In 1826, in the midst of the years covered in this period, the young nation celebrated its 50th birthday with great optimism. The founders of the country were passing on and leadership had passed to a new generation.

**Overview** The new republic worked to define itself during a time of rapid demographic, economic, and territorial growth. It increased suffrage; reformed its schools, prisons, and asylums; and developed its own art, literature, and philosophy. These changes took place as a market economy emerged and people benefited from the addition of fertile land farther west and advances in industry and transportation everywhere. The country focused on expanding its borders and trade while avoiding European entanglements.

**Alternate View** While this period saw growth, it also had increased conflict with American Indians and its neighbors. Many of the immigrants attracted by new opportunities also found prejudice and discrimination. Rights for the common man excluded American Indians, African Americans, and women. Efforts to improve life succeeded for many but not those enslaved. Landmarks in the institution of slavery came earlier, with the development of the cotton gin in 1793 and the end of the importation of enslaved Africans in 1808. Others came later, such as the Compromise of 1850.

**Key Concepts**

4.1: The United States developed the world’s first modern mass democracy and celebrated a new national culture, while Americans sought to define the nation’s democratic ideals and to reform its institutions to match them.

4.2: Developments in technology, agriculture, and commerce precipitated profound changes in U.S. settlement patterns, regional identities, gender and family relations, political power, and distribution of consumer goods.

4.3: U.S. interest in increasing foreign trade, expanding its national borders, and isolating itself from European conflicts shaped the nation’s foreign policy and spurred government and private initiatives.

**Source:** AP United States History Curriculum Framework 2014–2015
THE AGE OF JEFFERSON, 1800–1816

Let us then, fellow-citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. . . . But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists.

Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, 1801

In the election of 1800, there had been much animosity and bitter partisan feeling between the two national political parties. Following this Revolution of 1800, Thomas Jefferson, the new president, recognized the need for a smooth and peaceful transition of power from the Federalists to the Democratic-Republicans. That is why, in his inaugural address of 1801, Jefferson stressed the popular acceptance of the basic principles of constitutional government when he stated: “We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists.”

By 1816, Jefferson’s call for unity seems to have been realized. The Federalists had nearly disappeared, but the Democratic-Republicans had adopted many of their positions. Under Jefferson and his close friend James Madison, the nation experienced peaceful political change, expanded territorially, survived another war, and strengthened its democratic and nationalistic spirit. It was thriving, even as it faced significant problems—including slavery, the treatment of American Indians, and loyalty to local interests.

Jefferson’s Presidency

During his first term, Jefferson attempted to win the allegiance and trust of Federalist opponents by maintaining the national bank and debt-repayment plan of Hamilton. In foreign policy, he carried on the neutrality policies of Washington and Adams. At the same time, Jefferson retained the loyalty of Democratic-Republican supporters by adhering to his party’s guiding principle of limited central government. He reduced the size of the military, eliminated a number of federal jobs, repealed the excise taxes—including those on whiskey—and lowered the national debt. Only Republicans were named to his cabinet, as he sought to avoid the internal divisions that distracted Washington.
Compared to Adams’ troubled administration, Jefferson’s first four years in office were relatively free of discord. The single most important achievement of these years was the acquisition by purchase of vast western lands known as the Louisiana Territory.

**The Louisiana Purchase**

The Louisiana Territory encompassed a large and largely unexplored tract of western land through which the Mississippi and Missouri rivers flowed. At the mouth of the Mississippi lay the territory’s most valuable property in terms of commerce—the port of New Orleans. For many years, Louisiana and New Orleans had been claimed by Spain. But in 1800, the French military and political leader Napoleon Bonaparte secretly forced Spain to give the Louisiana Territory back to its former owner, France. Napoleon hoped to restore the French empire in the Americas. By 1803, however, Napoleon had lost interest in this plan for two reasons: (1) he needed to concentrate French resources on fighting England and (2) a rebellion led by Toussaint l’Ouverture against French rule on the island of Santo Domingo had resulted in heavy French losses.

**U.S. Interest in the Mississippi River**  During Jefferson’s presidency, the western frontier extended beyond Ohio and Kentucky into the Indiana Territory. Settlers in this region depended for their economic existence on transporting goods on rivers that flowed westward into the Mississippi and southward as far as New Orleans. They were greatly alarmed therefore when in 1802 Spanish officials, who were still in charge of New Orleans, closed the port to Americans. They revoked the *right of deposit* granted in the Pinckney Treaty of 1795, which had allowed American farmers tax-free use of the port. People on the frontier clamored for government action. In addition to being concerned about the economic impact of the closing of New Orleans, President Jefferson was troubled by its consequences on foreign policy. He feared that, so long as a foreign power controlled the river at New Orleans, the United States risked entanglement in European affairs.

**Negotiations**  Jefferson sent ministers to France with instructions to offer up to $10 million for both New Orleans and a strip of land extending from that port eastward to Florida. If the American ministers failed in their negotiations with the French, they were instructed to begin discussions with Britain for a U.S.-British alliance. Napoleon’s ministers, seeking funds for a war against Britain, offered to sell not only New Orleans but also the entire Louisiana Territory for $15 million. The surprised American ministers quickly went beyond their instructions and accepted.

**Constitutional Predicament**  Jefferson and most Americans strongly approved of the Louisiana Purchase. Nevertheless, a constitutional problem troubled the president. Jefferson was committed to a strict interpretation of the Constitution and rejected Hamilton’s argument that certain powers were
implied. No clause in the Constitution explicitly stated that a president could purchase foreign land. In this case, Jefferson determined to set aside his idealism for the country’s good. He submitted the purchase agreement to the Senate, arguing that lands could be added to the United States as an application of the president’s power to make treaties. Casting aside the criticisms of Federalist senators, the Republican majority in the Senate quickly ratified the purchase.

**Consequences** The Louisiana Purchase more than doubled the size of the United States, removed a European presence from the nation’s borders, and extended the western frontier to lands beyond the Mississippi. Furthermore, the acquisition of millions of acres of land strengthened Jefferson’s hopes that his country’s future would be based on an agrarian society of independent farmers rather than Hamilton’s vision of an urban and industrial society. In political terms, the Louisiana Purchase increased Jefferson’s popularity and showed the Federalists to be a weak, sectionalist (New England-based) party that could do little more than complain about Democratic-Republican policies.

THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE, 1803
Lewis and Clark Expedition  Even before Louisiana was purchased, Jefferson had persuaded Congress to fund a scientific exploration of the trans-Mississippi West to be led by Captain Meriwether Lewis and Lieutenant William Clark. The Louisiana Purchase greatly increased the importance of the expedition. Lewis and Clark set out from St. Louis in 1804, crossed the Rockies, reached the Oregon coast on the Pacific Ocean, then turned back and completed the return journey in 1806. The benefits of the expedition were many: greater geographic and scientific knowledge of the region, stronger U.S. claims to the Oregon Territory, better relations with American Indians, and more accurate maps and land routes for fur trappers and future settlers.

John Marshall and the Supreme Court

After the sweeping Democratic-Republican victory of 1800, the only power remaining to the Federalists was their control of the federal courts. The Federalist appointments to the courts, previously made by Washington and Adams, were not subject to recall or removal except by impeachment. Federalist judges therefore continued in office, much to the annoyance of the Democratic-Republican president, Jefferson.

John Marshall  Ironically, the Federalist judge who caused Jefferson the most grief was one of his own cousins from Virginia, John Marshall. Marshall had been appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court during the final months of John Adams’ presidency. He held his post for 34 years, in which time he exerted as strong an influence on the Supreme Court as Washington had exerted on the presidency. Marshall’s decisions in many landmark cases generally strengthened the central government, often at the expense of states’ rights.

Case of Marbury v. Madison (1803)  The first major case decided by Marshall put him in direct conflict with President Jefferson. Upon taking office, Jefferson wanted to block the Federalist judges appointed by his predecessor, President John Adams. He ordered Secretary of State James Madison not to deliver the commissions to those Federalists judges. One of Adams’ “midnight appointments,” William Marbury, sued for his commission. The case of Marbury v. Madison went to the Supreme Court in 1803. Marshall ruled that Marbury had a right to his commission according to the Judiciary Act passed by Congress in 1789. However, Marshall said the Judiciary Act of 1789 had given to the Court greater power than the Constitution allowed. Therefore, the law was unconstitutional, and Marbury would not receive his commission.

In effect, Marshall sacrificed what would have been a small Federalist gain (the appointment of Marbury) for a much larger, long-term judicial victory. By ruling a law of Congress to be unconstitutional, Marshall established the doctrine of judicial review. From this point on, the Supreme Court would exercise the power to decide whether an act of Congress or of the president was allowed by the Constitution. The Supreme Court could now overrule actions of the other two branches of the federal government.
Judicial Impeachments Jefferson tried other methods for overturning past Federalist measures and appointments. Soon after entering office, he suspended the Alien and Sedition Acts and released those jailed under them. Hoping to remove partisan Federalist judges, Jefferson supported a campaign of impeachment. The judge of one federal district was found to be mentally unbalanced. The House voted his impeachment and the Senate then voted to remove him. The House also impeached a Supreme Court justice, Samuel Chase, but the Senate acquitted him after finding no evidence of “high crimes.” Except for these two cases, the impeachment campaign was largely a failure, as almost all the Federalist judges remained in office. Even so, the threat of impeachment caused the judges to be more cautious and less partisan in their decisions.

Jefferson’s Reelection

In 1804 Jefferson won reelection by an overwhelming margin, receiving all but 14 of the 176 electoral votes. His second term was marked by growing difficulties. There were plots by his former vice president, Aaron Burr; opposition by a faction of his own party (the “Quids”), who accused him of abandoning Democratic-Republican principles; and foreign troubles from the Napoleonic wars in Europe.

Aaron Burr

A Democratic-Republican caucus (closed meeting) in 1804 decided not to nominate Aaron Burr for a second term as vice president. Burr then embarked on a series of ventures, one of which threatened to break up the Union and another of which resulted in the death of Alexander Hamilton.

Federalist Conspiracy Secretly forming a political pact with some radical New England Federalists, Burr planned to win the governorship of New York in 1804, unite that state with the New England states, and then lead this group of states to secede from the nation. Most Federalists followed Alexander Hamilton in opposing Burr, who was defeated in the New York election. The conspiracy then disintegrated.

Duel with Hamilton Angered by an insulting remark attributed to Hamilton, Burr challenged the Federalist leader to a duel and fatally shot him. Hamilton’s death in 1804 deprived the Federalists of their last great leader and earned Burr the enmity of many.

Trial for Treason By 1806, Burr’s intrigues had turned westward with a plan to take Mexico from Spain and possibly unite it with Louisiana under his rule. Learning of the conspiracy, Jefferson ordered Burr’s arrest and trial for treason. Presiding at the trial was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Marshall, a long-time adversary of Jefferson. A jury acquitted Burr, basing its decision on Marshall’s narrow definition of treason and the lack of witnesses to any “overt act” by Burr.
Difficulties Abroad

As a matter of policy and principle, Jefferson tried to avoid war. Rejecting permanent alliances, he sought to maintain U.S. neutrality despite increasing provocations from both France and Britain during the Napoleonic wars.

Barbary Pirates The first major challenge to Jefferson’s foreign policy came not from a major European power, but from the piracy practiced by the Barbary states on the North African coast. To protect U.S. merchant ships from being seized by Barbary pirates, Presidents Washington and Adams had reluctantly agreed to pay tribute to the Barbary governments. The ruler of Tripoli demanded a higher sum in tribute from Jefferson. Refusing to pay, Jefferson sent a small fleet of the U.S. Navy to the Mediterranean. Sporadic fighting with Tripoli lasted for four years (1801–1805). Although the American navy did not achieve a decisive victory, it did gain some respect and also offered a measure of protection to U.S. vessels trading in Mediterranean waters.

Challenges to U.S. Neutrality Meanwhile, the Napoleonic wars continued to dominate the politics of Europe—and to shape the commercial economy of the United States. The two principal belligerents, France and Britain, attempted naval blockades of enemy ports. They regularly seized the ships of neutral nations and confiscated their cargoes. The chief offender from the U.S. point of view was Britain, since its navy dominated the Atlantic. Most infuriating was the British practice of capturing U.S. sailors who it claimed were British citizens and impressing (forcing) them to serve in the British navy.

Chesapeake-Leopard Affair One incident at sea especially aroused American anger and almost led to war. In 1807, only a few miles off the coast of Virginia, the British warship Leopard fired on the U.S. warship Chesapeake. Three Americans were killed and four others were taken captive and impressed into the British navy. Anti-British feeling ran high, and many Americans demanded war. Jefferson, however, resorted to diplomacy and economic pressure as his response to the crisis.

Embargo Act (1807) As an alternative to war, Jefferson persuaded the Democratic-Republican majority in Congress to pass the Embargo Act in 1807. This measure prohibited American merchant ships from sailing to any foreign port. Since the United States was Britain’s largest trading partner, Jefferson hoped that the British would stop violating the rights of neutral nations rather than lose U.S. trade. The embargo, however, backfired and brought greater economic hardship to the United States than to Britain. The British were determined to control the seas at all costs, and they had little difficulty substituting supplies from South America for U.S. goods. The embargo’s effect on the U.S. economy, however, was devastating, especially for the merchant marine and shipbuilders of New England. So bad was the depression that a movement developed in the New England states to secede from the Union.

Recognizing that the Embargo Act had failed, Jefferson called for its repeal in 1809 during the final days of his presidency. Even after repeal, however, U.S. ships could trade legally with all nations except Britain and France.
Madison’s Presidency

Jefferson believed strongly in the precedent set by Washington of voluntarily retiring from the presidency after a second term. For his party’s nomination for president, he supported his close friend, Secretary of State James Madison.

**The Election of 1808**

Ever since leading the effort to write and ratify the Constitution, Madison was widely viewed as a brilliant thinker. He had worked tirelessly with Jefferson in developing the Democratic-Republican party. On the other hand, he was a weak public speaker, possessed a stubborn temperament, and lacked Jefferson’s political skills. With Jefferson’s backing, Madison was nominated for president by a caucus of congressional Democratic-Republicans. Other factions of the Democratic-Republican party nominated two other candidates. Even so, Madison was able to win a majority of electoral votes and to defeat both his Democratic-Republican opponents and the Federalist candidate, Charles Pinckney. Nevertheless, the Federalists managed to gain seats in Congress as a result of the widespread unhappiness with the effects of the embargo.

**Commercial Warfare**

Madison’s presidency was dominated by the same European problems that had plagued Jefferson’s second term. Like Jefferson, he attempted a combination of diplomacy and economic pressure to deal with the Napoleonic wars. Unlike Jefferson, he finally consented to take the United States to war.

**Nonintercourse Act of 1809** After the repeal of Jefferson’s disastrous embargo act, Madison hoped to end economic hardship while maintaining his country’s rights as a neutral nation. The Nonintercourse Act of 1809 provided that Americans could now trade with all nations except Britain and France.
Macon’s Bill No. 2 (1810) Economic hardships continued into 1810. Nathaniel Macon, a member of Congress, introduced a bill that restored U.S. trade with Britain and France. Macon’s Bill No. 2 provided, however, that if either Britain or France formally agreed to respect U.S. neutral rights at sea, then the United States would prohibit trade with that nation’s foe.

Napoleon’s Deception Upon hearing of Congress’ action, Napoleon announced his intention of revoking the decrees that had violated U.S. neutral rights. Taking Napoleon at his word, Madison carried out the terms of Macon’s Bill No. 2 by embargoing U.S. trade with Britain in 1811. However, he soon realized that Napoleon had no intention of fulfilling his promise. The French continued to seize American merchant ships.

The War of 1812
Neither Britain nor the United States wanted their dispute to end in war. And yet war between them did break out in 1812.

Causes of the War
From the U.S. point of view, the pressures leading to war came from two directions: the continued violation of U.S. neutral rights at sea and troubles with the British on the western frontier.

Free Seas and Trade As a trading nation, the United States depended upon the free flow of shipping across the Atlantic. Yet the chief belligerents in Europe, Britain, and France, had no interest in respecting neutral rights so long as they were locked in a life-and-death struggle with each other. They well remembered that Britain had seemed a cruel enemy during the American Revolution, and the French had supported the colonists. In addition, Jeffersonian Democratic-Republicans applauded the French for having overthrown their monarchy in their own revolution. Moreover, even though both the French and the British violated U.S. neutral rights, the British violations were worse because of the British navy’s practice of impressing American sailors.

Frontier Pressures Added to long-standing grievances over British actions at sea were the ambitions of western Americans for more open land. Americans on the frontier longed for the lands of British Canada and Spanish Florida. Standing in the way were the British and their Indian and Spanish allies.

Conflict with the American Indians was a perennial problem for the restless westerners. For decades, settlers had been gradually pushing the American Indians farther and farther westward. In an effort to defend their lands from further encroachment, Shawnee brothers—Tecumseh, a warrior, and Prophet, a religious leader—attempted to unite all of the tribes east of the Mississippi River. White settlers became suspicious of Tecumseh and persuaded the governor of the Indiana Territory, General William Henry Harrison, to take aggressive action. In the Battle of Tippecanoe, in 1811, Harrison destroyed the Shawnee headquarters and put an end to Tecumseh’s efforts to form an Indian
confederacy. The British had provided only limited aid to Tecumseh. Nevertheless, Americans on the frontier blamed the British for instigating the rebellion.

**War Hawks** A congressional election in 1810 had brought a group of new, young Democratic-Republicans to Congress, many of them from frontier states (Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio). Known as war hawks because of their eagerness for war with Britain, they quickly gained significant influence in the House of Representatives. Led by Henry Clay of Kentucky and John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, the war-hawk members of Congress argued that war with Britain would be the only way to defend American honor, gain Canada, and destroy American Indian resistance on the frontier.

**Declaration of War** British delays in meeting U.S. demands over neutral rights combined with political pressures from the war hawks finally persuaded Madison to seek a declaration of war against Britain. Ironically, the British government had by this time (June 1812) agreed to suspend its naval blockade. News of its decision reached the White House after Congress had declared war.

**A Divided Nation**

Neither Congress nor the American people were united in support of the war. In Congress, Pennsylvania and Vermont joined the southern and western states to provide a slight majority for the war declaration. Voting against the war were most representatives from New York, New Jersey, and the rest of the states in New England.
Election of 1812  A similar division of opinion was seen in the presidential election of 1812, in which Democratic-Republican strength in the South and West overcame Federalist and antiwar Democratic-Republican opposition to war in the North. Madison won reelection, defeating De Witt Clinton of New York, the candidate of the Federalists and antiwar Democratic-Republicans.

Opposition to the War  Americans who opposed the war viewed it as “Mr. Madison’s War” and the work of the war hawks in Congress. Most outspoken in their criticism of the war were New England merchants, Federalist politicians, and “Quids,” or “Old” Democratic-Republicans. New England merchants were opposed because, after the repeal of the Embargo Act, they were making sizable profits from the European war and viewed impressment as merely a minor inconvenience. Both commercial interests and religious ties to Protestantism made them more sympathetic to the Protestant British than to the Catholic French. Federalist politicians viewed the war as a Democratic-Republican scheme to conquer Canada and Florida, with the ultimate aim of increasing Democratic-Republican voting strength. For their part, the “Quids” criticized the war because it violated the classic Democratic-Republican commitment to limited federal power and to the maintenance of peace.

Military Defeats and Naval Victories

Facing Britain’s overwhelming naval power, Madison’s military strategists based their hope for victory on (1) Napoleon’s continued success in Europe and (2) a U.S. land campaign against Canada.

Invasion of Canada  A poorly equipped American army initiated military action in 1812 by launching a three-part invasion of Canada, one force starting out from Detroit, another from Niagara, and a third from Lake Champlain. These and later forays into Canada were easily repulsed by the British defenders. An American raid and burning of government buildings in York (Toronto) in 1813 only served to encourage retaliation by the British.

Naval Battles  The U.S. navy achieved some notable victories, due largely to superior shipbuilding and the valorous deeds of American sailors, including many free African Americans. In late 1812, the U.S. warship Constitution (nicknamed “Old Ironsides”) raised American morale by defeating and sinking a British ship off the coast of Nova Scotia. American privateers, motivated by both patriotism and profit, captured numerous British merchant ships. Offsetting these gains was the success of the British navy in establishing a blockade of the U.S. coast, which crippled trading and fishing.

Probably the most important naval battle of the war was in 1813 on Lake Erie with American Captain Oliver Hazard Perry, declaring victory with, “We have met the enemy and they are ours.” This led the way for General William Henry Harrison’s victory at the Battle of Thames River (near Detroit), in which Tecumseh was killed. The next year, 1814, ships commanded by Thomas Macdonough defeated a British fleet on Lake Champlain. As a result, the British had to retreat and abandon their plan to invade New York and New England.
**Chesapeake Campaign** By the spring of 1814, the defeat of Napoleon in Europe enabled the British to increase their forces in North America. In the summer of that year, a British army marched through the nation’s capital, Washington, D.C., and set fire to the White House, the Capitol, and other government buildings. The British also attempted to take Baltimore, but Fort McHenry held out after a night’s bombardment—an event immortalized by Francis Scott Key in the words of “The Star-Spangled Banner.”

**Southern Campaign** Meanwhile, U.S. troops in the South were ably commanded by General Andrew Jackson. In March 1814, at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in present-day Alabama, Jackson ended the power of an important British ally, the Creek nation. The victory eliminated the Indians and opened new lands to white settlers. A British effort to control the Mississippi River was halted at New Orleans by Jackson leading a force of frontier soldiers, free African Americans, and Creoles. The victory was impressive—but also meaningless. The Battle of New Orleans was fought on January 8, 1815, two weeks after a treaty ending the war had been signed in Ghent, Belgium.

**The Treaty of Ghent**

By 1814, the British were weary of war. Having fought Napoleon for more than a decade, they now faced the prospect of maintaining the peace in Europe. At the same time, Madison’s government recognized that the Americans would be unable to win a decisive victory. American peace commissioners traveled to Ghent, Belgium, to discuss terms of peace with British diplomats. On Christmas Eve 1814, an agreement was reached. The terms halted fighting, returned all conquered territory to the prewar claimant, and recognized the prewar boundary between Canada and the United States.

The Treaty of Ghent, promptly ratified by the Senate in 1815, said nothing at all about the grievances that led to war. Britain made no concessions concerning impressment, blockades, or other maritime differences. Thus, the war ended in stalemate with no gain for either side.

**The Hartford Convention**

Just before the war ended, the New England states threatened to secede from the Union. Bitterly opposed to both the war and the Democratic-Republican government in Washington, radical Federalists in New England urged that the Constitution be amended and that, as a last resort, secession be voted upon. To consider these matters, a special convention was held at Hartford, Connecticut, in December 1814. Delegates from the New England states rejected the radical calls for secession. But to limit the growing power of the Democratic-Republicans in the South and West, they adopted a number of proposals. One of them called for a two-thirds vote of both houses for any future declaration of war.

Shortly after the convention dissolved, news came of both Jackson’s victory at New Orleans and the Treaty of Ghent. These events ended criticism of the war and further weakened the Federalists by stamping them as unpatriotic.
The War’s Legacy

From Madison’s point of view, the war achieved none of its original aims. Nevertheless, it had a number of important consequences for the future development of the American republic, including the following:

1. Having survived two wars with Britain, the United States gained the respect of other nations.
2. The United States accepted Canada as a part of the British Empire.
3. Denounced for its talk of secession, the Federalist party came to an end as a national force and declined even in New England.
4. Talk of nullification and secession in New England set a precedent that would later be used by the South.
5. Abandoned by the British, American Indians were forced to surrender land to white settlement.
6. With the British naval blockade limiting European goods, U.S. factories were built and Americans moved toward industrial self-sufficiency.
7. War heroes such as Andrew Jackson and William Henry Harrison would soon be in the forefront of a new generation of political leaders.
8. The feeling of nationalism grew stronger as did a belief that the future for the United States lay in the West and away from Europe.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES: WHAT CAUSED POLITICAL PARTIES?

Thomas Jefferson’s election to the presidency was popularly known as the Revolution of 1800. The real revolution in 1800 was the complete absence of violence in the transition of power. While the Framers of the Constitution had opposed political parties, parties were accepted as an essential element of the U.S. political system.

Historians have identified various stages in the emergence of two major parties. At first (1787–1789), Federalist and Anti-Federalist factions arose in the various state ratifying conventions as people debated the merits and pitfalls of the proposed Constitution. The second stage was the initial years of the new federal government (1789–1800). Especially during Adams’ controversial presidency, the Anti-Federalists became a true political party—Jefferson’s Democratic-Republican party. In 1800, for the first time, a party actively recruited members (both voters and candidates for office) and forged alliances with politicians in every state. As a result of their organized efforts, the Democratic-Republicans took power in 1800.

Over time, historians’ interpretations of the early parties have changed. In the early 20th century, historians described the partisan struggles of the 1790s as a conflict between the undemocratic, elitist
Hamiltonian Federalists and the democratic, egalitarian Jeffersonian Democratic-Republicans. Charles Beard’s *Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy* interpreted the struggle as one between Hamilton’s capitalist class and Jefferson’s agrarian class. More recently, historians have focused more on personalities in defining the two parties. Finding general agreement in the practices of the opposing parties, these historians emphasize the differing characters of Jefferson and Hamilton and the significance of Washington’s friendship with Hamilton and of Jefferson’s friendship with Madison.

Richard Hofstadter, a leading historian of the 1950s and 1960s, observed both the differences and the shared ideas of the Democratic-Republicans and Federalists. He saw the parties maturing in 1800, moving past excessive rhetoric to accommodation, as both came to terms with the same political realities.
MULTIPLE-CHOICE QUESTIONS

Questions 1–3 refer to the excerpt below.

“I am ready to allow, Mr. President, that both Great Britain and France have given us abundant cause for war. . . . My plan would be, and my first wish is, to prepare for it—to put the country in complete armor—in the attitude imperiously demanded in a crisis of war, and to which it must be brought before any war can be effective. . . . I must call on every member of this Senate to pause before he leaps into or crosses the Rubicon—declaring war is passing the Rubicon in reality.”

—Senator Obadian German of New York, speech in the Senate, June 1812

1. Based on the tone of the excerpt, which of the statements below best expresses German’s position on declaring war in June of 1812?
   (A) He opposed going to war because he did not believe the country was prepared for one
   (B) He opposed the war because he thought people did not have the right attitude about fighting
   (C) He supported going to war immediately against both Great Britain and France
   (D) He supported the war to prevent British troops from Canada invading New York and other northern states

2. Who of the following would be most likely to agree with German’s position on the war?
   (A) John Calhoun and other politicians from the South
   (B) Henry Clay and other politicians from the West
   (C) James Madison and other politicians from the executive branch
   (D) Merchants from New England

3. Which of the following is the best support for German’s claim that the United States has “abundant cause for war”?
   (A) the impressment of U.S. sailors
   (B) the controversy over the Louisiana Purchase
   (C) the actions by the Barbary pirates
   (D) the findings of the Lewis and Clark expedition
Questions 4–6 refer to the excerpt below.

“All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression.

“We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. . . .

“Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.”

—Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, 1801

4. According to Jefferson’s address, which of the following should be relied on to protect equal rights for all people?
   (A) The majority
   (B) Elections
   (C) Laws
   (D) Religion

5. Which person would most strongly disagree with Jefferson’s statement, “We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists”?
   (A) John Calhoun
   (B) Alexander Hamilton
   (C) James Madison
   (D) James Monroe

6. Jefferson’s call to avoid entangling alliances is similar to the advice of
   (A) John Adams
   (B) Aaron Burr
   (C) John Marshall
   (D) George Washington
Questions 7–8 refer to the excerpt below.

“"It is true I am a Shawnee. My forefathers were warriors. Their son is a warrior. From them I take only my existence; from my tribe I take nothing. . . . [I] come to Governor Harrison to ask him to tear the treaty . . . but I would say to him:

"‘Sir, you have liberty to return to your own country.’

"Once, nor until lately, there was no white man on this continent. . . . It then all belonged to red men. . . . Once a happy race, since made miserable by the white people, who are never contented but always encroaching. The way, and the only way, to check and to stop this evil, is for all the red men to unite in claiming a common and equal right in the land. . . . For it never was divided, but belongs to all for the use of each. For no part has a right to sell.”

—Tecumseh, Letter to Governor William Henry Harrison, August 1810

7. Tecumseh believed that which of the following would be the best way for the American Indians to respond to the desire of white settlers for land?
   (A) Signing a treaty with the United States
   (B) Joining the British in order to stop westward expansion
   (C) Moving westward to lands unoccupied by American Indians
   (D) Forming a confederacy among all American Indians

8. Tecumseh objected to the treaty selling Indian land because he thought
   (A) the price offered by the United States was too low
   (B) American Indians were always encroaching on settlements
   (C) the white settlers would divide the land among them
   (D) no individual or single tribe had the right to sell the land
SHORT-ANSWER QUESTIONS

Briefly answer the questions in complete sentences. A thesis is not required.

Question 1. Answer a, b, and c.
   a) Choose ONE of the choices below, and explain why your choice best demonstrates how Presidents Jefferson and Madison largely relied on economic policies to carry out their foreign policies.
      • Louisiana Purchase
      • Embargo Act
      • Macon’s Bill No. 2
   b) Contrast your choice against ONE of the other options, demonstrating why that option is not as good as your choice.
   c) Provide ONE piece of evidence involving one of the choices provided or another situation during this period of Presidents Jefferson and Madison that either supports or contradicts their reliance on economic policies to carry out their foreign policies.

Question 2. Answer a and b.
   a) Briefly explain how ONE of the following either supports or contradicts this statement: “From the point of view of President Madison, none of the goals for the War of 1812 had been achieved.” Provide at least ONE piece of evidence to support your explanation.
      • foreign relations
      • nationalism
      • industry
   b) Briefly explain how ONE of the following goals of the United States in the War of 1812 would continue after the war to play a major role in the politics and policies of the nation.
      • impressment of sailors
      • American Indian conflicts
      • expansion
Question 3 is based on the following excerpts.

“What, Mr. Speaker, are we now called on to decide? It is, whether we will resist by force the attempt, made by that Government [Britain], to subject our maritime rights to the arbitrary and capricious rule of her will; for my part I am not prepared to say that this country shall submit to have her commerce interdicted or regulated, by any foreign nation. Sir, I prefer war to submission. . . .

“The British Government, for many years past they have been in the practice of impressing our seamen, from merchant vessels; this unjust and lawless invasion of personal liberty, calls loudly for the interposition of this Government . . .

“This war . . . will have its advantages. We shall drive the British from our continent—they will no longer . . . [be] intriguing with our Indian neighbors. . . . I am willing to receive the Canadians as adopted brethren.”

—Felix Grundy, Speech in the House of Representatives, December 1811

“This war of conquest, a war for the acquisition of territory and subjects, is to be a new commentary on the doctrine that republics are destitute of ambition; that they are addicted to peace. . . .

“But is war the true remedy? Who will profit by it? Speculators—a few lucky merchants. . . . Who must suffer by it? The people. It is their blood, their taxes that must flow to support it.

“Our people will not submit to be taxed for this war of conquest and domination. The government of the United States was not calculated to wage offensive war; it was instituted for the common defense and general welfare; and whoever should embark it in a war of offense would put it to a test which it was by no means calculated to endure.”

—John Randolph, Speech in the House of Representatives, December 1811

3. Using the excerpts, answer a, b, and c.
   a) Briefly explain the main point of excerpt 1.
   b) Briefly explain the main point of excerpt 2.
   c) Provide ONE piece of evidence from the debate over war during this period that is not included in the excerpts and explain how it supports the interpretation in either excerpt.
Question 4 is based on the following excerpt.

“And if this court is not authorized to issue a writ of mandamus. . . . It must be because the law is unconstitutional and therefore absolutely incapable of conferring the authority. . . .

“Certainly, all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law . . . and consequently . . . an act of the legislature repugnant to the constitution is void. . . .

“If, then, the courts are to regard the Constitution, and the Constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature, the Constitution, and not such ordinary act must govern the case to which they both apply.

“The judicial power of the United States is extended to all cases arising under the Constitution. . . .

“Thus, the particular phraseology of the Constitution . . . confirms and strengthens the principle . . . that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.”

—John Marshall, Marbury v. Madison, 1803

4. Using the excerpt, answer a, b, and c.
   a) Briefly explain the significance of Marshall’s opinion presented as Jefferson became the third president of the United States.
   b) Briefly explain how TWO of the following people would either support or question Marshall’s view.
      • William Marbury
      • John Adams
      • Thomas Jefferson
      • Alexander Hamilton

THINK AS A HISTORIAN: USES OF HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

A key skill of historians is the ability to use evidence accurately. Describe the kind of evidence that should be included in essays responding to each of these questions.

1. If the Supreme Court was asked to decide the constitutionality of the Louisiana Purchase, how would you expect John Marshall to have ruled?

2. How important was the War of 1812 to the development of the United States?

3. Explain whether you think westward expansion was the most important issue for the new country.