

HISTORY 1100.3
NOVEMBER 14, 2006

THE JEFFERSONIAN EXPERIMENT AND ITS IRONIES

I. President Jefferson: An Experiment in "Governing Without Government," or Power without Force

A. Jefferson's Inaugural Address: Defending the American "experiment" in non-authoritarian government and laying out the principles of the new administration.

Jefferson was a terrible public speaker who mumbled his speech so badly that most of his audience only knew what he said from the printed version. This was the last time a president would actually speak before Congress before a long time. While badly delivered, the inaugural address was a very important document that did not so much list a bunch of policies as lay out the basic principles of his administration, which would in many ways define the basic principles of the national government itself until everything fell apart before the Civil War. For our purposes, it will also define the problems we will be looking at in this last section of the course.

Jefferson began by reassuring the Federalists that they would not all be killed or purged from the government, as some of them expected. Jefferson demanded that the Federalists accept the decision of the majority of the people that he and the Republicans would now rule (many had not wanted to do that, of course), that they remain loyal despite losing power, but promised that minority rights would be protected. The combination of the Federalists giving in and Jefferson not taking revenge on them is one of the moments that really made our democratic system, with parties competing vigorously but allowing the winner to peacefully take power once the

competition was over.

The rest of the speech, and part that concerns us more, lays out TJ's philosophy of government. To understand what Jefferson was trying to do, we need to go back to a key line from Hamilton's interpretation of the Constitution in his debate with Jefferson over the constitutionality of the Bank of the United States. [*Opinion on the Constitutionality of the Bank.*]

AH had said that following Jefferson's crack-brained theories about the government having its hands tied when the constitution did not specifically authorize some action would present the sorry spectacle of "a political society without sovereignty, or of a people governed without government." To Hamilton, this was an absurd idea, a contradiction in terms. But that was exactly what Jefferson was trying to accomplish, though he did not put it exactly that way.

The American republic was an experiment, Jefferson argued in his inaugural address, an experiment in a new and better form of government, one that really would not be sovereign or exercise power in the traditional European patriarchal way, through force or threats of force. AH had believed that only way republic would be strong enough to survive was for it to embrace the European way, for it to be as rich and powerful and sometimes repressive as the British government was.

As Jefferson saws it, the American republic could and should do things differently. It was, and should remain, an exception to the European rules of politics, or rather, an experiment with a completely new set of rules. The American democratic republic could withstand criticism and opposition from within, without becoming oppressive. It could be great without being a military empire.

[new bullet] The Federalists' mistake had mostly been in lacking the courage and faith

that the republic could survive without radical surgery that would destroy what was valuable about it in the first place. Democracy was the government's strength, Jefferson believed, not a danger or a kind of necessary evil that had to be restrained as the Federalists had tried to do.

Democracy allowed people to love their country and its constitutional government as they would their own families. **[new bullet]** In other words, to develop the same kind of freely chosen and deeply felt sentimental attachment that Americans were encouraged to seek in their personal lives and increasingly believed to be the basis for best and strongest relationships.

"I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government can not be strong, that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

At any rate, what TJ was announcing in inaugural address was a serious effort to try this experiment for real, as the Federalists had not tried it. He wanted to show that a republic could survive without wielding power in the traditional ways: force and fear. Jefferson hoped that instead that the union could be held together by mutual attachment and love of liberty. Instead of being forced or intimidated into obeying, Americans would or could be persuaded to unite with "one heart and one mind" around the best interests of their country.

We will see how well this worked out in practice for Jefferson. It turned out that coercion was very hard to avoid in any situation, like a vast country, where there was determined opposition. Sentimental attachment was indeed a strong bond, but slavery and the economic interests surrounding it turned out to be a little stronger.

B. The Revolution of 1800 in Political Culture

Some of the most important changes that came in with Jefferson related to what historians call “political culture,” the symbolism and imagery and ritual practices that express the basic values of a particular place and time. The effort to create a monarchy-like political culture around Washington and Adams had been one of the first things that had been criticized, and this was one of the first areas that Jefferson sought to change.

1. The anti-monarchical style of Jefferson’s presidency: messy clothes and a big cheese

--While no common man and never as radical a democrat as his supporters might have liked, Jefferson made sure his presidency had a more democratic feel than those of Washington and Adams. He was helped with all this by the fact that capital had now moved to Washington.

None of the buildings were done and only a few hundred people lived there. Living there was more like camping at a construction site than anything else, and the backwoods setting made it easy to change the tone of the government and very hard to remind anyone of the British monarchy.

-- TJ dispensed with royal trappings as much as he could. No levees, anyone could see president any time they wanted. Frequent dinners with congressmen and visitors, served “pell-mell” with no elaborate protocol or seating arrangement. He dressed in ordinary street clothing, even sloppy clothing, even sometimes greeting visitors wearing slippers and an unbuttoned coat, the moral equivalent of greeting guests in your bathrobe. He seemed to make of greeting Federalists and British dignitaries this way. Here’s how a newspaper put it at the time:

“In regard to Jefferson, the account will please all republicans: He has none of those LEVEES, those ostentatious ceremonies, which are the appendages of European courts, and which were encouraged by the late President. No – he adheres to republican

simplicity. – Every citizen finds immediate access to him, when he is not at one of the departments of state, to which he pays a daily visit of some hours; and in his absence, all strangers find a polite reception at his house.”

Jefferson’s efforts at conducting the government in a spirit of “republican simplicity” were intended as a welcoming gesture toward the common American voter (and his wife and children), to send the message that this was a government that was open and accessible to them, and did not try to stand above them. The people seem to embrace Jefferson in return, and his popularity exploded after his election to near folk-hero status nearly on par with Washington and Ben Franklin. Popular songs were composed, “The People’s Friend” as well as “Jefferson and Liberty.” Commemorative plates and pitchers with his picture were sold, and numerous tributes were sent to Washington, sometimes just in words but in other cases in more impressive forms, like gigantic gifts of food.

One such gift that I am referring to is the so-called “Mammoth Cheese” Jefferson received from the dairy farmers of Cheshire, Mass. (From the women as well as the men.) These farmers were members of the Baptist Church, in Mass. a minority denomination that had to pay taxes to support Puritan church, appreciated TJ’s stand for religious freedom. 4 ft in diameter, 15 inches thick, 1200 lbs., milk of 900 cows. Their pastor Elder John Leland drove it to DC personally, delivering it to Jefferson on New Year’s 1802 and giving a speech. The Federalists had been making fun of the Mammoth cheese since the tribute had been announced the previous 4th of July, but Jefferson stood in the door of the White House to receive the gift. (And later showed people in to see the cheese.) Leland’s speech and TJ’s reply were printed under the heading “The Greatest Cheese in America, for the Greatest Man in America.” TJ said it showed passion of republicanism and the skill of American farmers. The cheese was a bit silly but

heard. On other occasions Jefferson received mammoth loaves of bread and a mammoth cut of veal.

2. From “Fathers” to “Friends of the People” "Father of his Country" to the "People's Friend"

--Jefferson’s symbolic embrace democracy and equality was misleading to a degree: Jefferson was really no “man of the people” and in staffing his administration he insisted on the same type of people that the Federalists had used: educated gentlemen, the upper 1% or less of American society. Nevertheless, his style sent a message that the *open* pretensions of the American leaders to be some sort of natural aristocracy were being abandoned. Historian Alan Taylor has characterized the change well: Gentlemen politicians went from being “fathers of the people” — stern authoritarian fathers like the Federalists — to “friends of the people.” Not roommates or bosom buddies, but friendly benefactors ready to help and dispense advice and material aid, couched in language that people would not be intimidated by. A man who would treat people with respect, listening to their concerns and accepting their gifts graciously. Think about the different image suggested by the nickname used for George Washington, "Father of his country," vs. what Jefferson was named in the title of a popular song, "The People's Friend." This change in the basic stance that leaders were able to take towards the average citizen was huge, and really define our expectations for our political leaders to this day. In some ways it was a good. We expect politicians to be our servants and allies rather than our parents. This attitude obviously empowers the citizen. Unfortunately, it also has the potential to cheapen politics. Only in America would people openly speak as if it was appropriate to vote for the candidate they would rather have beer with. Yet that sort of sentiment was always a key advantage for our current

president.

II. The Revolution of 1800 in Government Policy

A. Domestic policy: making the government smaller, cheaper, and less coercive.

1. Dismantling the Federalist security program: expiration of Alien and Sedition Acts, abolition of direct tax, greater tolerance, cancellation of military build-up.

--- Disavowed political repression, projected more tolerant attitudes towards immigrants and religion.

--- Navy placed on a mostly defensive posture: instead of completing the planned fleet, 100s of small, cheap gunboats would be built to merely defend harbors.

2. Phasing out of Hamilton's financial system: debt would be paid off, B.U.S. allowed to expire in 1811.

-- could not be destroyed overnight without created economic crisis and ruining nation's credit.

Funded debt would be paid, but to get rid of it, not just to maintain it.

-- end of Fed security program also saved money.

B. A Republican Foreign Policy

Mostly discussed earlier – presented here for review

1. Overall goal: allow U.S. to stay predominantly agricultural for as long as possible, postponing need for urbanization or manufacturing.

2. Main principles in international affairs: Neutrality (preventing wars & need for large army/navy), small defense-only military (gunboats), free trade (maximizing markets for U.S. farmers).

3. Primary in western hemisphere: Expansion of nation's agricultural land base, by acquiring new territory and clearing existing territory of Indians.

--make sure that future generations of farmers had land and that no large population of unemployed people developed.

--expansion meant not only gaining land but making it possible for large numbers of whites to farm, by clearing Indians from it.

4. Chief methods: negotiation and "peaceable coercion" (through commercial discrimination, as proposed in the 1790s: punishing nations that did not allow free trade, such as British, by restricting access to U.S. market).

-- by slapping their goods with higher import taxes and making them less competitive or perhaps by blocking their access to our market altogether.

-- "free trade" meaning that our ships could go wherever and carry whatever they wanted.

III. Source of the Ironies: Jeffersonian Expansionism

A. The Louisiana Purchase: Triumph of the Jeffersonian Style of Foreign Policy

1. Accidental nature of the Purchase. Main goal had been control of New Orleans and the Mississippi River.

The Louisiana Purchase was really an accident rather than a result of deliberate policy, though it promoted all of Jefferson's most fondly desire purposes. It came about because of Jefferson's desire to get control or access to New Orleans, the key to making an American agricultural empire in the Ohio and Mississippi River valleys.

2. Jefferson got worried when Spain, a weak power, gave

Louisiana back to Napoleon's France in 1800.

Spanish had controlled the area since French defeat in 1763, and though they had caused trouble, they were also too poor and weak to hold area forever. Few Spaniards had moved into Louisiana, as the area was called, and their strategy for holding the territory had relied on bribing American settlers and officials to either settle in Spanish Territory or bring chunks of western U.S. into Spanish orbit. Jefferson was confident that this policy would inevitably end in U.S. control of area. This confidence turned to fear just after Jefferson took office when news reached America that in 1800 Spain had secretly given Louisiana back to France, now run by military dictator Napoleon Bonaparte, in exchange for a kingdom in Italy for the Queen of Spain's brother. France was a much stronger power than Spain, and fondly remembered by Indians throughout the West, because France had always been more respectful of Indian culture than the other powers and had not transferred large numbers of settlers. French had long wanted their American empire back, and Napoleon was considering shifting the focus of his conquests to the west. Louisiana was useful as source of food for the French sugar colonies in Caribbean. Napoleonic France was one of the superpowers of this day, so this was a major threat to U.S. interests.

3. Western Federalists urged war with Spain before French could take over Louisiana. TJ sent mission to buy New Orleans from France.

A political crisis erupted after the Spanish closed New Orleans in 1802, just before the scheduled transfer to France. With TJ desperate, a western Federalist senator (James Ross of Pa.) introduced a resolution in Feb. 1803 calling for a major military assault on New Orleans, with 50,000 troops, before French could establish themselves there. This was an old idea of

Hamilton's. It would have cost \$5 million and hurt Jefferson's experiment on at least two grounds: make him spend lots of money that would require taxes and loans to raise, and also involve him immediately in something he opposed, the massive use of military force.

Jefferson tried to head off war by sending James Monroe to Paris with instructions to buy New Orleans and maybe the Floridas for up to 50 million livres (\$9.3 million). They never expected things to turn out as well as they did.

4. Losing interest in Americas because of failure to reconquer Saint-Domingue, Napoleon offered to sell all of Louisiana for \$15 million.

-- Failure of attempted reconquest of black-controlled Saint Domingue, present Haiti, changed Napoleon's mind about a new American empire.

Background: Most profitable remaining French possession in New World, a sugar-producing island in the Caribbean. Unrest that began as part of French Rev back in 1791, but turned into a slave rebellion. Eventually Toussaint L'overture emerged as an independent black dictator.

French sent troops to island and Toussaint was captured, but eventually other black generals successfully ejected Napoleon's army, with 50,000 troops lost to fever and bullets. A new war with Britain was also about to break out, and Napoleon did not want British in control of New Orleans or Americans joining a war against him. He also hoped that US and Spain could be kept busy fighting each other over Louisiana, rather than joining a new war against France.

--Napoleon offered to sell all of Louisiana (1/3 of present U.S.) at cost of only \$15 million.

5. Jefferson hesitated to accept, because constitution did not grant power to buy new territory, but then accepted.

--This was great opportunity, and would more than double the size of the country and meet

Jefferson's goal by non-violent means very nicely. Yet TJ hesitated because constitution did not provide for the purchase of new territory. As a strict constructionist, he was unsure of what to do. Republican expansionists argued that because the constitution did provide for the creation of new states and the governing of new territory, it must also have the power to acquire new territory, including by purchase. TJ eventually decided the opportunity to serve his larger goals was too good: not only in terms of expansion, but in proving that the nation could grow without war or a big army or high taxes. So he went ahead with the deal, and an overwhelming Republican majority in Congress followed him.

Federalists opposed TJ vigorously, employing the argument that the Purchase was unconstitutional, that Jefferson had betrayed his constitutional principles.

The nation celebrated LA Purchase, but TJ's plan was not what we Midwesterners might think. He was not thinking of most of the Purchase as a place where white farmers would actually settle, which was a good thing because the arid (dry) nature of the West was increasingly recognized. Instead, the LA Purchase was to allow expansion of farming in an entirely different way, as we will see.

B. The Louisiana Purchase and Jefferson's two-faced Indian policy

Indians were key to Jefferson's expansion plans, in various ways.

1. Lewis and Clark as ambassadors to the far western Indians.

Lewis and Clark were sent out as ambassadors to the far western Indians as much as geographic explorers (Plains and Pacific Northwest peoples), to set up alliances and trade relationships in the mode of the French.

2. Intended use of Louisiana: dumping ground for remaining Indians east of the Mississippi. Jefferson as father of “Indian removal” policy.

Why? To ward off Spanish (who were mad as hell about the Louisiana Purchase, which they regarded as illegal), but also to pave way for Jefferson's planned use for the use area west of the Mississippi as a giant dumping ground where eastern Indians could be moved. This was real intended use of the Purchase: to allow white settlement *east* of the Mississippi.

Jefferson thus was father of the Indian removal policy that was later fully implemented by Andrew Jackson. The policy was, force Indians to accept a trade of their eastern homelands for new lands in the LA Purchase, specifically in the present states of AR, MO, NE, KS, and especially OK. Jefferson pursued it under the guise of humanitarian reform, by expanding the program to "civilize" the Indians that had begun under George Washington. Teach them European-style farming (growing more crops than you needed to eat so that you could sell them in the market to make money to buy other things you needed) and get men to stop hunting and start working in the fields. They would need less land, and would gladly sell what they did not need, or trade it for more land out west.

-- Jefferson's Indian policy was highly two-faced: friendly alliance west of the Mississippi, "civilization" and removal east of it.

C. Reactions to the Louisiana Purchase: The Northern Confederacy and the rise of New England sectionalism.

--- New England Federalists (along with Hamilton) had never approved of quick westward expansion. They disapproved for any number of reasons: rapid dispersal of population violated New England tradition of compact, community-oriented settlement; they fear that rapid expansion & dispersed settlement turned whites into savages as they moved beyond the reach of

civilized institutions; dispersal of the population rendered their plans for developing manufacturing and commerce less feasible; it also drained population from Northeast, and threatened to severely reduce New England's influence and share of congressional and electoral votes within the union.

--- The Louisiana Purchase sent the New England Federalists into orbit, pushed some of them to edge of treason, into thoughts of splitting New England off from the rest of the country. Part of the problem was that they did not think of themselves as a "loyal" opposition. Remember that many Federalists not thought of themselves as the party in power during the 1790s, but instead as the ruling class. They went ahead and handed over the reins to Jefferson in 1801 but still saw the transfer of power as something in the nature of a *coup d'etat*. They believed that Jefferson and democracy were driving the country to ruin and that (worse) New England was going to get the shaft on a permanent basis and perhaps even lose its population. People were already flooding out of land-starved CT and MA (at first into NY, VT, ME) even before the Louisiana Purchase was finalized. Before immigration and industrialization, it really did look like New England might shrink away to nothing in terms of its national influence

Of course, it didn't happen that way, but these fears led some Federalists to toy with disunion. In 1803-4, former Secretary of State Timothy Pickering and several other extremists hatched a plan for a Northern Confederacy, made up of New England plus NY and NJ. Vice President Aaron Burr was running for governor of New York in 1804, and the plan was for Burr to take NY into the new breakaway nation and become its leader. Burr's loss in that election, and the opposition of Alexander Hamilton and other more moderate Federalist leaders killed the scheme. Nevertheless, the Northern Confederacy established what became a recurring pattern:

those who were least committed to party politics were the most disposed to disunion.

Burr later killed Hamilton in a duel and then led another failed conspiracy, this time to split the West off from the rest of the country.

IV. Embargo and War: Breakdown of the Jeffersonian Experiment

A. Jefferson's Embargo, 1807-1809: an experiment in "peaceable coercion" that grew less and less peaceable and more and more coercive.

1. Cause was British and French practice, during Napoleonic Wars, of treating U.S. ships as enemies if they tried to trade or cooperate with the other power.

British blockaded European continent, controlled by Napoleon, seizing any ships that tried to trade with any country there. France seized any ship that obeyed the British blockade, or went along with a licensing system that the British had set up. Jefferson decided to go with the Doomday Device of peaceable coercion, the Embargo.

2. Definition of the embargo: total ban on U.S. trade with foreign countries.

--The embargo amounted to total ban on exports, for indefinite period. Custom houses would allow no American ships to leave for foreign ports and no foreign ships to pick up American goods. Ships in the coastal trade had post bonds for twice their value to prove they were not planning to export. Fishermen also had to post large bonds. The Embargo followed example of Revolution-era trade boycotts: Europe (especially British) needed our food & money more than we needed their manufactured goods.

3. Impact: little on British or French policy, but threw much of northeast U.S. into a depression and met with great resistance in New York and New England.

-- Diplomatically, the Embargo was utterly ineffectual: Britain ignored Embargo, Napoleon

mocked it in Bayonne Decree, 1808, in which he ordered that all American ships the French found be seized on theory that, if there was an Embargo on, any American ships that went to sea must really be owned by British.

The real impact was on the U.S. economy. While this policy hurt every region economically, it was hardest on the region that depended most on foreign trade and on the ocean. This meant New England, where shipping, shipbuilding, fishing, and whaling were all huge industries.

-- Rather than see their entire economy shut down, there was massive circumvention by merchants and officials in the North, including some by officials who supported Jefferson otherwise. Ships at sea stayed at sea, goods were taken overland or over the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and Lake Champlain to be shipped out of Canada. Coasting vessels often claimed they were going from NY to Baltimore and then just headed for Europe or Asia when they were out of sight. Sometimes ships that were not supposed to leave port would simply do it in the dead of night.

4. Jefferson resorted to military force and progressively more repressive enforcement laws to make the Embargo work.

--resistance and evasion continued to be widespread along the nation's borders, leading Jefferson to employ what were arguably the most repressive and unconstitutional policies any President has ever used in peacetime. By the end his principles clearly deserted him, and peaceable coercion had been proven pretty much a failure.

The first Embargo Act was only one of five. Each one extended the reach of the Embargo and gave the President and the customs service more and more sweeping powers to enforce it. The Embargo was extended from oceangoing ships to coasting vessels and then to

river and lake craft and finally to wagons, sleighs, and other land vehicles. Jefferson employed the Navy to police the coast lines and called out the militia to police the borders. When the militia (the national guard) proved ineffective and often unwilling to move against their fellow citizens, TJ added 8 regiments to the army and declared the region around Lake Champlain on the Canadian border in rebellion. For last year of the Embargo, army was used heavily to patrol for violations. A standing army, something Jefferson had always feared, was being used against the population and for much longer than the army had been in the field during the Whiskey or Fries Rebellions. Customs collectors were eventually empowered to seize and search vessels without warrants on their personal suspicion that there was intent to violate the Embargo. Eventually the rights of shipowners were so curtailed that they were officially presumed guilty of violating the Embargo if a ship could not be accounted for.

--Numerous legal challenges were issued against Embargo and Jefferson's own appointees often ruled against him. Ironically the only judge to uphold the Embargo was a Federalist in Mass. named John Davis. Embargo was challenged on grounds that power to regulate commerce did not include power to prohibit it. Davis used Hamilton's broad reading of the commerce power and the "inherent sovereignty" of the United States to uphold TJ's actions.

Eventually the economic suffering in the North cracked TJ's coalition, and on his final day in office, New York and New England Jeffersonians voted with Federalists to end the Embargo. This was one of TJ's very few legislative defeats over his whole administration.

B. New Pres. James Madison's drift toward war, using weaker versions of the embargo, 1809-1812.

First, embargo was lifted on all countries except Britain and France (creating massive loopholes) with President authorized to lift non-intercourse against either power if they decided to respect

American rights. Then all embargoes were lifted with president authorized to reimpose an embargo on any nation that did not come around. Through various mixed signals and tricks played by Napoleon, Madison was manipulated into keeping up the trade war with Britain, while mostly relaxing the sanctions against France, leading toward danger of real war with Britain, which many of Madison's Republican supporters wanted anyway by 1812. Western expansionists ("War Hawks") wanted to secure the new western territories and end Indian attacks they felt were sponsored by the British and/or the Spanish. Many other Democratic Republicans simply had given up on Jefferson's experiment and wanted to prove that the Republic really could fight after all.

SUMMARIZE MAJOR POINTS ONLY OF 1812 IF LITTLE TIME

V. The War of 1812

A. Humiliating stalemate in the North and East, including two failed invasions of Canada, and the burning of Washington, D.C. in 1814.

B. Smashingly successful war of conquest in the West and South, mostly against Indians.

1. The Indians as an impediment to expansion, especially of the Southern plantation economy.

Indians were greatest impediment to expansion, especially when they had access to weapons and trade from some source besides the United States. This was particularly true in the South, where Indian groups like the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws had large and growing populations, settled societies, and strong leadership, and controlled some of the best agricultural land on the continent. With strong support from some European power, they might have been

able to hold the Americans off. Moreover, the Southern Indians were potential competitors to the Southern plantation economy. For instance, the Florida Seminoles were in the habit of allowing escaped slaves from GA and AL live among them in a quasi-equal status. Other Southern Indians (or at least a mixed-blood element of them, descended from British and Scottish traders) were rapidly adopting white culture and becoming slaveholding planters themselves. Either way, as effective resisters of the white invasion, or competitors in the plantation economy, the Southern Indians were in a position to block U.S. expansion into the southwest.

The Northwestern Indians were less well equipped to resist, in terms of wealth and population than their southwestern counterparts, but were very militant going back decades to the French and Indian War and Pontiac's Rebellion. What both needed was support from some foreign power, in terms of supplies and a few well-placed military installations to support Indian resistance.

2. Catalyst for renewed Indian resistance: religious revivals/resistance movements led by Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa in NW, Red Sticks in South. Became armed rebellions somewhat supported by British & Spanish.

European support was not that strong: The British only supported Indian rebels while the war with France and the U.S. was threatened or going on. The Spanish were too poor and weak to do much except occasionally supply guns and food, and let Indians live in their territory in Florida.

3. Gen. William Henry Harrison's conquest of the Northwest. Key battles: Tippecanoe (1811), Put-in-Bay (1813) & the Thames (1813).

4. Andrew Jackson's conquest of the Southwest, including

victories over the Creek rebels (Red Sticks) at Horseshoe Bend (1814) and the British at the Battle of New Orleans (1815), the lone defeat of British troops by American troops in this war.

Together the Battles of Horseshoe Bend and New Orleans ensured that eastern Indians would never be able to mount an effective resistance or attract support from the European powers again. Along with some actions by Jackson after the war, they opened way for massive white settlement.

Both battles were also unimaginable slaughters. Outnumbered and outgunned, 800-900 Creeks were killed, costliest battle in history of Indian warfare. Jackson had artillery, while only a few of the Red Sticks had guns that still worked. The Red Sticks found themselves trapped in their camp situated in a horseshoe-shaped bend of the Tallapoosa River in present-day east central Alabama. Cherokees fighting with Jackson cut off the Red Sticks' escape route, and they were shot down like dogs, 200 as they tried to get away across the river behind their camp.

New Orleans was just as bad for the British. Massive British army moved slowly up Mississippi River toward the city, lugging 1000s of men and cannons and boat through the swamps south of New Orleans. At one point, they delayed while widening a river to bring large barges with men and guns in. At any rate, British ended up on a narrow piece of land between river on left and swamp on right. When British made their final assault on Jan. 8, 1815, Jackson managed to be waiting behind strong: high earthen walls with cannon behind a moat. British attack resulted in a horrendous slaughter. Regiment that was supposed to bring ladders and bales of sugar cane to get over the moat and wall was late and army ended up standing in front of the moat being killed by the 100s. Naturally the British lines quickly disintegrated and in half hour it was over. Incredible stats: British had 2,036 men killed or wounded, Jackson's troops 8 killed, and 13 wounded. The top 3 British generals were killed. Top British General Edward Pakenham

tried to rally his troops and got perforated in the arm, thigh, and groin before he died.

One other thing that the Battle of New Orleans did was public's whole view of the war, from a dismal failure to a great success. Of course, it was fought after Treaty of Ghent was signed.

C. New England Reaction: The Hartford Convention, 1814-1815.

1. War was especially harmful and unpopular in New England. Resentment at long and apparently permanent Southern control of federal government.

--- Economically the war, like the Embargo, was especially harmful in New England and New York. The war was also happening on their doorstep, chiefly along the borders with Canada. Governors of New England states refused to allow recruiting or the use of their militia troops and made private contacts with the British about the possibility of their states making peace separately from the U.S. There was much resentment of the fact that country had (except for 4 years under Adams) had always been run by Virginians, in the interest of Virginians, and now that the country was expanding so quickly, with Southerners expected to culturally dominate the West, the expectation was that New England would never be influential again, would never escape Southern domination. Ironically, this was very similar to how the South started to feel just a short time later when North began to outpace it in economic development and population growth.

2. Convention of New England states called at Hartford, Conn. Some leaders wanted to secede, but moderates gained control.

--- Official specially elected representatives from all New England states met in Hartford beginning Oct 1814 to discuss their grievances against the war. It was rumored and feared that

this was a secession convention. Madison sent Major Thomas Jesup to conduct military maneuvers in the streets while it was going on. Moderates controlled the convention in the end and it did not recommend secession.

3. Passed resolutions calling for various constitutional amendments to reduce power of the South and protect power of New England within the Union.

They met in secret nonetheless so people were left to assume the worst, which the Democratic-Republican press was happy to do. They did pass resolutions calling for various constitutional changes that would reduce power of the South and protect power of New England within the union: repeal of the 3/5 compromise, limitations on presidential terms, and the requirement of a 2/3 majority for all declarations of war, admission of new states, or impositions of trade embargoes. Other proposals limited federal military drafts within the states, and gave states more control over their own defense, including the stipulation that federal taxes had to be for the defense of the states where they were paid and a mechanism for coordinating state militias outside of federal control.

4. Followed some ideas of VA and KY Resolutions, employing compact theory, and originated idea of a minority or sectional veto over national policies.

Hartford Convention did propose secession, but it did ask the national government to give up key elements of sovereignty (power over its own money and troops) and for the South to give up the main protection it had won in 1787. The convention's resolutions used similar language as the VA and KY Resolutions, portraying the states as sovereign contractors: "in cases of deliberate, dangerous and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of a state and liberties of the people; it is not only the right but the duty of such a state to interpose its authority

for their protection." The resolutions of Hartford Convention were also the first time that the idea was suggested of a minority or sectional veto over national policies.

It is also important to point out what New England did NOT do in this case or the earlier Northern Confederacy. They never sealed the deal. Despite their hatred of the war and resentment of the South, cooler heads prevailed. The hesitancy of New England to take step of leaving union, was ridiculed in the early days of political cartooning. Quincy as King of New England and "Leap no Leap."

5. Bad timing: Hartford Convention killed Federalist Party as a national force, branding it as disloyal.

The public announcements of the Convention's resolutions happened to appear at same time that people learned of the Battle of New Orleans. The War of 1812 suddenly became wildly popular and Federalists looked like traitors.

D. Immediate Aftermath and Results of the War

None from the Treaty of Ghent, but many in terms of impact on the country.

- 1. During war and postwar period ("Era of Good Feelings"), Republicans adopted many old Federalist policies, including the resurrection of the Bank of the United States. National**
- 2. US government, through agency of Gen. Andrew Jackson, used naked military aggression to seize Spanish Florida and finish off Indians in the South:**

Postwar Indian treaties, beginning with Ft. Jackson (1815), First Seminole War (1818), Arbuthnot and Ambrister case, Transcontinental Treaty (1819).

3. The War of 1812 and the Origins of the Westward Movement: The Great Migration of 1815-1819

***a) New states carved from Jackson and Harrison's conquests:
LA (1812), IN (1816), MS (1817), IL (1818), AL (1819).***

***b) Spurred westward movement of regional cultures,
economic boom in sales of land & equipment to emigrants,
expansion of banking to finance it all.***

Many ironies & unexpected results: required expansion of government power to manage, spurred economic development of a kind that TJ did not welcome (manufacturing), and as we will see, threatened union in several ways, by giving sections something to fight over and reinvigorating slavery.

***c) Contrary to Jefferson's intentions, way was paved for a
massive expansion of plantation slavery and cotton growing.
1812, not cotton gin, was the catalyst.***

***(1) Also expanded internal slave trade, launched new
"middle passage" in which 100,000s of slaves were sent
west ("sold down the river"). Paved way for the massive
expansion of plantation slavery and cotton growing.
1812, not cotton gin, was the catalyst.***

Contrary to Jefferson's intentions.

4. The Missouri Crisis (during depression): Lacking need to keep Southern allies, Northern congressmen voted to ban slavery from new state of MO.

Sponsored by old Federalists sincerely opposed to the expansion of slavery, but also hoping to stir things up, happened long before new abolitionism.

***a) Wake-up call for South: North was getting larger in
population & would act against slavery when it had the
chance.***

***b) Resolved by drawing permanent line between slavery &
freedom for all future states.***

c) Stirred up terrible fears about future of union, just at time

when many were feeling more patriotic about it.

Jefferson: "I had for a long time ceased to read newspapers, or pay any attention to public affairs, confident they were in good hands But this momentous question, like a fire bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union. It is hushed, indeed, for the moment. But this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper."

VI. The War's Greatest Irony: The Origins of the U.S. Industrial Revolution

A. Preconditions in economic and demographic trends before and during the war.

1. Overpopulation and land shortages in the Northeast.

-- Younger sons could not find land at home. This formed the beginnings of large-scale migration out of the older parts of New England: north to Maine, west to VT & NY and beyond. Overpopulation provided the need and potential for manufacturing and expansionary pressures.

2. Massive fortunes made in shipping boom before 1807, by merchants trading with both sides during Napoleonic Wars.

B. Francis Cabot Lowell and the Boston Associates: Pent-up merchant capital, wartime restrictions, and the origins of the New England textile industry.

1. Lowell was wealthy Boston merchant whose business was stalled by Jefferson's embargo.

Though a young man, Francis Cabot Lowell was one of Boston's wealthiest merchants and a card-carrying member of the Boston Federalist elite. Though extremely rich, Lowell actually wanted to find a steadier source of income than international trade, especially when Jefferson had just made it so much more difficult. Lowell built a large wharf in 1807 and 1808 only to have it idled by the Embargo, and not long after the merchant firm of Joseph & Henry Lee failed, wiping out a close friend and relative's fortune. Lowell began looking around for a new business to get into and often thought of manufacturing cotton cloth, which British textile industry had done with great success, especially since the invention of power loom (powered by water.) The countryside around Boston and in other parts of New England was well suited to water-powered factories because of the many small accessible rivers in the area. The only problem was that British were trying to monopolize the technology.

2. Looking for other investment opportunities, Lowell traveled in Europe and in process stole British technology for mechanized textile production (the "power loom.")

In 1810 Lowell decided to put his merchant business partly on hold and travel in Europe, especially in Scotland. He stayed for 2 years. While there Lowell made sure to tour the great factories of Manchester, England, where he saw and studied and *memorized* the design and operation of the power loom. He had to memorize it because the British customs service was

very alert to the possibility of technological piracy. They searched Lowell's luggage for notes or drawings and would have confiscated anything they had found. Nevertheless, Lowell had committed enough of the machine to memory that upon his return an American mechanic named Paul Moody was able to recreate the power loom based on Lowell's descriptions.

3. Lowell and the Boston Associates opened state-of-the-art textile factory in Waltham, Mass., and later a whole series of them in new town of Lowell, Mass. First workers were young farm women.

In 1813, Lowell and a group of other wealthy Boston merchants (called the Boston Associates) formed the Boston Manufacturing Company and opened a state of the art factory at Waltham, Mass., the first real factory in the U.S., putting as many processes as they could under one roof. They had so much capital on hand that they were able to spend \$600,000 in the first few years while the enterprise got off the ground. Lowell was concerned about the prospect of ignorant, dirty, dangerous workers so instead of immigrants or poor men he recruited teenage daughters of farm families for his work force and built a dormitory for them to stay in. Work would be temporary, bring extra money, be an adventure for young women before marriage. This system was widely successful and later spread over the region, most famously at Lowell, Mass., in 1822, a city specially created for the purpose. Mill girls had activities, newspaper, education.

C. Waltham and Lowell were beginning of a process that would transform U.S. into a manufacturing giant, with New England (along with Middle States) as center of it.

The "Industrial Revolution" did not become nationwide and dominant in a large number of industries until the Civil War era, but its beginning came in New England during Jefferson & Madison's trade wars. Household industry (esp. in weaving and cloth-making in homes)

declined after 1815 (except in frontier areas) and after 1830 it began to vanish everywhere.

In many ways, this was just the opposite of the result TJ had been seeking.