Henry's concluding statement that implied that life without liberty is worse than death. The last paragraph emphasizes the hypocrisy of their treatment against the Patriots' ideals, and it acts as a call to action to the colonial government to give rights to the slaves to fix this inconsistency.

Document 8: General Washington Argues for Greater Military Funding by Portraying the Plight of Soldiers at Valley Forge, 1778

The first part of this speech is Washington's claim that continuing the war effort is of utmost importance to the colonies. He mentions that, although there is still some support for the war, the necessity of funding is unaddressed and is growing ever more important. The reason, he says, is that Great Britain will try to come to terms of peace with them, either to deceiving or sincere intent. Washington argues that either way, this will lead to a dependence that is contrary to the independence that the colonies were originally fighting for, which will mean that their cause is lost and that life will return to the life they abhorred. He is careful to make this distinction of life of peace with the British versus a life of independence from them to his audience, which is meant to explain the enduring cause for which the colonists, however weary, are still fighting. This in turn serves as a vindication of the prolonged war efforts and an encouragement to keep fighting.

The latter part of the speech mentions the dire situation at Valley Forge that requires funding. Washington portrays the men as poor and helpless, without clothes, food, or shelter, people that desperately need help and yet still have a "patience and obedience ... can scarce be [matched]." This is

meant to evoke an emotional response to his audience to show the utmost importance of funding for the deprived troops.

How did the Revolution alter the lives of various groups—men and women; Indians and slaves; loyalists and patriots—in different ways?

To the white Patriot men, the Revolution was a welcome change that was a call to freedom and the other rights that had been suppressed in the previous years with British taxation without representation. For all of the other groups—women, Native Americans, slaves, and Loyalists—the fight was not meant to benefit them nor their rights.

In her letter to her husband, Abigail Adams asked to have women's rights be included with the men's rights, because she deemed it reasonable that all people should have the same rights. The slaves held a similar view in their address to Massachusetts, citing the Enlightenment ideas of the "natural and inalienable rights" that the Patriots were holding themselves to. Therefore, even while using the same reasoning as the white men, these minority groups were laughed at for trying to gain freedom for themselves—in the eyes of the ones in power, it was this system of male dominance that had powered society for so long, and they believed that it was their rights that they were fighting for. As a result, these minority groups did not have an improvement of independence or rights, and stayed in their positions in society. Culture and society did not change in this aspect.

Native Americans, who were always in conflict with the European colonists, did not try to gain freedom from the colonists because they had no hope for reconciliation. Instead, they turned to the British for help against the colonists, such as when Joseph Brant declared the Mohawk's loyalty to Great Britain. Unfortunately, the colonists won the war and placed even harsher conditions on the Native Americans, who became even more suppressed than before the Revolution.

The Loyalists were against the Patriots, and naturally were frowned upon by the Patriots. As a result, they were the ones that were greatly persecuted by the Patriots. The Patriots, on the other hand, looked at the Revolution as an opportunity for independence, as was evident by Patrick Henry's powerful speech. George Washington also mentioned that it was important that they separated from Britain, rather than simply obtaining a peaceful dependence on them, so that they could earn their rights for themselves. As a result, the Patriots were the men who gained the most from the Revolution and were the most optimistic about it. Their thoughts of independence, although they did not guarantee rights for minority groups of people, did become the cornerstone of American identity and ideology.

Do the British measures leading up to the Revolution in retrospect look reasonable? If so, how can one explain the American response to them?

They do seem reasonable, considering that Great Britain had gone through a heavy war with great financial losses and had a large empire to maintain. Considering the great spending that they had in the Americas, it was reasonable to tax them. They were also taxing the colonies at lower rates than they were their own citizens. The acts were only reasonable in their eyes.

The colonists did not render the practical side of the taxation as important as the political side, however. The colonists looked at acts such as the Stamp Act as a form of unfair colonial control, because they had not been represented in Parliament. The Stamp Act Congress wrote a document that listed the grievances of the colonies; among these were that the Stamp Act and other acts had been done without the consent of the colonial legislative bodies, and therefore was violating the people's rights and should not be allowed. They further claimed that this was restricting their freedom and commercial ability, and

was greatly unfavorable to the colonies. Patrick Henry and George Washington claimed in their speeches that the dependence on Great Britain would inevitably lead to these restrictions, no matter what reconciliation might be attempted; they claimed that all was futile except complete separation from Great Britain. As a result, the separation was a political move that meant to fulfill the new cultural ideals of freedom and natural rights that were arising in the American colonies.

Would you characterize the Revolution as a conflict that looked forward or backward?

For the most part, the Revolution was a conflict that looked forward to ideas that had never been put to practice before. The Patriots were looking to establish independence for the new Enlightenment ideals that put freedom and independence at the forefront; behind the scenes, women's and slaves' rights were being advocated. Although it was first considered unfavorable to split from Great Britain, with positive attitudes seen towards a continued relationship with Great Britain such as in the Stamp Act Congress, the colonists were soon looking ahead to new ideas. Patrick Henry and George Washington advocated strongly against the subordination of the colonies to the British as had been the case for almost two centuries, but instead looked forwards to a new world that could protect their freedoms and rights.

The fight for freedom hid the conflict that happened internally in the colonies, however. Women's rights were being fought for behind the scenes, as well as the abolition of slavery. While these were being fought for, the white men who were already in power suppressed them. Therefore, while they fought for the advancement of their own liberties on an international scale against the British, the men also looked to traditional societal and cultural customs when it came to these minority groups. They used their own power hypocritically, raising themselves using words of justice while suppressing others who seek equality with the same terms of justice.

Chapter 5

Document 1: The Articles of Confederation Stress the Rights of States, 1781

The Articles of Confederation set the framework for a new government, stressing the revolutionary ideas of equality free of oppression from a central government. This document is the preamble of the Articles of Confederation, which gives a summary of each article of the Articles of Confederation. While the central government is very weak, focused only upon a legislative body that meets once a year with delegates sent by the states (Article V), and which many major governmental policies could not pass without the consent of nine of the colonies (Article IX). The states, on the other hand, were totally sovereign (Article II) had the responsibility to protect each other at all times (Article III), had an equal say in Congress (one vote each, Article V), and had the power to collect taxes (Article VIII). Although idealistic in terms for the Patriots during the Revolutionary War, this set the groundwork for failure as the Americans began to realize the need for a more practical and efficient system with a stronger central government.

Document 3: Slaveholders in Virginia Argue Against the Abolition of Slavery, 1784-1785

In this article, Virginia slave masters complain about efforts to abolish slavery. Like the freedom fighters, they cite the natural rights of Man: they believe that the new legislature was attempting to take their property (slaves) from them, which was their birthright. Furthermore, they compared this to the British, who had wrongly had the power to take possessions without consent; this struck a chord with

many of the Revolutionaries at the time, who had wanted their system of governing to be totally opposite of that of the British. The slaveholders also mention that slavery is a holy right, listed in the Bible, and that a general emancipation of slavery by law would result in “Want, Poverty, Distress, and Ruin ... Neglect, Famine, and Death ... the Horrors of Rapes, Murders, and Outrages”—they are afraid of too much change that might upset the current system of economic exchange powered by slavery. The passage is concluded by the slaveholders’ general contempt for the slaves, and it emphasizes the word “free.” This document provides clear evidence of why the slaveholders were so passionate to keep slavery—to keep their property and to prevent change—despite the work of abolitionists.

Document 7: *The Federalist Papers* Illustrate the Advantages of Ratification of the Constitution, 1787-8

In this essay to the New York citizens by James Madison, the benefits of a representative republic (which the Constitution features) over a pure democracy (which the Articles of Confederation feature) are argued to the citizens. Madison’s main point is that “factions,” or dissenting groups in society that are violent and work against the good of the whole, have less power in a republic. He argues that the sense of opposition in these groups is inherent in human nature, and that they are persistently working negatively towards the government. Madison argues that in a pure democracy, there is no oversight, and no one can control the factions. On the other hand, a representative republic would have a few Enlightened officials with the true interest of the citizens, who would be more virtuous and unfazed by popular and unreasonable sentiment. The penultimate paragraph in this passage is full of rhetorical questions meant to promote Madison’s point: he asks himself, and then answers how the idea of a representative republic would be more virtuous (because of even-minded representatives), secure (without the violence of factions), and opposed to the destruction of factions. It is also argued that as a country becomes larger, a pure democracy would become less practical because of the sheer number of votes to collect; a republic is more scalable and practical to handle a greater number of citizens.

In his essay about checks and balances, Madison again talks about human nature and the greed for power. The struggle for power was a great source of contention between Great Britain and the colonies; therefore, the new Americans were very opposed to having a strong executive branch and Madison’s speech was crucial in convincing the Americans. Madison argued that in order to balance power, the government should be split into different branches, so that not all of the power was concentrated in the central legislative branch, and that the branches “by their mutual relations be the means of keeping each other in their proper places.” Thus the idea of checks and balances was born—a system in which branches were under the power of other branches so as to avoid power abuse.

Alexander Hamilton persuades the people into allowing a presidency, despite popular sentiment against a single ruler because of their negative experiences with the dictatorial rule of the kings of England. Hamilton directly acknowledges and addresses this; much of the piece is written in a compare-contrast structure that compares the proposal of a new President to the idea of the king. His claim includes the fact that while the king has absolute jurisdiction over many matters, the President must work with the consent of other branches; that while the choice of king is hereditary, the President is a qualified, elected representative; and that while the king is spiritually divine, the President will have no say in religious affairs. Overall, he presents the President as a very moderate leader, one that will not become the despotic leader the English king was.

Document 8: Patrick Henry Condemns the Centralization of Government if the Constitution is Ratified, 1788

In this document Patrick Henry is concerned that the Constitution is too radical and rests on too many assumptions that have never been carried out. He claims that the Constitution is as revolutionary as the Revolution itself, and that the decision to go from the Confederation created by the Articles of Confederation to the more united nation of the Constitution should not be taken. He argues that the current system of government adheres to the principles that the revolutionaries had been fighting for during the Revolutionary War, and that it was a working system that did not bring up many issues, specifically citing that Virginia had no issues with the current system despite Constitution-advocates warning that “the Union is gone” and wanting a stronger central government. The latter part of his essay describes that not only are the Articles of Confederation functional, but the Constitution acts as a threat to their morals. He argues that the President may become like a king, the representatives may become corrupt, and Congress may hold all the power, essentially forming an oligarchy. He also argues that the system of checks and balances is a new idea that has not been put to practice. To more conservative Americans, Henry’s argument gave many powerful reasons why the Constitution should not be ratified, being so new and hypothetical.

Would the United States have survived as a nation if the Articles of Confederation had remained the framework of government? How would government and society have differed if the Articles had not been replaced by the Constitution?

The United States probably would have survived if the Articles of Confederation had not been replaced by the Constitution. The Constitution was meant to be a re-write of the Articles that switched out some of the traditional revolutionary values—i.e., greater power to the states than the national government—for more practical ones—i.e., the separation of power amongst multiple branches of government and a greater central government—but life under the Articles of Confederation would still be tolerable.

Patrick Henry, for example, argues that the Articles of Confederation created a working system, while the Constitution created a stronger government that put the freedom of the people at the mercy of their representatives and the president, effectually creating an aristocracy again. This was a common sentiment at the time, and many people in that time period supported the Articles of Confederation for promoting the rights of individual states against a strong central force, which would then prevent against a monopoly of power, one similar to Great Britain’s dictator-like rule over the colonies, from forming. The system would appeal to the most fundamental ideals of the recent Revolution.

The problem with the Articles of Confederation was the great inefficiency with which it functioned. Madison argued that the more lax, egalitarian society would foster “factions,” dissenting groups that no central power could dissuade. As a result, a “mobocracy” might result, forming anarchy; this would be prevented with a central government at the head. Similarly, Hamilton argued that a President and an executive branch would be necessary for government (a *leader* of government, rather than simply a headless legislative body), but would not have the powers that the king of England had. Therefore, what the Framers imagined for a Constitution was simply an improvement aimed at the current problems in society. Without the Constitution replacing the Articles of Confederation, American society would likely be more chaotic and less efficient, albeit more free and friendly to the revolutionaries. Government would operate solely based on the legislative branch, which should still promote the interests of the public, but there would be no executive or judicial branches to lead the government or handle legal matters—the government would be less powerful and narrower in its scope,

while the state legislatures would handle most legal and economic matters. Ultimately, this might lead to lesser unity between the colonies as they coexisted without a central political power, and therefore culture and society would be much more disorganized and dissimilar throughout the colonies.

Was the framing of the Constitution “counterrevolutionary”?

Although the Constitution ostensibly returns to some anti-revolutionary methods of governing—e.g., an introduction of a single-person head of government and a greater central government—it does so while maintaining the principles upon which the Revolution stood. In other words, it returns to some old customs in light of the new ideals—the Revolution still rules the hearts of the people, but the old, slightly-modified English ways of governance that might be re-introduced so as to carry out the law to the revolutionary ends.

Hamilton highlights this in his essay. He relates to the audience that the idea of President is necessary for practical purposes, just as a king is necessary to lead his country and government, but that other than his principal role of leadership, everything else still adheres to the American ideals. For example, he lists that the President will be elected rather than be chosen hereditarily, that he will be head of government and not a religious ruler, and that many momentous actions by the President, such as the decision of war, must be done with the consent of the other branches of government—all this is in contrary to the powers of the British king, yet the fundamental role still exists.

Madison has a similar concept of the idea of stronger central governance for the purpose of eliminating factions. Without factions, there would be less of a sense of mobocracy, and therefore there would be less anarchy and more order in the United States. Instead of using this greater central power to despotic ends like the British did over the colonies with the wrongful taxation preceding the Revolution, Madison views the increase in central government as a strong regulating power that would protect the rights of the people and maintain a healthy democracy.

But the Constitution did not only reinstate English systems of governance; completely new systems were introduced as well, making the Constitution revolutionary. The systems of the separation of powers and checks and balances, as stated by Madison, would allow the new central government to be better-regulated than traditional systems. In contrast, in England the Parliament appointed members of the Cabinet—the executive branch of government—so that the entire British government was one branch with almost unlimited jurisdiction. The Constitution provided new political measures to combat the rise of corruption and protect the revolutionary ideas of society, limiting the power of the president and the new central government.

Compare and contrast the focus upon religious freedom and physical enslavement. How did the United States justify slavery, but accept freedom of religion?

In both the cases of slavery and religious freedom, the European colonists deemed it their right that ought to be protected—the right to property (slaves in the chattel slavery system) and the right to freedom of religion. The slaveholders of Virginia mentioned in their address that slaves were their property, and the right to property was a sacred, natural right; like the women’s and slaves’ rights advocates, they emulated the freedom fighters in wants for freedom of basic rights. The only potential disagreement between the two is the interpretation of “property”—the idea of slaves simply as property was a common idea in that time period, however, and therefore the continuity of slavery was considered a sound practice. In this case, the slaves’ rights were not considered, as they were reduced to chattel and were not true people that deserved the same natural rights as the Europeans.

On the other hand, religious freedom was a right that the colonial Americans had constantly been fighting for. Ever since the engenderment of America, many colonists had emigrated from England in order to escape religious persecution, such as with the Pilgrims in the Massachusetts colony at Plymouth. Like the right to property, the freedom of religion was also a highly cherished right to the Americans—it constituted another of the three natural rights that Locke had proposed in his highly-influential paper, *Common Sense*: liberty (specifically of worship). Therefore, like the fight to continue slavery, both of these movements for the continuation of slavery and for religious freedom were attempts at preserving rights (for the European colonists) central to the ideals of the Revolution, which became the central beliefs of culture and society.

How important was slavery in this important time?

Slavery had become less recognized in this time of political turmoil, but they still held a role in the war and in abolitionist movements that followed afterwards. During the war, many slaves had fought for both sides of the war, and especially for the British who gave promises of freedom for slaves bound to lifetime service. After the war, despite anti-abolitionists such as the Virginia slaveowners, the slaves fought for freedom, citing the natural right to liberty that their white Patriot masters had been fighting for. As in the 1777 petition by slaves to the Massachusetts Bay Colony legislature for freedom, the slaves sensed a hypocrisy in societal ideals, with the natural rights that are supposed to be applied to *all* people being denied to a select group. As a result, the African Americans were fighting an internal social conflict for emancipation while their masters were fighting a political power play with the Europeans for their rights.

After the war, especially with the new ideals of the Jeffersonian Democratic-Republicans, the increased societal emphasis on farming called again for the need of slavery. While Jefferson imagined a land of hardworking white citizens tilling their land and staying independent and free of corruption, it was inevitable that increased farm output would bring the need for increased labor, which again was met by slavery. Thus, slaves again were heavily relied upon and even played a part in carrying out the will of Jefferson's party through the augmentation of its economic system.

Chapter 6

Document 1: Republican Thomas Jefferson Celebrates the Virtue of the Yeoman Farmer, 1785

In this document, Thomas Jefferson emphasizes the importance of the role of yeoman (subsistence) farmers in society. He claims that land is a great resource that the Americans have, being an expansive realm much greater in area than European nations, and that God's "chosen people" are those who work the land as humble farmers. These people are the ones who are the most virtuous and the least corrupt, even extrapolating so far as to say that the ratio of non-farmers to yeoman farmers in a society is representative of how sound a society is. He argues that the yeoman farmers are independent, while their customers (the rest of society) are dependent on them; this dependence fosters negativity and corruption. It can be reasonably inferred that this was inspired by Revolutionary ideas based on the dependence of Great Britain and the favorability of independence over dependence. Based on this independence, it is favorable to have a greater population of farmers here and other professions—such as "carpenters, masons, smith"—back in Europe so as to avoid corrupting the citizens of the United States. Thus, Jefferson proposed an entire system of economics, based around the profession of agriculture for necessity and trading with Europe for other goods.

Document 2: Judith Sargent Murray Argues for the “Equality for the Sexes,” 1790

Murray angrily argues that women and men are equal, and should be treated equally but are not. She begins by asking how women and men really differ from each other; in what ways women are inferior to men. A logical answer to her own question is given, proving using a broad measure of intellect to support her claim that women are intellectually equal to or more adept intellectually than men. Having asserted this claim of women’s competency, she explains that women have a feeling of inferiority, and therefore live a wrongful life of shame. Because they are looked down upon by men and not given the same opportunities as men, they are subjected to a life of “sexual employments or amusements” in vain, and a “mortifying consciousness of inferiority, which embitters every enjoyment.” The document then shifts to become a call to action to support the betterment of women’s education because that would greatly enrich a woman’s life so that it would rightfully become equal in standard to a man’s life. Like Abigail Adams, Murray was one of the first women to openly challenge the long-standing superiority of man, bringing Revolutionary ideas of natural rights to social issues as well as political ones.

Document 3: Federalist Alexander Hamilton Envisions a Developed American Economy, 1791

Hamilton imagines a system of lifestyle that augments the nation’s ability to profit from industry, which directly opposes Jefferson’s want for a farming-based society meant to combat corruption. Hamilton lists seven points that his plan will center around that are very similar to liberal systems today, such as stimulating employment in lesser-staffed fields, promotion of immigration, greater diversity of talent and less discrimination, as well as farming (but not as the foundation of the economic system as was Jefferson’s plan). Each of these points are discussed in detail, making up the rest of the document. All of these points are based around optimizing profit by using as many resources as possible: this means the use of more people (from immigration), machines (who can work as efficiently as humans in some cases), more types of jobs (industry and farming), and more fields (a diversification and anti-discrimination of talent). This system of economics contrasts strongly against Jefferson’s, which was based around the morality and religiosity of farmers; Hamilton’s plan, on the other hand, focused on material advancement.

Essay (Kerber): The Fears of the Federalists

After Jefferson was elected, the Federalists showed great concern. The Jeffersonians were characteristically free, but the Federalists believed that there ought to be more structure in the new society that the Americans had; as a result, they believed the Jeffersonians were naïve in their calls for idealistic freedom. Their greatest concern was the growing proletariat, the class of poor and less educated people, who had the tendency to form a mob mentality contrary to that of the government or the common good—the “factions” that Madison warned against. The federalists argued that the United States were born out of turmoil, and that the freedom that the Jeffersonians wanted would only lead to the rebellious attitude that allowed the colonies to separate themselves from Great Britain. It turned out that the idea of the moral, noble farmer that Jefferson wanted was an idealistic and impractical image, and even Jefferson said that the mobs would be the problem with society (and that was why the idea of the non-corrupt farmers was the foundation of his plan). As a result, the industrial views of Hamilton became somewhat more popular, with industries already forming. With the federalists worrying that human nature prevented mankind from being naturally virtuous, they turned to other sources of virtue:

the principle source of this was religion. Religion, which formed the moral basis of many people's lives, eventually saved the public such as during the Great Revival of 1801. The victorious Jeffersonian liberal view clashed strongly with the more conservative, concerned Federalist view in politics, economics, and social issues of morality.

Essay (McCoy): The Fears of the Jeffersonian Republicans

This document begins with the origin of Jefferson's political and economic views during a French questionnaire of the members of the Continental Congress. However, his answer to the survey became a widely-supported view that idealized the hard work and high morals of farmers, as well as the need for foreign interdependence for goods other than the bare necessities that agriculture could provide. The latter was a view that was not customary in the colonies, but Jefferson considered the vast arable land of the United States a comparative advantage for the United States that could be used for the greater benefit of the citizens, while higher-quality goods would still be cheaper if bought from the industrial nations of Europe. McCoy goes on to explain many points of Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* in great detail, such as the fear that Jefferson had of extensive manufacturing that was similar to European economics, or his disdain for dependence on others, for which the self-sufficient yeoman farmers would provide a solution.

The next section of McCoy's essay talks about the changes to government from Jefferson's presidency on. In 1800, the year of Jefferson's election, he deemed his election a revolution, one that prevented the Federalist view of Anglicanized manufacturing that he strongly opposed from being implemented, and therefore allow a truly republican government. Jefferson proceeded to attempt to lower spending and the debt and erase Hamilton's financial policies such as higher taxes, which Jefferson thought was corrupting society. This view became very popular amongst many people, even industrial or non-farming people that the Federalist view advocated for.

Next, McCoy discusses the belief of Malthus, a parson who believed that societal aging—into corruption, as was usually observed—was inevitable, and that no system, not even the Jeffersonian view of anti-corruption, could hold it off forever. This was in contrary to Jefferson's belief that a virtually-indefinite resource of land and the abundance of farming would hold off corruption, but Malthus disagreed. However, Jefferson acknowledged Malthus' work for its liberal economic views that corresponded with his own, and rejected Malthus' population views for a belief in American self-sustainability.

The final section of McCoy's essay focused on the Louisiana Purchase, which gave the United States much more arable land, which further alleviated Jefferson's concerns. This, he argued, allowed for the spread of a republican system by allowing more land to the farmers. However, McCoy ends with a curiously opposing thought that as the United States began to open up to free trade and more international relationships, the beliefs of the Jeffersonians would become more idealistic and titular and lose their importance.

Whose vision of America's future, Jefferson's or Hamilton's, is most appealing to you? Whose vision was most fully realized?

Hamilton's view seems the more appealing worldview to me. It supports the optimization of American resources, especially its human resources and industrial capabilities, in order to augment American superiority in the world. He focused on practical ways to allow a forward movement of American society, especially economically, that correspond with many successful liberal policies that

extend even to today, such as the supporting of immigration for greater manpower, greater diversification of the workforce, and stimulating lesser-staffed fields of work. His view makes sense and gives a clear indication of progress with sound reasoning and measurable steps to realization—it was an entire system of economic exchange waiting to be realized.

However, it was not Hamilton's industrial view, but Jefferson's agrarian view, that became the vision that was more greatly implemented. After Thomas Jefferson's ascension to presidency in 1800 and the subsequent efforts of the Jeffersonian Republicans to remove traces of Hamilton's work, society became tilted in the favor of Jefferson. He believed that industry and dependence on others would lead to corruption and greed, while the hard-working, humble farmers were "God's people" and would be the least corrupt because of their own independence. Therefore, he supported the theory that the greater the amount of land a nation has, and the greater the percentage of humble yeoman farmers, the less corrupt the nation would be. Therefore, as McCoy stated in his essay, as much as 90% of the people in the United States were husbandmen, and even workers of industry supported Jefferson's view. Following the Louisiana Purchase, this view became even more solid with the expansion of the United States, because there was more land to create more work for the farmers who would continue his theory. Therefore, while Hamilton's view was more of a practical, economic model, Jefferson had more of a moral ideal that the people favored, showing that cultural and societal wants during the tumultuous time were more important to the colonists than economic desires. Corruption of political power was a major concern of the revolutionaries, who worried that the new government of the United States might become corrupt and dictatorial like the British one; this view of anti-corruption and moral sanctity, based on cultural values of revolutionary ideals, proved very alluring.

How did the fears and hopes of those who belonged to the Federalists and to the Democratic-Republican Party differ?

The major concern of the Federalists was that the excessive freedom granted by the Jeffersonians would foster a proletariat class that would create mob mentality. This was because the ideal yeoman farmer that Jefferson had in mind was very rare, and there was no strict correlation between a higher degree of morality and the subsistence farmers. The Federalists hoped that the United States would have better economic policies, including better foreign relations; this was very different from the Jeffersonians' moral and independent theories.

The Jeffersonians, on the other hand, had won power in 1800 with the election of Thomas Jefferson, and did not have as great a fear of the other party's policies. Jefferson quickly began removing the policies that the Federalists had put in place, such as increased taxes and industry. However, they were concerned about the integrity of their system as time went on: Malthus had spread a popular population theory that asserted that any society, no matter how virtuous its principles, will follow the path to corruption. Furthermore, Jefferson's policy depended on the availability of land. Luckily, and especially after the Louisiana Purchase shortly after Jefferson's election, land was abundant for the colonies, much more so than that of any European nation; this, he claimed, would be enough to survive the nation for centuries to come for farmers and their humble rectitude. Therefore, while the Jeffersonians based their society on moral principles—an unprecedented system—and while doomsayers like Malthus preached the inevitability of a social degeneration, the view of the Jeffersonians was still generally positive.

How did Federalists and Democratic-Republicans represent and misrepresent one another?

Both parties, being in opposition to one another, naturally misrepresented the other party as a polar opposite. The Federalists, for example, saw the Jeffersonians as the key to the detriment of society because they were *too equal*—they were promoting exaggeration of the benefits of the yeoman farmers, who the Federalists believed were simply ordinary farmers struggling to make a living and profit and not the idealized heroes that the Jeffersonians made them out to be. The society they saw was one that was still highly reactive, born out of an age of turmoil and not completely settled.

The Jeffersonian Republicans saw the economic views of the Federalists as potentially corrupting, as it fostered a capitalistic society that may foster an aristocratic class and cause people to deviate from their moral beliefs. They saw the Federalists as a more elitist group focused on profit rather than the common good; this turned out to be a popular belief amongst the American citizens, which contributed to the victory of the Democratic-Republicans over the Federalists.

Ultimately, the very image of the two parties stood distinct from one another, the Federalists being the progressive party of economic concerns, and the Democratic-Republicans being an ethical society based on the commoner. Ultimately, the recent cultural ideals that were more prevalent in Jefferson's party led to his election, as well as the strengthening of revolutionary ideals into the fabric of American identity as well.