The Rise of a Nationalist Faction

Money questions — debts, taxes, and tariffs — dominated the postwar political agenda. Americans who had served the Confederation as military officers, officials, and diplomats viewed these issues from a national perspective and advocated a stronger central government. George Washington, Robert Morris, Benjamin Franklin, John Jay, and John Adams wanted Congress to control foreign and interstate trade and tariff policy. However, lawmakers in Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania — states with strong commercial traditions — insisted on controlling their own tariffs, both to protect their artisans from low-cost imports and to assist their merchants. Most southern states opposed tariffs because planters wanted to import British textiles and ironware at the lowest possible prices.

Nonetheless, some southern leaders became nationalists because their state legislatures had cut taxes and refused to redeem state war bonds. Such policies, lamented wealthy bondholder Charles Lee of Virginia, led taxpayers to believe they would “never be compelled to pay” the public debt. Creditors also condemned state laws that “stayed” (delayed) the payment of mortgages and other private debts. “While men are madly accumulating enormous debts, their legislators are making provisions for their nonpayment,” complained a South Carolina merchant. To undercut the democratic majorities in the state legislatures, creditors joined the movement for a stronger central government.

Delegates from five states met in Annapolis, Maryland, in September 1786 to consider solutions to the confederation’s economic problems. They recommended that another convention, with representatives from all the states, meet in Philadelphia in 1787. Spurred on by Shays’s Rebellion, nationalists in Congress secured a resolution calling for such a convention to revise the Articles of Confederation. Only an “efficient plan from the Convention,” a fellow nationalist wrote to James Madison, “can prevent anarchy first & civil convulsions afterwards.”

The Philadelphia Convention

In May 1787, fifty-five delegates arrived in Philadelphia. They came from every state except Rhode Island, where the legislature opposed increasing central authority. Most were strong nationalists; forty-two had served in the Confederation Congress. They were also educated and propertied: merchants, slaveholding planters, and “monied men.” There were no artisans, backcountry settlers, or tenants, and only a single yeoman farmer.

Some influential Patriots missed the convention. John Adams and Thomas Jefferson were serving as American ministers to Britain and France, respectively. The Massachusetts General Court rejected Samuel Adams as a delegate because he opposed a stronger national government, and his fellow firebrand from Virginia, Patrick Henry, refused to attend because he “smelt a rat.” Just as politically engaged citizens disagreed in 1787 whether a new form of government was needed, historians have argued ever since about whether the Constitution was necessary (AP* Interpreting the Past).

The absence of experienced leaders and contrary-minded delegates allowed capable younger nationalists to set the agenda. Declaring that the convention would “decide for ever the fate of Republican Government,” James Madison insisted on increased national authority. Alexander Hamilton of New York likewise demanded a strong central government to protect the republic from “the imprudence of democracy.”
Was the Constitution Necessary?

Political debate during the 1780s focused on the efficacy of the Articles of Confederation, ratified in 1781. For those leery of a strong central government, the Confederation placed authority properly with the states and safeguarded the rights of the people against tyranny. To others, the national Congress lacked the authority and power to restrain popular excesses, maintain order, and establish sound financial policies. Commercial growth convinced some Americans that the young country was thriving, but others saw the chase for money as a sign of moral weakness. These divergent views came to a head in May 1787 when representatives from the states met in Philadelphia to revise the Articles of Confederation. Instead they drafted an entirely new form of government. Two historians—Merrill Jensen and Gordon S. Wood—offer interpretations of the 1780s from differing points of view, highlighting factors pushing some to support and others to reject the Articles of Confederation.

MERRILL JENSEN

The often violent expression of such discontents in politics should not blind us to the fact that the period was one of extraordinary economic growth. Merchants owned more ships at the end of the 1780s than they had at the beginning of the Revolution . . . [and] the export of agricultural produce was double. . . . American cities grew rapidly. . . . There can be no question but that freedom from the British Empire resulted in a surge of activity in all phases of American life . . . [T]here is no evidence of stagnation and decay in the 1780s. Instead the story is one of a newly free people who seized upon every means to improve and enrich themselves in a nation which they believed had a golden destiny.

GORDON S. WOOD

Viewing the state as analogous to the human body, Americans saw their country stricken by a serious sickness. The 1780s seemed to mark the point in the life of the young nation where a decisive change had to occur, leading either to recovery or death. . . . The signs of disease spread everywhere. Merchants and farmers were seeking their own selfish ends; hucksters were engrossing products to raise prices. Even government officials . . . were using their public positions to fill their own pockets. The fluctuation in the value of money . . . was putting a premium on selfishness. . . . Instead of bringing about the moral reformation they had anticipated from victory, the Revolution had only aggravated America’s corruption and sin.

AP SHORT ANSWER PRACTICE

1. Identify and explain two differences between these historians’ interpretations of America during the 1780s.
2. Using the two historians’ descriptions of the 1780s, identify the factors that might have led some Americans to support— and others to reject—the Articles of Confederation.
3. Explain how this chapter’s sections on “The Articles of Confederation” and “The Constitution of 1787” support one or the other historian’s interpretation of the 1780s.

The Virginia and New Jersey Plans

The delegates elected George Washington as their presiding officer and voted to meet behind closed doors. Then—momentously—they decided not to revise the Articles of Confederation but rather to consider the so-called Virginia Plan, a scheme for a powerful national government devised by James Madison. Just thirty-six years old, Madison was determined to fashion national political institutions run by men of high character. A graduate of Princeton, he had read classical and modern political theory and served in both the Confederation Congress and the Virginia assembly. Once an optimistic Patriot, Madison had grown discouraged because of the “narrow ambition” and outlook of state legislators.

Madison’s Virginia Plan differed from the Articles of Confederation in three crucial respects. First, the plan rejected state sovereignty in favor of the “supremacy of national authority,” including the power to overturn state laws. Second, it called for the national
government to be established by the people (not the states) and for national laws to operate directly on citizens of the various states. Third, the plan proposed a three-tier election system in which ordinary voters would elect only the lower house of the national legislature. This lower house would then select the upper house, and both houses would appoint the executive and judiciary.

From a political perspective, Madison’s plan had two fatal flaws. First, most state politicians and citizens resolutely opposed allowing the national government to veto state laws. Second, the plan based representation in the lower house on population; this provision, a Delaware delegate warned, would allow the populous states to “crush the small ones whenever they stand in the way of their ambitious or interested views.”

So delegates from Delaware and other small states rallied behind a plan devised by William Paterson of New Jersey. The New Jersey Plan gave the Confederation the power to raise revenue, control commerce, and make binding requisitions on the states. But it preserved the states’ control of their own laws and guaranteed their equality: as in the Confederation Congress, each state would have one vote in a unicameral legislature. Delegates from the more populous states vigorously opposed this provision. After a month-long debate on the two plans, a bare majority of the states agreed to use Madison’s Virginia Plan as the basis of discussion.

This decision raised the odds that the convention would create a more powerful national government. Outraged by this prospect, two New York delegates, Robert Yates and John Lansing, accused their colleagues of exceeding their mandate to revise the Articles and left the convention. The remaining delegates met six days a week during the summer of 1787, debating both high principles and practical details. Experienced politicians, they looked for a plan that would be acceptable to most citizens and existing political interests. Pierce Butler of South Carolina invoked a classical Greek precedent: “We must follow the example of Solon, who gave the Athenians not the best government he could devise but the best they would receive.”

**The Great Compromise**  
As the convention grappled with the central problem of the representation of large and small states, the Connecticut delegates suggested a possible solution. They proposed that the national legislature’s upper chamber (the Senate) have two members from each state, while seats in the lower chamber (the House of Representatives) be apportioned by population (determined every ten years by a national census). After bitter debate, delegates from the populous states reluctantly accepted this “Great Compromise.”

Other state-related issues were quickly settled by restricting (or leaving ambiguous) the extent of central authority. Some delegates opposed a national system of courts, predicting that “the states will revolt at such encroachments” on their judicial authority. This danger led the convention to vest the judicial power “in one supreme Court” and allow the new national legislature to decide whether to establish lower courts within the states. The convention also refused to set a property requirement for voting in national elections. “Eight or nine states have extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders,” George Mason of Virginia pointed out. “What will people there say if they should be disfranchised?” Finally, the convention specified that state legislatures would elect members of the upper house, or Senate, and the states would select the electors who would choose the president. By allowing states to have important roles in the new constitutional system, the delegates hoped that their citizens would accept limits on state sovereignty.

**Negotiations over Slavery**  
The shadow of slavery hovered over many debates, and Gouverneur Morris of New York brought it into view. To safeguard property rights, Morris wanted life terms for senators, a property qualification for voting in national elections, and a strong president with veto power. Nonetheless, he rejected the legitimacy of two traditional types of property: the feudal dues claimed by aristocratic landowners and the ownership of slaves. An advocate of free markets and personal liberty, Morris condemned slavery as “a nefarious institution.”
Many slave-owning delegates from the Chesapeake region, including Madison and George Mason, recognized that slavery contradicted republican principles and hoped for its eventual demise. They supported an end to American participation in the Atlantic slave trade, a proposal the South Carolina and Georgia delegates angrily rejected. Unless the importation of African slaves continued, these rice planters and merchants declared, their states “shall not be parties to the Union.” At their insistence, the convention denied Congress the power to regulate immigration — and so the slave trade — until 1808 (AP® Analyzing Voices).

The delegates devised other slavery-related compromises. To mollify southern planters, they wrote a “fugitive clause” that allowed masters to reclaim enslaved blacks (or white indentured servants) who fled to other states. But in acknowledgment of the antislavery sentiments of Morris and other northerners, the delegates excluded the words slave and slavery from the Constitution; it spoke only of citizens and “all other Persons.” Because slaves lacked the vote, antislavery delegates wanted their census numbers excluded when apportioning seats in Congress. Southerners — ironically, given that they considered slaves property — demanded that slaves be counted in the census the same as full citizens, to increase the South’s representation. Ultimately, the delegates agreed that each slave would count as three-fifths of a free person for purposes of representation and taxation, a compromise that helped southern planters dominate the national government until 1860.

**National Authority** Having addressed the concerns of small states and slave states, the convention created a powerful national government. The Constitution declared that congressional legislation was the “supreme” law of the land. It gave the new government the power to tax, raise an army and a navy, and regulate foreign and interstate commerce, with the authority to make all laws “necessary and proper” to implement those and other provisions. To assist creditors and establish the new government’s fiscal integrity, the Constitution required the United States to honor the existing national debt and prohibited the states from issuing paper money or enacting “any Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts.”

The proposed constitution was not a “perfect production,” Benjamin Franklin admitted, as he urged the delegates to sign it in September 1787. But the great statesman confessed his astonishment at finding “this system approaching so near to perfection.” His colleagues apparently agreed; all but three signed the document.

**The People Debate Ratification**

The procedure for ratifying the new constitution was as controversial as its contents. Knowing that Rhode Island (and perhaps other states) would reject it, the delegates did not submit the Constitution to the state legislatures for their unanimous consent, as required by the Articles of Confederation. Instead, they arbitrarily — and cleverly — declared that it would take effect when ratified by conventions in nine of the thirteen states. Moreover, they insisted that the conventions could only approve or disapprove the plan; they could not suggest alterations. As George Mason put it, the conventions would “take this or take nothing.”

As the constitutional debate began in early 1788, the nationalists seized the initiative with two bold moves. First, they called themselves Federalists, suggesting that they supported a federal union — a loose, decentralized system — and obscuring their commitment to a strong national government. Second, they launched a coordinated campaign in pamphlets and newspapers to explain and justify the Philadelphia constitution.

**The Antifederalists** The opponents of the Constitution, called by default the Antifederalists, had diverse backgrounds and motives. Some, like Governor George Clinton of New York, feared that state governments would lose power. Rural
In this part of the text, we trace the impact of republican ideology on American politics and society. What happened when republicanism collided head-on with the well-established practice of slavery? After the Revolution, the Massachusetts courts abolished slavery, but in 1787, slavery was legal in the rest of the Union and was the bedrock of social order and agricultural production in the southern states. A look at the debates on the issue of the African slave trade at the Philadelphia Convention and in a state ratifying convention shows that slavery was an extremely divisive issue at the birth of the nation—a dark cloud threatening the bright future of the young republic.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Slavery was not a major topic of discussion at the Philadelphia convention, but it surfaced a number of times, notably in the important debate over representation (which produced the three-fifths clause). A discussion of the Atlantic slave trade began when Luther Martin, a delegate from Maryland, proposed a clause allowing Congress to impose a tax on or prohibit the importation of slaves.


“Mr. Martin proposed to vary article 7, sect. 4 so as to allow a prohibition or tax on the importation of slaves. . . . [He believed] it was inconsistent with the principles of the Revolution, and dishonorable to the American character, to have such a feature [promoting the slave trade] in the Constitution.

Mr. [John] Rutledge [of South Carolina] declared that religion and humanity had nothing to do with this question. Interest alone is the governing principle with nations. The true question at present is whether the Southern states shall or shall not be parties to the Union. . . . Mr. [Oliver] Ellsworth [of Connecticut] was for leaving the clause as it stands. Let every state import what it pleases. The morality or wisdom of slavery are considerations belonging to the states themselves. . . . The old Confederation had not meddled with this point, and he did not see any greater necessity for bringing it within the policy of the new one.

Mr. [Charles C.] Pinckney [said] South Carolina can never receive the plan [for a new constitution] if it prohibits the slave trade. In every proposed extension of the powers of Congress, that state has expressly and watchfully excepted that of meddling with the importation of Negroes. . . .

Mr. [Roger] Sherman [of Connecticut] was for leaving the clause as it stands. He disapproved of the slave trade; yet, as the states were now possessed of the right to import slaves, . . . and as it was expedient to have as few objections as possible to the proposed scheme of government, he thought it best to leave the matter as we find it.

Col. [George] Mason [of Virginia] stated that this internal trade originated in the avarice of British merchants. The British government constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to it. The present question concerns not the importing states alone, but the whole Union. . . . Maryland and Virginia, he said, had already prohibited the importation of slaves expressly. North Carolina had done the same in substance. All this would be in vain if South Carolina and Georgia be at liberty to import. The Western people are already calling out for slaves for their new lands, and will fill that country with slaves, if they can be got through South Carolina and Georgia. Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the immigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. . . .

Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country. As nations cannot be rewarded or punished in the next world, they must be in this. By an inevitable chain of causes and effects, Providence punishes national sins by national calamities. . . . He held it essential, in every point of view, that the general government should have power to prevent the increase of slavery.

democrats protested that the proposed document, unlike most state constitutions, lacked a declaration of individual rights; they also feared that the central government would be run by wealthy men. “Lawyers and men of learning and monied men expect to be managers of this Constitution,” worried a Massachusetts farmer. “[T]hey will swallow up all of us little folks . . . just as the whale swallowed up Jonah.” Giving political substance to these fears, Melancton Smith of New York argued that the large electoral districts prescribed by the Constitution would restrict office holding to wealthy men, whereas the smaller districts used in state elections usually produced legislatures “composed principally of respectable yeomanry.” John Quincy Adams agreed: if only
Mr. Ellsworth, as he had never owned a slave, could not judge of the effects of slavery on character. He said, however, that if it was to be considered in a moral light, we ought to go further, and free those already in the country. . . Let us not intermeddle. As population increases, poor laborers will be so plentiful as to render slaves useless. Slavery, in time, will not be a speck in our country. . . .

Gen. [Charles C.] Pinckney [argued that] South Carolina and Georgia cannot do without slaves. As to Virginia, she will gain by stopping the importations. Her slaves will rise in value, and she has more than she wants. It would be unequal to require South Carolina and Georgia to confederate on such unequal terms. . . . He contended that the importation of slaves would be for the interest of the whole Union. The more slaves, the more produce to employ the carrying trade; the more consumption also; and the more of this, the more revenue for the common treasury. . . . [He] should consider a rejection of the [present] clause as an exclusion of South Carolina from the Union.

THE MASSACHUSETTS RATIFYING CONVENTION

In Philadelphia, the delegates agreed on a compromise: they gave Congress the power to tax or prohibit slave imports, as Luther Martin had proposed, but withheld that power for twenty years. In the Massachusetts convention, the delegates split on this issue and on many others. They ratified the Constitution by a narrow margin, 187 to 168.


"Mr. Neal [from Kittery] [an Antifederalist] went over the ground of objection to . . . the idea that slave trade was allowed to be continued for 20 years. His profession, he said, obliged him to bear witness against any thing that should favor the making merchandise of the bodies of men, and unless his objection was removed, he could not put his hand to the constitution. Other gentlemen said, in addition to this idea, that there was not even a proposition that the negroes ever shall be free: and Gen. Thompson exclaimed — 'Mr. President, shall it be said, that after we have established our own independence and freedom, we make slaves of others? Oh! Washington . . . he has immortalized himself! but he holds those in slavery who have a good right to be free as he is . . .'.

On the other side, gentlemen said, that the step taken in this article, towards the abolition of slavery, was one of the beauties of the constitution. They observed, that in the confederacy there was no provision whatever for its ever being abolished; but this constitution provides, that Congress may after twenty years, totally annihilate the slave trade . . .

Mr. Heath (Federalist): . . . I apprehend that it is not in our power to do anything for or against those who are in slavery in the southern states. No gentleman within these walls testifies every idea of slavery more than I do: it is generally detested by the people of this commonwealth, and I ardently hope that the time will soon come, when our brethren in the southern states will view it as we do, and put a stop to it; but to this we have no right to compel them.

Two questions naturally arise: if we ratify the Constitution, shall we do anything by our act to hold the blacks in slavery or shall we become the partakers of other men's sins? I think neither of them: each state is sovereign and independent to a certain degree, and they have a right, and will regulate their own internal affairs, as to themselves appears proper. . . . We are not in this case partakers of other men's sins. . . .

The federal convention went as far as they could; the migration or immigration &c. is confined to the states, now existing only, new states cannot claim it. Congress, by their ordinance for erecting new states, some time since, declared that there shall be no slavery in them. But whether those in slavery in the southern states, will be emancipated after the year 1808, I do not pretend to determine: I rather doubt it.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS

1. At the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, what were the main arguments for and against federal restrictions on the Atlantic slave trade? How do you explain the position taken by the Connecticut delegates in Philadelphia and Mr. Heath in the Massachusetts debate?
2. What argument does George Mason, a Virginia slave owner, make in favor of prohibiting the Atlantic slave trade?
3. What evidence of regional tensions appears in the documents? Several men from different states — Mason from Virginia, Ellsworth from Connecticut, and Heath from Massachusetts — offered predictions about the future of slavery. How accurate were they?

"eight men" would represent Massachusetts, "they will infallibly be chosen from the aristocratic part of the community."

Smith summed up the views of Americans who held traditional republican values. To keep government "close to the people," they wanted the states to remain small sovereign republics tied together only for trade and defense — not the "United States" but the "States United." Citing the French political philosopher Montesquieu, Antifederalists argued that republican institutions were best suited to small polities. "No extensive empire can be governed on republican principles," declared James Winthrop of Massachusetts. Patrick Henry worried that the Constitution would re-create British
rule: high taxes, an oppressive bureaucracy, a standing army, and a "great and mighty President . . . supported in extravagant munificence." As another Antifederalist put it, "I had rather be a free citizen of the small republic of Massachusetts than an oppressed subject of the great American Empire." Many Americans found themselves somewhere in the middle, supporting a stronger central government in principle but worried about countless details that made the Constitution appear flawed.

**Federalists Respond** In New York, where ratification was hotly contested, James Madison, John Jay, and Alexander Hamilton defended the proposed constitution in a series of eighty-five essays written in 1787 and 1788, collectively titled *The Federalist*. This work influenced political leaders throughout the country and subsequently won acclaim as an important treatise of practical republicanism. Its authors denied that a centralized government would lead to domestic tyranny. Drawing on Montesquieu's theories and John Adams's *Thoughts on Government*, Madison, Jay, and Hamilton pointed out that authority would be divided among the president, a bicameral legislature, and a judiciary. Each branch of government would "check and balance" the others and so preserve liberty.

In "Federalist No. 10," Madison challenged the view that republican governments only worked in small polities, arguing that a large state would better protect republican liberty. It was "sown in the nature of man," Madison wrote, for individuals to seek power and form factions. Indeed, "a landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations." A free society should welcome all factions but keep any one of them from becoming dominant—something best achieved in a large republic. "Extend the sphere and you take in a greater variety of parties and interests," Madison concluded, inhibiting the formation of a majority eager "to invade the rights of other citizens."

**The Constitution Ratified** The delegates debating these issues in the state ratification conventions included untutored farmers and middling artisans as well as educated gentlemen. Generally, backcountry delegates were especially skeptical, while those from coastal areas were more likely to support the new constitution. In Pennsylvania, a coalition of Philadelphia merchants and artisans and commercial farmers ensured its ratification. Other early Federalist successes came in four less populous states—Delaware, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut—where delegates hoped that a strong national government would offset the power of large neighboring states (Map 6.7).

The Constitution's first real test came in January 1788 in Massachusetts, a hotbed of Antifederalist sentiment. Influential Patriots, including Samuel Adams and Governor John Hancock, opposed the new constitution, as did many followers of Daniel Shays. But Boston artisans, who wanted tariff protection from British imports, supported ratification. To win over other delegates, Federalist leaders suggested nine amendments that the Massachusetts delegation would submit to the new Congress for consideration once the Constitution was ratified. By a close vote of 187 to 168, the Federalists carried the day.

Spring brought Federalist victories in Maryland, South Carolina, and New Hampshire, reaching the nine-state quota required for ratification. But it took the powerful arguments advanced in *The Federalist* and more talk of amendments to secure the Constitution's adoption in the essential states of Virginia and New York. The votes were again close: 89 to 79 in Virginia and 30 to 27 in New York.

Testifying to their respect for popular sovereignty and majority rule, most Americans accepted the verdict of the ratifying conventions. "A decided majority" of the New Hampshire assembly had opposed the "new system," reported Joshua Atherton, but now they said, "It is adopted, let us try it." In Virginia, Patrick Henry vowed to "submit as a quiet citizen" and fight for amendments "in a constitutional way." And during the first session of Congress, James Madison set to work drafting a set of amendments to
MAP 6.7 Ratifying the Constitution of 1787

In 1907, geographer Owen Libby mapped the votes of members of the state conventions that ratified the Constitution. His map showed that most delegates from seaborne or commercial farming districts (which sent many delegates to the conventions) supported the Constitution, while those from sparsely represented, subsistence-oriented backcountry areas opposed it. Subsequent research has confirmed Libby’s socioeconomic interpretation of the voting patterns in North and South Carolina and in Massachusetts. However, other states’ delegates were influenced by different factors. For example, in Georgia, delegates from all regions voted for ratification.

satisfy some of the most pressing concerns that had arisen in the ratification process (see Chapter 7).

Unlike in France, where the Revolution of 1789 divided the society into irreconcilable factions for generations, the American Constitutional Revolution of 1787 created a national republic that enjoyed broad popular support. Federalists celebrated their triumph by organizing great processions in the seaport cities. By marching in an orderly fashion—in conscious contrast to the riotous Revolutionary mobs—Federalist-minded citizens affirmed their allegiance to a self-governing but elite-ruled republican nation.

IN YOUR OWN WORDS What were the most important compromises struck in the Philadelphia convention of 1787?
SUMMARY

In this chapter, we examined the unfolding of two related sets of events. The first was the war between Britain and its rebellious colonies that began in 1776 and ended in 1783. The two great battles of Saratoga (1777) and Yorktown (1781) determined the outcome of that conflict. Surprisingly, given the military might of the British Empire, both were American victories. These triumphs testify to the determination of George Washington, the resilience of the Continental army, and support for the Patriot cause from hundreds of local militias and tens of thousands of taxpaying citizens.

This popular support reflected the Patriots' second success: building effective institutions of republican government. These elected institutions of local and state governance evolved out of colonial-era town meetings and representative assemblies. They were defined in the state constitutions written between 1776 and 1781, and their principles informed the first national constitution, the Articles of Confederation. Despite the challenges posed by conflicts over suffrage, women's rights, and fiscal policy, these self-governing political institutions carried the new republic successfully through the war-torn era and laid the foundation for the Constitution of 1787, the national charter that endures today.

CHAPTER 6 REVIEW

AP CONTENT REVIEW  Answer these questions to demonstrate your understanding of the chapter's main ideas.

1. What challenges did Patriot forces confront in the first two years of the war, and what were their key achievements?

2. What were the keys to Patriot victory in the American Revolution?

3. What were the most important challenges facing governments in the 1780s?

4. What were the most important compromises struck in the Philadelphia convention of 1787?

5. Consider the events listed under “Politics and Power” and “Work, Exchange, and Technology” for the period 1776–1787 on the thematic timeline on page 138. How did war debt and inflation influence the development of political institutions during these years?

AP TERMS TO KNOW  Identify and explain the significance of each term below.

Key Concepts and Events

Battle of Long Island (1776)  (p. 172)
Battle of Saratoga (1777)  (p. 175)
Valley Forge  (p. 176)
Philipsburg Proclamation  (p. 179)
Battle of Yorktown (1781)  (p. 182)
currency tax  (p. 183)
Treaty of Paris of 1783  (p. 183)
Pennsylvania constitution of 1776  (p. 185)
mixed government  (p. 185)
Articles of Confederation  (p. 187)
Northwest Ordinance of 1787  (p. 189)
Shays's Rebellion  (p. 191)
Virginia Plan  (p. 193)
New Jersey Plan  (p. 194)
Federalists  (p. 195)
Antifederalists  (p. 195)
Federalist No. 10  (p. 198)

Key People

General George Washington  (p. 172)
General Horatio Gates  (p. 175)
Baron von Steuben  (p. 177)
James Madison  (p. 192)
General William Howe  (p. 172)
Robert Morris  (p. 176)
Judith Sargent Murray  (p. 186)
Key Academic Terms

kinship (p. 170)  pension (p. 178)
mercenary (p. 172)  guerilla (p. 179)
exortion (p. 176)  attrition (p. 180)
partisan (p. 176)  stymied (p. 182)
prerogative (p. 186)  adjudicate (p. 187)
factionalism (p. 198)

MAKING CONNECTIONS  Recognize the larger developments and continuities within and across chapters by answering these questions.

1. In Chapter 5, we saw the way that protests against imperial policy grew until colonists chose to declare their independence rather than submit to Parliament’s authority. By 1787, the problems created by the Revolutionary War forced leaders of the newly independent states to consider plans for their own powerful central government. What problems led nationalists to believe such a step was necessary? How did Antifederalists draw on Revolutionary ideas to make their case against the Constitution? What claims did nationalists make in response to dampen Antifederalist fears?

2. Look again at Map 6.5 on page 188 showing western land claims in the 1780s. If these claims had not been ceded to the Continental Congress, what would have been the likely result? Why was it so important to the survival of the Confederation that individual states give up their claims to these western lands?

KEY TURNING POINTS  Refer to the chapter chronology on page 172 for help in answering the questions below.

Gates defeats Burgoyne at Saratoga (1777), the Franco-American alliance (1778), and Cornwallis surrenders at Yorktown (1781). How were these three events linked? How important was the French alliance to the Patriot victory?

AP PRACTICE QUESTIONS

MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS  Choose the correct answer for each question.

Questions 1–3 refer to the excerpt below.

"These are the times that try men’s souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: it is dearness only that gives every thing its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated. Britain, with an army to enforce her tyranny, has declared that she has a right (not only to tax) but to ‘bind us in all cases whatsoever,’ and if being bound in that manner, is not slavery, then is there not such a thing as slavery upon earth. Even the expression is impious; for so unlimited a power can belong only to God.”

Thomas Paine, “The American Crisis,” December 19, 1776

1. Which of the following best explains the challenge faced by Patriots as described in the excerpt?
   a. Debates between the states over the fate of slavery
   b. Early military struggles against the British army
   c. Criticisms levied in Parliament by those opposed to the colonial war
   d. The Enlightenment ideal of freedom as the highest of all virtues

2. The sentiments expressed in the excerpt are most similar to sentiments expressed by which of the following groups?
   a. Women advocating a greater role in American society
   b. Frontier settlers in favor of seizing American Indian lands
   c. Protestant evangelists during the First Great Awakening
   d. Antifederalists opposed to ratification of the Constitution

3. Which of the following most significantly contributed to the defeat of the British in the Revolutionary War?
   a. The American public’s willingness to endure economic shortages and inflation
   b. The technological and military superiority of the Continental Army
   c. The lack of dissent against the war effort in the American colonies
   d. The ingenuity of American mechanics in bolstering industrial output
Questions 4–6 refer to the map below.

4. The map could be best used to support a characterization of the dominant national attitude regarding slavery in the United States in the 1780s as
   a. abolitionist seeking emancipation.
   b. free-soil opposing the westward expansion of slavery.
   c. sectional resulting from early federal and state government policies.
   d. perfectionist avoiding compromise in favor of principle.

5. Which of the following most directly contributed to the status of the Indiana and Ohio Territories as shown in the map?
   a. Federal treaty obligations with American Indian tribes
   b. Compromises at the Constitutional Convention
   c. The end of the Seven Years’ War
   d. Passage of the Northwest Ordinance

6. In the years immediately following the Revolutionary War, the regional differences depicted in the map posed the greatest threat to
   a. maintaining existing systems of labor.
   b. creating a sense of national identity and unity.
   c. promoting peaceful relations with neighboring countries.
   d. solving the nation's financial crisis.
SHORT ANSWER QUESTIONS Read each question carefully and write a short response. Use complete sentences.

1. Using the two excerpts above, answer (a), (b), and (c).
   a. Briefly explain ONE major difference between Jensen’s and Wood’s historical interpretations of American politics during the 1780s.
   b. Briefly explain how ONE specific historical event or development from the 1780s that is not explicitly mentioned in the excerpts could be used to support Jensen’s interpretation.
   c. Briefly explain how ONE specific historical event or development from the 1780s that is not explicitly mentioned in the excerpts could be used to support Wood’s interpretation.

2. Using the graph above, answer (a), (b), and (c).
   a. Briefly explain ONE specific historical factor that caused the change illustrated in the graph.
   b. Briefly explain ONE significant historical event or development resulting from the change illustrated in the graph.
   c. Briefly explain ANOTHER significant historical event or development resulting from the change illustrated in the graph.

3. Answer (a), (b), and (c).
   a. Briefly explain ONE specific historical similarity between the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution.
   b. Briefly explain ONE specific historical difference between the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution.
   c. Briefly explain ONE specific historical event, development, or circumstance that led to the difference you indicated in (b).