In May 1809, Mary and James Harrod gathered their five children, loaded a few belongings (tools, seeds for the summer planting, and several prized pieces of furniture) on a wagon, closed the door on their four-room cabin, fell in line with a dozen other families, and headed west from Spotsylvania County, Virginia, toward a new life in Kentucky. They left behind 15 years of wearying effort trying to wring a modest living.
from 10 acres of marginal upland, and a family cemetery that held two of their other children and Mary's parents.

Beyond the Appalachian Mountains, 450 difficult miles ahead, lay additional hard work and uncertainty. Though central Kentucky, where the Harrods would settle, contained few Indian villages, powerful tribes from north and south of the Ohio River hunted there and fought over its control. They also fought the growing tide of white settlers. The first years would be especially hard for James and Mary as they “opened up” the land, planted the first crops, and erected a cabin. They would be lonesome as well, for the Harrods would be unlikely to see even the chimney smoke of their nearest neighbors.

Yet James and Mary were hopeful as they trudged west. The land agent who had sold them their claim had promised rich, fertile soil that in time would support a good life. And they had been excited at the prospect of joining the swelling stream of migrants seeking new lives in the Trans-Appalachian West. The first years would be especially hard for James and Mary as they “opened up” the land, planted the first crops, and erected a cabin. They would be lonesome as well, for the Harrods would be unlikely to see even the chimney smoke of their nearest neighbors.

Yet James and Mary were hopeful as they trudged west. The land agent who had sold them their claim had promised rich, fertile soil that in time would support a good life. And they had been excited at the prospect of joining the swelling stream of migrants seeking new lives in the Trans-Appalachian West. They would be lonesome as well, for the Harrods would be unlikely to see even the chimney smoke of their nearest neighbors.

In April 1795, Ben Thompson started north from Queen Anne's County, Maryland, for New York City. Ben knew little beyond farming, but he was ambitious, and when he arrived in New York he listened carefully to the ships' captains who talked about life at sea while they recruited men for their crews. Ben was lucky, for he arrived just as American overseas commerce, stimulated by renewed war in Europe, was entering a decade of unprecedented prosperity. Sailors were in demand, pay was good, and few questions were asked. For five years, Ben sailed the seas. Having enough of travel, he returned to New York and hired out as an apprentice to a ship's carpenter.

About the same time, Phyllis Sherman left her home in Norwalk, Connecticut. She also headed for New York, where she took a job as a maid in the household of one of the city's wealthy merchants. As fate would have it, Phyllis and Ben met, fell in love, and in the spring of 1802 were married.

There is little of note in this except that Ben and Phyllis were former slaves and were married in the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. Ben had cast off his slave name, Cato, as a sign of liberation, while Phyllis kept the name her master had given her. Ben was doubly fortunate, for he had purchased his freedom just as cotton production began to expand through the Old Southwest, creating a growing demand for field slaves shipped in from the Chesapeake. In another decade, he would have faced greater difficulty securing his independence. Phyllis had been freed as a child when slavery ended in Connecticut. As she grew up, she tired of living as a servant with her former owner's family and longed for the companionship of other blacks. She had heard that there were people of color in New York City, and she was correct. In 1800, it contained 6,300 African Americans, more than half of them free.

Though life in New York was better than either Ben or Phyllis had known before, it was hardly easy. They shared only marginally in the city's commercial prosperity. In 1804, they watched helplessly as yellow fever carried off their daughter and many of their friends. And while they found support in newly established African American churches and the expanding black community, they had to be constantly on guard because slave ships still moved in and out of the port and slave catchers pursued southern runaways in the city's streets.

In the early republic, thousands of Americans seized opportunities to improve their lives. Some, like Ben Thompson and Phyllis Sherman, moved from the countryside to the nation's burgeoning cities, while others, such as Mary and James Harrod, joined the swelling tide of westward expansion. Their actions helped strengthen American values of social equality, individual initiative, and personal autonomy.
They contributed as well to a process of social transformation that historians have called the “opening” of American society. That process was powered by the accelerating movement of people across the land, disrupting families, weakening long-established communities, and creating countless new settlements. It was fueled as well by an expanding market economy with its relentless discipline of supply and demand, pursuit of individual profit, and contractual relationships. This chapter examines the onset of these processes of social change that would continue to transform people’s lives throughout the nineteenth century.

The chapter also explores the multiple ways in which America’s diverse regions became knitted together into an increasingly coherent nation, as well as the tensions that resulted from those closer ties. Chapter 9 turns next to a variety of reform movements that sought to achieve social justice and bring the conditions of daily life into conformity with the nation’s democratic ideals.

In the early republic, Indian-white relations continued to trouble the nation’s affairs, as westward migration and newly fashioned Indian policies generated both peaceful accommodation and armed resistance. These complicated issues constitute an additional focus of the chapter.

The years of the early nineteenth century also brought important changes in the nation’s foreign policy. With the War of 1812, the United States finally escaped the condition of neocolonialism that since independence had left it vulnerable to European wars and pressure. Just as important, the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 created a new framework for relations with other nations in the Americas.

Finally, we examine the collapse of the Federalist–Jeffersonian political system and the emergence of a distinctly new style of American politics that was increasingly democratic in temper and forms of party organization.
A NATION OF REGIONS

In the early republic, the vast majority of Americans drew their living from the land. As the nineteenth century began, 83 percent of the labor force was engaged in agriculture; that figure had hardly changed 25 years later. Yet across the nation, people occupied the land in very different ways.

The Northeast

In the Northeast, a region stretching from New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania to New England, family farms dominated the landscape. On New England’s rock-strewn land, farmers often abandoned field crops for the greater profits to be made from dairying and livestock. On the richer agricultural lands of New York and Pennsylvania, farmers cultivated the land intensively, planting crops year after year rather than following the time-honored practice of allowing worn-out fields to lie fallow and recover their fertility. Before 1776, the mid-Atlantic landscape had looked unkempt, with wide areas still covered by timber and fallow lands lapsing into brush. Fifty years later, the countryside looked increasingly orderly, its carefully cultivated fields marked by hedges and stone walls.

Farmers in southeastern Pennsylvania and along New York’s Hudson River valley produced an

Agricultural Productivity in 1800 and 2001

As this figure indicates, American agricultural productivity soared during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Why was it so relatively low in 1800?

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
agricultural surplus, the produce left over after meeting their families’ needs, and exchanged it in nearby towns for commodities such as tea, window glass, and tools. Across much of the rural Northeast, however, cash played a small part in economic exchange. Noted an observant Frenchman, people “supply their needs in the countryside by direct reciprocal exchanges. The tailor and the bootmaker... do the work of their calling at the home of the farmer... who... provides the raw material for it and pays for the work in goods... They write down what they give and receive on both sides, and at the end of the year... settle a large variety of exchanges with a very small quantity of coin.”

Most farms were not large. By 1800, the average farm in longer-settled areas was no more than 100 to 150 acres, down substantially from half a century before. That was primarily a result of the continuing division of farm property from fathers to sons. Even in southeastern Pennsylvania, the most productive agricultural region in the entire Northeast, economic opportunity was declining. Continuous planting had robbed the soil of fertility, forcing farmers to bring more marginal land under cultivation, thus bringing a steady decline in productivity.

By 1800, nearly 20 percent of male taxpayers in southeastern Pennsylvania were single, clear evidence that young men were delaying marriage until they could establish themselves financially. In some localities, as many as 30 percent of married taxpayers were landless.

Whereas the majority of northeasterners made their living from the land, growing numbers of rural folk also worked for wages as artisans or day laborers in nearby towns, or toiled in the small-scale manufactories—grain and saw mills, potash works, and iron forges—that dotted the rural landscape. Farm women contributed to the family economy by

Rural Industry in the North

Prior to the expansion of urban industrialization beginning in the 1830s, American manufacturing was small in scale and was often scattered across the countryside. What circumstances would be most likely to determine the location of the different industries included on this map?
helping with the livestock, preserving food, and making clothes for sale or exchange with neighbors. As the practice of men working for wages outside the family setting grew, women’s unwaged domestic labor began to be regarded as less valuable.

Frustrated by the backwardness of American agriculture, reformers compiled agricultural libraries and issued publications promoting “scientific” techniques. One of them, Elkanah Watson, a prosperous businessman turned gentleman farmer, experimented with fine-fleeced merino sheep whose valuable wool promised new prosperity.

Watson was instrumental as well in creating the nation’s first agricultural fairs in western Massachusetts. Part visionary and part huckster, Watson intended the fairs’ displays of equipment, animals, and produce to educate farmers and “excite a lively spirit of competition” among them. His efforts succeeded beyond his fondest hopes, for within a few years rural folk by the thousands were converging on the annual Berkshire gatherings. In a short while, these precursors to the county fairs that have remained a staple of rural and small-town American life had spread from Maine to Virginia and as far west as Illinois.

By 1830, demands posed by the Northeast’s expanding population for new agricultural land and a wide variety of wood products had transformed much of the region’s once heavily forested landscape. The numerous iron furnaces scattered across the countryside consumed firewood voraciously, while the production of potash and turpentine, planks for wooden houses, and fencing for fields further depleted forest ranges.

More than anything, though, it was the demand for heating fuel during the long winter months that made the woodcutter’s ax ring. Rural households burned from 20 to 30 cords of firewood annually in highly inefficient open fireplaces. As the region’s coastal cities increased in size and nearby wood lots
were exhausted, fuel had to be fetched from inland areas as far as 100 miles away.

The South

Life was very different in the South, a region stretching from Maryland to Georgia along the coast, and west to the newly forming states of Alabama and Mississippi. In 1800, much of southern agriculture was in disarray. Low prices, land exhausted of its fertility, and the loss of slaves during the Revolutionary War had left the Chesapeake economy in shambles.

One English traveler reported that in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, crops were “so intermixed with extensive tracts of waste land, worn out by the culture of tobacco . . . that on the whole the country had the appearance of barrenness.”

In hopes of boosting their sagging fortunes, southern planters experimented with wheat and other grains. Regional recovery began in earnest, however, when they turned to a new staple crop—cotton. In 1790, the South had produced 3,135 bales of cotton; by 1820, output had mushroomed to 334,378 bales. In 1805, cotton accounted for 30 percent of the nation’s agricultural exports; by 1820, it exceeded half. Across the old coastal South and the newly developing states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, cotton was becoming king.

A fortuitous combination of circumstances fueled the transformation: the growing demand for raw cotton by textile mills in England and the American Northeast; wonderfully productive virgin soil; a long, steamy growing season; an ample supply of slave labor; and southern planters’ long experience in producing and marketing staple crops.

Eli Whitney’s cotton gin speeded the process as well. The silky fibers of long-staple cotton could be easily separated from the cotton’s seeds. The delicate long-staple plant, however, grew only in the hot, humid climate along the southern coast. The hardier, short-staple variety could be successfully cultivated in the southern interior, but its fibers clung tenaciously to the plant’s sticky, green seeds. A slave could clean no more than a pound of short-staple cotton a day.

A solution began to appear in 1793 when Eli Whitney, a Yankee schoolteacher living in the South, set his mind to the problem of short-staple cotton and its seeds. Within a few days, he had designed a functioning model of what he called a “cotton gin.” It was disarmingly simple, nothing more than a box containing a roller equipped with wire teeth, designed to pull the fibers through a comblike barrier, thus stripping them from the seeds. A hand crank...
activated the mechanism. With this crude device a laborer could clean up to 50 pounds of short-staple cotton a day.

The swing to cotton marked a momentous turning point in the South’s—and the nation’s—history. It raised the value of southern land and opened economic opportunity for countless southern whites, but it also increased the demand for black field hands and breathed new life into slavery. Some of the escalating demand for slave labor was met from overseas. In 1803, Georgia and South Carolina alone imported 20,000 new slaves, as southern planters and northern suppliers rushed to meet the need before the slave trade ended in 1808. Much of the demand for agricultural labor, however, was met by the internal slave trade that moved black labor from the worn-out lands of the Chesapeake to the lush cotton fields of the southern interior.

**Trans-Appalachiapha**

West of the Appalachian Mountains, a third region of settlement was forming as the nineteenth century began. In the eighteenth century, British colonists had called the regions west of white settlement the “backcountry,” the land that lay behind them as they faced east, toward the Atlantic and Europe. As attention shifted toward settlement of the Trans-Appalachian West, however, people spoke increasingly of an ever-expanding “frontier.”

Trans-Appalachiapha, a broad and shifting “middle ground” of settlement and encounter, extended from the mountains to the Mississippi River and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. In 1790, scarcely 100,000 white settlers had lived there. By 1810, augmented by people like Mary and James Harrod, their number had swollen to nearly one million. A decade later, there were over a million more. They came by wagon through the Cumberland Gap and other tortuous routes into Kentucky and Tennessee, or clambered aboard flatboats at Pittsburgh to float down the Ohio River to destinations at Wheeling, Cincinnati, and Louisville.

The human tide appeared to grow with each passing year. The woods were full of new settlers, wrote an amazed observer near Batavia in western New York in 1805. “Axes are resounding, and the trees literally falling around us as we passed,” America, he exclaimed, “is breaking up and going west!”

Settlers were drawn by the promotions of speculators seeking their fortunes in the sale of western land. By 1800, absentee landlords had engrossed much of present-day West Virginia, Tennessee, and the western Carolinas. Between 1790 and 1820, land companies hawked vast areas of New York, Ohio, and Kentucky to prospective settlers such as the Harrods. Many ventures failed, but countless others returned handsome profits to their investors. Individual settlers joined in the speculative fever, often going deeply into debt to buy extra land, expecting to resell it when population increased and land values rose.

North of the Ohio River, settlement followed the grid pattern prescribed in the Land Ordinance of 1785. There, free-labor agriculture took hold and towns such as Columbus and Cincinnati emerged as service and cultural centers for the surrounding population. South of the Ohio, white settlers and their black slaves distributed themselves more randomly across the land, much as their ancestors had done back east. In Kentucky and Tennessee, free-labor agriculture was soon challenged by the spread of slavery-based cotton.

In this constantly shifting “borderland,” people of different ethnicity, race, class, and regional origin mingled together, their conflicting social, economic, and cultural values often generating tension. But as they built new communities, they fashioned new ways of life, in the process strengthening belief in America as a land of opportunity.

As people poured in, the newness and diversity of Trans-Appalachia gained it a reputation for rough
Frances Trollope, born in England and wife of an English barrister, came to the United States in 1827. She settled for a few years in Cincinnati where she opened a lecture hall, had a shop for the sale of fancy goods, and made something of a name for herself. When her business venture failed, she returned to England where in 1832 she published Domestic Manners of the Americans, one of the most acerbic and yet insightful of the many travel accounts penned by foreign visitors to the early republic.

The “simple” manner of living in Western America was more distasteful to me from its leveling effects on the manners of the people than from the personal privations that it rendered necessary. . . . The total and universal want of manners, both in males and females, is so remarkable that I was constantly endeavouring to account for it. It certainly does not proceed from want of intellect . . . but there is no charm, no grace in their conversation. . . . There is always something either in the expression or the accent that jars the feelings and shocks the taste. . . . In America, that polish which removes the coarser and rougher parts of our nature is unknown and undreamed of. . . . Nothing can exceed their activity and perseverance in all kinds of speculation, handicraft, and enterprise which promises a profitable pecuniary result. I heard an Englishman . . . declare that he had never overheard Americans conversing without the word DOLLAR being pronounced between them. . . . Yet the Americans declare that “they are the most moral people upon earth”. . . . My honest conviction is that the standard of moral character in the United States is greatly lower than in Europe. . . . It is amusing to observe how soothing the idea seems [to Americans] that they are more modern, more advanced than England. Our classic literature, our princely dignities, our noble institutions, are all [regarded as] bygone relics of the dark ages. . . .

What was it about the American people that set Trollope’s teeth on edge?

and colorful ways. The transience of the population, together with large numbers of young, unattached males, kept society unsettled. In Louisville and similar towns along the Ohio River, boatmen, gamblers, con men, and speculators gave civic life a raucous quality, while the grandeur of the natural surroundings stoked people’s imaginations. No characters were more famous in popular folklore than western adventurers such as Daniel Boone. None was more colorful than the mythical riverman Mike Fink, “half man, half alligator,” who could “whip his weight in grizzly bears.” And nothing revealed the West’s rawness more graphically than the eye-gouging, ear-biting, no-holds-barred, “rough and tumble” brawls that regularly erupted.

As settlers arrived, they began the long process of transforming the region’s heavily forested land. In mountainous areas of western Pennsylvania, hillsides were denuded of trees that anxious travelers dragged behind their wagons as makeshift brakes during the jolting ride downhill. Believing, erroneously, that open land was infertile, farmers staked their claims where the trees grew thickest and set about the arduous task of rooting them out by cutting off a girdle of bark then setting them on fire, or leaving them to die in place while planting crops around the decaying hulks. “The scene is truly savage,” observed an English traveler used to the orderly landscape of his own country. “Immense trees stripped of their foliage, and half consumed by fire extend their sprawling limbs . . . now bleached by the weather.” The relentless demand for wood added to the assault on the region’s forests. As expanding areas of Trans-Appalachia came under the farmer’s plow, forests and wildlife gave way.

The Nation’s Cities

Though most Americans lived on the land or in small towns, increasing numbers dwelt in the nation’s expanding cities. From 1790 to 1830, the nation’s population increased by nearly 230 percent, but urban places of more than 2,500 residents grew almost twice as fast.

Patterns of urban development differed from region to region. The most dramatic growth occurred in the port cities of the Northeast. By 1830, the region contained four cities of more than 50,000. New York alone held over 100,000 people, while inland towns such as Springfield, Massachusetts, and Albany, New York, proliferated as service centers for their surrounding areas.
The cities of the Atlantic seaboard were ethnically diverse, even though the wars of the American and French revolutions sharply reduced European immigration between the 1770s and 1820s. In New York and Philadelphia, Irish, German, British, and African Americans, together with travelers from around the world, jostled for space on the cities’ sidewalks. Sailors, often speaking strange tongues, added raucous behavior and at times an edge of danger to urban life.

As during the colonial era, economic life still centered on the wharves where sailing ships from distant ports docked, and the warehouses where cargoes were stored. Urban economies were changing, however, as manufacturing was beginning to transform urban life. Philadelphia was becoming a textile manufacturing center, while New York produced shoes and iron goods. As these enterprises expanded, artisan production slowly gave way to factory-based labor.

Such changes widened the gap between the cities’ richer and poorer inhabitants. Prosperous merchants rested securely at the top of the social pyramid, their households graced by fine table linens and store-bought furniture, the artifacts of an expanding consumer economy. Below them came an aspiring middle class of artisans, shopkeepers, and professional men whose families shared modestly in the general prosperity. At the bottom spread a growing underclass of common laborers, dock workers, and the unemployed, their lives a continuous struggle for survival. Though rich and poor had lived close together in colonial cities, rising land values now forced the lower classes into crowded alleys and tenements, while more prosperous urban dwellers began clustering in fashionable neighborhoods.

In the Southeast, urban development centered in long-established ports such as Charleston, Richmond, and Savannah. As during the colonial period, they continued to serve as commercial entrepots, exporting agricultural products and importing manufactured goods. Half their population was black, the vast majority of them slaves.

In Trans-Appalachia, fledgling towns such as Pittsburgh and Chicago dotted the region’s rivers and lakes. Only small villages in 1790, these interior cities held 30 percent of the nation’s urban population by 1830. New Orleans and St. Louis reflected their multinational origins. Established as a French colony in 1718, New Orleans came under Spanish rule in 1763. When the city became part of the United States in 1803, French and Spanish Creole families continued to dominate urban life. For several decades, U.S. citizens remained a minority among the white population. Of its 27,000 people, nearly 13,000 were black. Upriver from New Orleans, the smaller town of St. Louis—at different times part of French and Spanish North America—had a similarly diverse population. Enslaved blacks made up nearly one-third of the town’s 1,000 residents.

Though increasing rapidly in population, America’s urban places remained small in area. In these “walking cities,” residents could easily stroll from one side of town to the other. Rapid growth, however, brought increasing congestion. Asa Greene, a New York physician, observed ruefully that to cross Broadway “you must button your coat tightly about you ... settle your hat firmly on your head, look up
Philadelphia led the way in street paving, but dust in dry season and mud when it rained constantly plagued urban life. One alarmed citizen, finding a man embedded up to his neck in a mud hole following a violent downpour, offered to help pull him out. “No need to worry,” replied the man, “I have a horse underneath me.” So, at least, went a popular fable.

More than mud clogged urban streets in the early nineteenth century, for residents dumped their garbage there, privies leached into open drains, and livestock roamed freely, leaving their droppings behind. Though one urban dweller thought the scavenging hogs she encountered were “disgusting,” she acknowledged that without them the streets would soon be choked with filth. Packs of stray dogs added to the confusion.

Under such conditions, typhoid and dysentery, spread by contaminated water, took a continuous toll. Not until 1832 with construction of the Croton Aqueduct did New York City establish a safe and adequate water supply.

Urban families had long maintained small garden plots and milk cows. As populations grew and land values increased, however, gardens and cows gradually disappeared, further weakening diet and health. The rigors of poor diet, frequent disease, and inadequate medical care often brought life to an early end. Scarcely half of urban dwellers reached age 45. Unlike today, women on average died sooner than men, their bodies weakened by frequent childbirth. While birthrates had begun a long term decline, white women could still expect to bear from four to eight children. Immigrant and black women averaged even more.
Indian–white relations took a dramatic turn in the early years of the nineteenth century. In 1790, vast areas of trans-Appalachia were still controlled by Native American tribes. North of the Ohio River, the Shawnee, Delaware, and Miami formed a western confederacy capable of mustering several thousand warriors. South of the river lived five major tribal groups: the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole. Together, they totaled nearly 60,000 people. By 1830, however, the balance of power throughout Trans-Appalachia had shifted decisively as white settlers, many of them bringing their black slaves with them south of the Ohio River, streamed into the region.

In response, tribal groups devised various strategies of resistance and survival. Among the Cherokee, many sought peaceful accommodation. Others, like the Shawnee and Creek, rose in armed resistance. Neither strategy was altogether successful, for by 1830 the Indians faced a future of continued acculturation, military defeat, or forced migration west of the Mississippi River.

Less dramatic but no less important, the social and cultural separation of Indians and white Americans sharpened during these years. As late as the 1780s, Indians still walked the streets of New York and Philadelphia, while countless Indians and white Americans interacted as traders or marriage partners. By 1830, such contacts were much less common and racial separation increased as Native Americans were confined on reservations or forced to move farther west.

The Goals of Indian Policy

During the years from 1790 to 1830, the federal government established policies that would govern Indian–white relations through much of the nineteenth century. Intended in part to promote the assimilation of Native Americans into white society, the policies actually speeded the transfer of Indian land to white settlers and set the stage for a later, more dramatic program of Indian removal.

With the government's initial "conquest" theory rendered obsolete by the Indians' refusal to regard themselves as a conquered people (see Chapter 7), U.S. officials shifted course by recognizing Indian rights to the land they inhabited and declaring that all future land transfers would come through treaty agreements.

Henry Knox, Washington's first secretary of war, laid out the government's new position in 1789. The Indians, he explained, "being the prior occupants of the soil, possess the right of the soil." It should not be taken from them "unless by their free consent, or by the right of conquest in case of just war." The Indian Intercourse Act of 1790 declared that public treaties, ratified by Congress, would henceforth be the only legal means of obtaining Indian land. Though it promised a more humane Indian policy, the acquisition of Indian land for white settlement remained the overarching goal.

The new, treaty-based strategy proved effective. Native American leaders frequently ceded land in return for trade goods, yearly annuity payments, and assurances that there would be no further demands. Reluctant tribal leaders could often be persuaded to...
Throughout the nation’s history, the American population has changed dramatically, not only in size and geographic distribution but also in birth and death rates, marriage age, and family size. In the early nineteenth century, for example, the average life expectancy of white Americans was about 45 years, and men tended to outlive women. In our own time, the average life expectancy has reached 74, and women on average live longer than men. Populations have differed as well across regions, in urban and rural settings, and among racial, ethnic, and class groups.

Changes in the demographic profile of the American population have powerful effects on the nation’s economic, social, and political development. The changing size and makeup of the labor force shape economic activity, while changing proportions of older and younger Americans affect consumer habits and put different demands on health care and educational systems—as the aging of baby boomers in our own time is again making clear. When mortality rates were high, as was often the case in early American history, parents had more children in an effort to stabilize their families. As mortality declined during the nineteenth century, so too did birthrates and family size.

Demographic information can tell us a great deal about the life experiences of ordinary Americans. Indeed, demographic data is often the major source of information about otherwise anonymous individuals. For all these reasons, historians spend considerable time analyzing populations and the ways they change.

Two kinds of demographic data have proved most important. One consists of birth, death, and marriage records, often found in church or town registers. These records chronicle the basic demographic events in people’s lives. If they are complete and continuous enough, they allow historians to trace the life course of individuals and to reconstruct patterns of family and community life.

Here we offer an example of the second kind of demographic data, a census. The material is from the federal census of 1820. Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution called for an enumeration (or counting) of the nation’s population every 10 years, “in such manner” as Congress required. The information was to be used in determining the periodic reapportionment of the House of Representatives and allocation of direct taxes to the states. The first decennial census was taken in 1790.

Compared with modern census inquiries, the first federal censuses collected limited information. The 1790s census, for example, gathered data under six headings: “Name of head of family,” “Free white males, 16 years and upwards,” “Free white males, under 16,” “Free white females,” “All other free persons,” and “Slaves.” As the nation grew, the demand for additional information increased. In 1820, Congress for the first time called for the collection of economic data. In the decades following, categories of social and economic data were gradually expanded.

The table provided here contains data from three cities—New York City, Charleston, South Carolina; and Cincinnati, Ohio—located in different sections of the country. What do the data tell you about the racial, gender, and age profiles of these cities? How do they differ? Do you find significant age and gender differences between white and black populations? Between free blacks and slaves? Can you explain the differences that you find? In making your calculations, be sure to take into account both absolute numbers and proportions of the total populations.

Why were there no slaves in Cincinnati, while there were still slaves in New York? What kinds of people might have been included under the heading “Foreigners not naturalized?” The economic data included in the 1820 census was very general. What conclusions are you able to draw concerning economic activities in the three cities? Can you explain the differences?

Reflecting on the Past How would the federal census of 2000 differ from the census displayed here? Why do disputes often arise over the kinds of information that should be gathered?
## Data from the Federal Census of 1820

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Charleston</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free white males, 25 and under</td>
<td>36,122</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>3,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free white males, 26 and over</td>
<td>21,331</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free white males, total</td>
<td>57,453 (44)</td>
<td>5,899 (23)</td>
<td>5,091 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free white females, 25 and under</td>
<td>37,438</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>3,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free white females, 26 and over</td>
<td>20,070</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free white females, total</td>
<td>57,508 (44)</td>
<td>5,330 (21)</td>
<td>4,289 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total white population</td>
<td>114,961 (88)</td>
<td>11,229 (44)</td>
<td>9,380 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free colored males, 25 and under</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free colored males, 26 and over</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free colored males, total</td>
<td>4,194 (3)</td>
<td>623 (2)</td>
<td>219 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free colored females, 25 and under</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free colored females, 26 and over</td>
<td>2,832</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free colored females, total</td>
<td>6,174 (5)</td>
<td>852 (3)</td>
<td>214 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male slaves, 25 and under</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male slaves, 26 and over</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male slaves, total</td>
<td>177 (1)</td>
<td>5,695 (22)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female slaves, 25 and under</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female slaves, 26 and over</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female slaves, total</td>
<td>341 (1)</td>
<td>6,957 (27)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total black population</td>
<td>10,886 (8)</td>
<td>14,127 (55)</td>
<td>433 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners not naturalized</td>
<td>5,390 (4)</td>
<td>425 (2)</td>
<td>241 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total city population</td>
<td>131,237</td>
<td>25,781</td>
<td>10,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons engaged in agriculture</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons engaged in commerce</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons engaged in manufacturing</td>
<td>9,523</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: New York City did not then include Kings, Queens, or Suffolk counties. Figures in parentheses represent percentages of each city's total population.
cooperate by warnings about the inevitable spread of white settlement, or more tractable chieftains could be found. In these ways, vast areas of tribal land passed to white settlers.

Federal policy also attempted to regulate the fur trade, in which both Native Americans and white traders eagerly participated. The Indians, in return for their abundant furs, secured the blankets, guns, and rum that they valued highly, while white traders acquired valuable furs in exchange for inexpensive trade goods.

The fur trade brought handsome profits to companies such as John Jacob Astor’s American Fur Company (1808), but often worked to the Indians’ disadvantage. Rum devastated Indian communities, while trade goods frequently transmitted diseases such as measles and smallpox. Indians often became dependent on the trade because it provided the only reliable supplies of coveted goods such as iron kettles and firearms. As the demand for furs and pelts increased, Native Americans frequently overtrapped their hunting grounds, forcing them to compete with other tribes for new sources of furs farther west.

In an effort to reduce fraud and the resulting conflict, Congress created government trading posts, or “factories,” where Indians could come for fairer treatment. Native Americans, however, frequently found themselves deeply in debt to government traders. In 1822, Congress abolished the factory system.

A third objective of federal Indian policy was to “civilize” and “Christianize” Native Americans, then assimilate them into white society. With the government’s blessing, Moravians, Baptists, and other religious groups sent scores of missionaries to live among the Indians, preach the Gospel, and teach white ways. John Stewart, a freeborn, part-Indian mulatto, was one such missionary. From 1815 to his death in 1821, he preached to the Wyandotte near Sandusky, Ohio. Among the most selfless were Quakers who labored with the Iroquois in New York. In spite of the missionaries’ best efforts, however, most Indians remained aloof. The chasm between Christianity and their own religions was too wide (see Chapter 2).
Education was the other weapon of assimilation. In 1793, Congress appropriated $20,000 to promote literacy, agriculture, and vocational instruction among Indians. Federal officials encouraged missionaries to establish schools where Indian children could learn the three Rs and vocational skills. But the vast majority of Indian children never attended, and they and their parents distrusting the schools’ alien environment.

Although white assimilationists cared deeply about the physical and spiritual fate of Native American people, they showed little sympathy for Indian culture, for they demanded that Native Americans give up their language, religion, and extended family arrangements and adopt the ways of white society. Assimilation or removal were the stark alternatives posed by even the most benevolent whites.

Strategies of Survival: The Iroquois and Cherokee

Faced with the loss of land and tribal autonomy, Native Americans devised various strategies of resistance and survival. Among the Iroquois, a prophet named Handsome Lake led his people through a religious renewal and cultural revitalization. As a young man, he had joined in the fight against American independence. His spirit broken by the American victory, he had watched helplessly as Indian land was taken and his people were confined on New York reservations. Handsome Lake’s own life crumbled as well. On several occasions, alcohol and depression brought him close to death.

Following a series of visions in 1799, Handsome Lake began preaching a combination of Indian and white ways: temperance, peace, land retention, and a new religion combining elements of Christianity and traditional Iroquois belief. His vision offered hope and renewed pride in the midst of the Iroquois’ radically changed lives.

Far to the south, the Cherokee followed a different path of accommodation. As the nineteenth century began, the Cherokee still controlled millions of acres in Tennessee, Georgia, and the western Carolinas. Their land base, however, was shrinking.

Southern state governments, responding to white demands for Indian land, undercut tribal autonomy. In 1801, Tennessee unilaterally brought Cherokee lands under the authority of state courts. The Cherokee, who had their own system of justice and distrusted the state courts as biased, rejected Tennessee’s demands.

Soon a group of full-blood leaders called for armed resistance. Better to stand and fight, they argued, than follow the false path of accommodation. Others, including mixed-bloods such as John Ross, insisted that accommodation offered the best hope for survival.

After a bitter struggle, the accommodationists won out and brought the tribe’s scattered villages under a common government, the better to protect their freedom and prevent the further loss of land. In 1808, the Cherokee National Council adopted a written legal code combining elements of U.S. and Indian law, and in 1827, it devised a written constitution patterned after those of nearby states. The council also issued a bold declaration that the Cherokee were an independent nation with full sovereignty over their lands. In 1829, the Cherokee government made it an offense punishable by death for any member of the tribe to transfer land to white ownership without the consent of tribal authorities.

Meanwhile, the process of social and cultural accommodation, encouraged by Cherokee leaders such as Ross and promoted by white missionaries and government agents, went forward. As the Cherokee turned from their traditional hunting, gathering, and farming economy to settled agriculture, many moved from village settlements onto individual farmsteads. Others established sawmills, country stores, and blacksmith shops. In contrast to traditional practices of communal ownership, the concept of private property took hold.

The majority of Cherokee people kept their crude log cabins and continued to live a hand-to-mouth existence. But some mixed-bloods who learned English and understood how to deal with white authorities accumulated hundreds of acres of fertile land and scores of black slaves.

Since the mid-eighteenth century, the Cherokee had held a few runaway blacks in slavelike conditions. During the early nineteenth century, Cherokee slavery expanded and became harsher. By 1820, there were nearly 1,300 black slaves in the Cherokee nation. A tribal law of 1824 forbade intermarriage with blacks. The accelerating spread of cotton cultivation increased the demand for slave labor among the Cherokee, as among southern whites. As accommodation increased, slave ownership became a mark of social standing.

By 1820, the strategy of peaceful accommodation had brought clear rewards. Tribal government was stronger and the sense of Cherokee identity was reasonably secure. But success would prove the Cherokee people’s undoing. As their self-confidence grew, so did the hostility of neighboring whites impatient to acquire their land. That hostility would soon erupt in a campaign to drive the Cherokee from their land forever.
Patterns of Armed Resistance: The Shawnee and Creek

Not all tribes proved so accommodating to white expansion. The Shawnee and Creek, faced with growing threats to their political and cultural survival, rose in armed resistance. Conflict, smoldering as the nineteenth century began, burst into flame during the War of 1812.

In the late 1780s, chieftains such as Little Turtle of the Miami and Blue Jacket of the Shawnee had led devastating raids across Indiana, Ohio, and western Pennsylvania, panicking white settlers and openly challenging U.S. control of the Old Northwest. In 1794, President Washington, determined to smash the Indians’ resistance once and for all, sent a federal army led by the old Revolutionary War general Anthony Wayne into the area. It won a decisive victory over 2,000 Indian warriors in the Battle of Fallen Timbers. Shortly after, in the Treaty of Greenville, the assembled chiefs ceded the southern two-thirds of Ohio. That cession opened the heart of the Old Northwest to white control. Subsequent treaties further reduced the Indians’ land base, driving the tribes more tightly in on each other.

By 1809, two Shawnee leaders, the brothers Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, the latter known to whites as “the Prophet,” were traveling among the region’s tribes warning of their common danger and forging an alliance against the invading whites. They established headquarters at an ancient Indian town named Kithtippecanoe in northern Indiana. Soon it became a gathering point for Native Americans from across the region responding to the messages of cultural pride, land retention, and pan-Indian resistance proclaimed by the Shawnee brothers.

Between 1809 and 1811, Tecumseh carried his message south to the Creek and the Cherokee. His speeches rang with bitterness. “The white race is a wicked race,” he told his listeners. “Since the days when the white race first came in contact with the red men, there has been a continual series of aggressions. The hunting grounds are fast disappearing, and they are driving the red men farther and farther to the west.” The only hope was “a war of extermination against the paleface.” Though the southern tribes refused to join, by 1811 more than 1,000 fighting men had gathered at Kithtippecanoe.

Alarmed, the governor of the Indiana Territory, William Henry Harrison, surrounded the Indian stronghold with a force of 1,000 soldiers. After a successful all-day battle, he burned Kithtippecanoe to the ground.

The Indians, however, were not yet defeated. Tecumseh’s followers, taking advantage of the recent outbreak of the War of 1812 with England and aided by British troops from Canada, mounted devastating raids across Indiana and southern Michigan. With the British, they crushed American armies at Detroit and followed up with forays against Fort Wayne. The tide turned, however, at the Battle of the Thames near Detroit, where Harrison inflicted a grievous defeat on a combined British and Indian force. Among those slain was Tecumseh.

The American victory at the Thames signaled the collapse of Tecumseh’s confederacy and an end to Indian resistance in the Old Northwest. Beginning in 1815, American settlers surged once more across Ohio and Indiana, then into Illinois and Michigan. The balance of power in the Old Northwest had shifted decisively.

To the south, the Creek challenged white intruders with similar militancy. As the nineteenth century began, white settlers were pushing onto Creek lands in northwestern Georgia and central Alabama. Although some Creek leaders urged accommodation, others, called Red Sticks, prepared to fight. The embers of this conflict were fanned into flame by an aggressive Tennessee militia.
commander named Andrew Jackson. Citing Creek atrocities against “defenseless women and children,” Jackson urged President Jefferson to endorse a campaign against the “ruthless foe.”

Jackson got his chance in the summer of 1813, when the Red Sticks carried out a series of devastating raids and assaulted Fort Mims on the Alabama River, killing 500 men, women, and children. News of the tragedy elicited bitter cries for revenge.

At the head of 5,000 Tennessee and Kentucky militia, augmented by warriors from other tribes eager to punish their traditional Creek enemies, Jackson launched his long-awaited attack. As he moved south, the fighting grew more ferocious. Davey Crockett, one of Jackson’s soldiers, later reported that the militia volunteers shot down the Red Sticks “like dogs.” The Indians gave like measure in return.

The climactic battle of the Creek War came in March 1814 at Horseshoe Bend, on the Tallapoosa River in central Alabama. While American cannon fire raked the Red Sticks’ fortified town of Tohopeka, Cherokee warriors cut off all hope of retreat. In the battle that followed, more than 800 Native Americans died, more than in any other Indian–white battle in American history. Jackson followed up his victory with a scorched-earth sweep through the remaining Red Stick towns.

After allowing the Red Stick chieftain and his followers to return home, Jackson exacted his final revenge by constructing Fort Jackson on the Hickory Ground, the most sacred spot of the Creek nation. During the following months, he seized 22 million acres, nearly two-thirds of the Creek domain. Before his Indian fighting days were over, Jackson would acquire for the United States, through treaty or conquest, nearly three-fourths of Alabama and Florida, a third of Tennessee, and a fifth of Georgia and Mississippi.

Indian–white conflict in the South did not end with the Creek defeat at Horseshoe Bend. For nearly a decade, the Second Seminole War, costly in lives and money, would ravage much of Florida. Just as Tecumseh’s death had signaled the end of Indian resistance in the North, however, so Jackson’s defeat of the Creek broke the back of Indian defenses in much of the South. With all possibility of armed resistance gone, Native Americans gave way before the swelling tide of white settlement.
PERFECTING A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Throughout the nation's history, the American people have launched a variety of reform movements aimed at achieving social justice and bringing the conditions of daily life into conformity with democratic ideals. The first of those reform eras occurred in the early nineteenth century.

The Revolutionary Heritage

Reform was inspired by democratic ideals fostered during the Revolution and kept fresh in countless Americans' minds. Preeminent among them was the principle of social equality. In part, this meant equality of opportunity—the notion that people should have a chance to rise as far as ability and ambition would carry them. The doctrine of social equality had a powerful moral dimension as well, because it implied an equality of worth among individuals, no matter what their social standing might be.

The Revolution also fostered a belief in the "youthfulness" of America, in contrast to the "old" and "decadent" nations of Europe. This sense of America's uniqueness, combined with the seemingly limitless land of the interior, offered the promise of creating a nation unlike any that had existed before, one in which ordinary citizens could create new lives for themselves and their families, if given the chance.

The Evangelical Impulse

A surge of evangelical Christianity inspired the reform impulse as well. Throughout the nation's history, religion has been a major force in American public life. This was true in the early republic when a wave of Protestant enthusiasm in what has become known as the Second Great Awakening swept across the nation. From its beginnings in the 1790s through much of the nineteenth century, in settings ranging from the Cane Ridge district of backwoods Kentucky to the cities of the Northeast, Americans by the tens of thousands sought personal salvation and social belonging in the shared experience of religious revivalism.

Displayed most spectacularly at Methodist and Baptist camp meetings, the revivals crossed boundaries of class and race. Rough-hewn itinerant preachers, black as well as white, many of them theologically untrained but all of them afire with religious conviction, spread the Gospel message, in the process knitting networks of believers closely together.

In 1809, Benjamin Latrobe, principal architect of the new Capitol building in Washington, D.C., and a shrewd observer of the American scene, visited a Methodist camp meeting on the Leesburg Road in northern Virginia. Positioning himself at the head of
Camp meetings were fundamental events during the Second Great Awakening. What does this depiction tell you about the kinds of people who attended and the activities that took place? (Alexander Rider, Camp Meeting. Collection of the New-York Historical Society/Bridgeman Art Library)

In the early republic, as at other times in the nation’s history, social ideals often jarred against social reality. One source of tension was the contrast between the affirmations of democratic equality and deepening social divisions.

As the nineteenth century began, women continued to hold far less property than men. For black slaves, ownership of anything more than the most basic personal possessions was unattainable. Though the condition of free blacks such as Ben Thompson and Phyllis Sherman was better, they, too, held little of the country’s wealth.

Among white males, property was broadly shared in rural areas of the North, where free labor and family-farm agriculture predominated, and least so in the South, where planters’ control of slave labor and the best land permitted them to monopolize the lion’s share of the region’s wealth. The most even distribution of property was to be found on the edges of white settlement in Trans-Appalachia, but it was often an
equality of want. In some areas, such as southern Appalachia, well over 50 percent of settlers lived as tenants, unable to gain ownership of the land they worked from absentee landlords. Poor transportation often deprived frontier areas of access to outside markets, further depressing people’s lives.

Though America contained no permanent and destitute underclass (at least among white citizens), poverty was real and increasing. In the South, it was most evident among poor whites living on the sandy pine barrens of the backcountry. In the North, port cities held growing numbers of the poor. Boston artisans and shopkeepers, who together had owned 20 percent of the city’s wealth in 1700, held scarcely half as much a century later.

Recurring economic recessions hit the urban poor with particular force, while winter added to hard times as shipping slowed and jobs disappeared. During the winter of 1805, New York’s Mayor DeWitt Clinton, worried about the potentially disruptive behavior of 10,000 impoverished New Yorkers, asked the state legislature for help. In the winter of 1814–1815, relief agencies assisted nearly one-fifth of the city’s population. Across rural New England and south-eastern Pennsylvania, propertyless men and women, the “strolling poor,” roamed the countryside searching for work.

Three other groups were conspicuous among the nation’s poor. One consisted of old Revolutionary War veterans like Long Bill Scott, who had found poverty as well as adventure in the war. State and federal governments were peppered with petitions from grizzled veterans and their widows, describing their misery and seeking relief. Women and children also suffered disproportionately from poverty. Between 1816 and 1821, they outnumbered men in New York City’s almshouses.

For every American who actually suffered poverty’s effects, several others lived just beyond its reach. The thinness of their margin of safety became evident during the depression of 1819–1822. Triggered by a financial panic caused by the unsound practices of hundreds of newly chartered state banks, a deep depression settled over the land, generating bankruptcies and sending unemployment soaring. By the early 1820s, the depression was lifting, but it left behind broken fortunes and shattered dreams.

Alleviating poverty was one goal of the early reformers. In New York City, private and public authorities established more than 100 relief agencies to assist unfortunates from orphans to poverty-stricken seamen. Across the nation, a “charitable revolution” witnessed the increase of benevolent institutions from 50 in 1790 to nearly 2,000 by 1820. Most of these ventures drew a sharp distinction between the “worthy poor” who merited help and the “idle poor” who were deemed to lack character and thus deserve their fate. No matter that a New York commission in 1823 found only 46 able-bodied adults among the 851 inmates of the city’s poorhouses.

Municipal authorities and private charities also established orphanages, insane asylums, and hospitals. Many such efforts were short-lived, but they attested to the continuing strength of revolutionary and religious ideals and provided a foundation for the more ambitious reforms that would come later in the century.

Women’s Lives

Women’s lives did not change dramatically during the early years of the nineteenth century. But developments occurred that set the stage for later, more significant breakthroughs.

Divorce was one area in which women achieved greater equality. When a neighbor asked John Backus, a silversmith in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, why he kicked and struck his wife, John replied that it
was partly because his father had treated his mother in the same way. We do not know whether John’s mother tolerated such abuse, but his wife did not. She complained of cruelty and secured a divorce. More and more women followed her example.

Securing a divorce was not easy, for most states allowed it only on grounds of adultery, and South Carolina did not permit it at all. Moreover, coverture laws required wives to transfer their property to their husbands, making divorce a risky economic proposition for women. New laws enabling women to file for divorce in court rather than having to secure legislative approval made the process easier. Even so, women faced the uncomfortable task of persuading all-male juries of their husbands’ infidelities.

Still, divorce was becoming more available to women. In Massachusetts during the decade after independence, 50 percent more women than men filed for divorce, with an almost equal rate of success. Part of the explanation lay in the war’s disruptions, which led some men to desert their families, thus encouraging their wives to take action. The Trans-Appalachian West lured men away as well. It seems just as certain, however, that women took to heart prevailing values of individualism and equality, leading them to expect more of marriage.

Changes also occurred in women’s education. Young women would have to be properly prepared for their prospective role as “Republican Mothers,” having prime responsibility for training future citizens in principles of republican virtue. Some women, such as Judith Sargent Murray, demanded more of women’s education. In the 1790s, Murray criticized parents who pointed their daughters exclusively toward marriage and dependence. “They should be enabled to procure for themselves the necessaries of life; independence should be placed within their grasp,” she wrote. “A woman should reverence herself.”

Between 1790 and 1830, a number of female academies were established, mostly in the northeastern states. Though some prescribed bookkeeping, reading, geography, and history as proper elements of girls’ as well as boys’ education, traditionalists were decidedly more conservative, warning that undue intellectual activity would “unsex” women. Even the most ardent supporters of female learning, such as Murray, conceded that education was primarily important so that women might function more effectively within the domestic sphere. Still, by 1830, literacy for white females was at an all-time high.

Women were affected in various ways by changes in American religious life. Though women had long outnumbered men in church membership, the Second Great Awakening drew them into the churches in even greater numbers. Lacking public tax support as church and state drew apart, ministers relied on female volunteers to raise funds and promote missionary and charitable projects. In that way, churches offered women limited entrance into public life.

At the same time, the evangelical impulse, to which many women were drawn, actually reduced women’s roles in the churches. Whereas women had previously served as religious exhorters and participated in Baptist and Methodist church governance, they found themselves increasingly marginalized as those rapidly growing denominations strove for social acceptance and adopted older denominations’
rigidly gendered rules. In matters of church discipline, women were more frequently charged with “disorderliness” and condemned for “disobedience” than their male brethren. In these ways, a once-robust tradition of piety in which men and women shared spiritual truth and ministered equally to each other’s souls gave way.

**Race, Slavery, and the Limits of Reform**

As we saw in Chapter 7, the Revolution initiated the end of slavery in the northern states and challenged it in the Upper South. As the new century began, however, private manumissions were declining in Maryland and Virginia, while antislavery sentiment was weakening, and more rigid categories of racial exclusiveness were appearing throughout the North. The gradual abolition of slavery there had soothed many white consciences.

In the South, the spread of cotton cultivation sent the value of slave labor soaring, just as revolutionary idealism was fading with the passage of time.

Equally important were two slave rebellions that generated alarm among southern whites. Panic-stricken refugees fleeing the successful revolt of black Haitians on the Caribbean island of St. Domingue (see Chapter 8) spread terror through the South. In response, southern legislatures tightened their “Black Codes,” cut the importation of new slaves from the Caribbean, and weeded out malcontents among their chattels.

A second shock followed in the summer of 1800, when a rebellion just outside Richmond, Virginia, was nipped in the bud. A 24-year-old slave named Gabriel devised a plan to arm 1,000 slaves for an assault on the city. Gabriel and his accomplices were American-born blacks who spoke English and worked at skilled jobs that provided a good bit of personal autonomy. They fashioned their own ideology of liberation by appropriating the revolutionary tradition of Virginia’s whites and applying it to the conditions of their own lives.

A drenching downpour delayed the attack, giving time for several house servants (subsequently granted freedom by the Virginia Assembly) to sound
The majority of black spokesmen argued against the colonization of American blacks outside the United States. Some, however, such as Abraham Camp, a free black living in Indiana, declared themselves willing to undertake the risks of emigration for the chance of true freedom. He made that clear in this letter of July 13, 1818, to the secretary of the American Colonization Society. In the years ahead, angrier black Americans would issue more strident calls for separation and black nationalism.

I am a free man of colour, have a family and a large connection of free people of colour residing on the Wabash (river), who are all willing to leave America whenever the way shall be opened. We love this country and its liberties, if we could share an equal right in them, but our freedom is partial, and we have no hope that it ever will be otherwise here; therefore we had rather be gone, though we should suffer hunger and nakedness for years. . . . Nothing shall be lacking on our part in complying with whatever provision shall be made by the United States, whether it be to go to Africa or some other place; we shall hold ourselves in readiness, praying that God (who made man free in the beginning, and who by his kind providence has broken the yoke from every white American) would inspire the heart of every true son of liberty with zeal and pity, to open the door of freedom for us also.

Why has Camp turned his back on the promise of America?

the alarm. No whites died in the abortive rebellion, but scores of slaves and free blacks were arrested, and 25 suspects, including Gabriel, were hanged at the order of Governor James Monroe. The carnage both alarmed and saddened Thomas Jefferson. “There is strong sentiment that there has been hanging enough,” he confided to Monroe. “The other states and the world at large will forever condemn us if we . . . go one step beyond absolute necessity.” In the midst of panic, however, the line between necessity and revenge was hard to find.

In the early nineteenth century, antislavery appeals all but disappeared from the South. Even religious groups that had once denounced slavery grew quiet. “A majority of the (white) people of the southern states,” declared a Georgia congressman in 1806, deprecated slavery as a “political evil” but did not consider it a crime or believe it “immoral to hold human flesh in bondage.” Confederate spokesmen would be saying much the same thing at the time of the Civil War.

Slavery continued to exist as well in the nation’s capital, where Congress retained Maryland’s slave code for the District of Columbia. There, black servants attended the needs of southern congressmen, while slave markets thrived in the shadow of the Capitol building.

In the Northeast, antislavery sentiment was also weakening. With racial domination no longer enforced by law, whites invoked the doctrine of black inferiority to justify racial exclusiveness and ensure their own continued control. The belief in immutable racial differences also encouraged conciliatory attitudes toward slave owners in the South. Compared to the eighteenth century, when ideas of racial exclusiveness had competed with Enlightenment beliefs in the common humanity of all mankind, rigid ideas of racial difference were becoming increasingly common.

The hardening of racial attitudes was evident as well in the growing sentiment for colonizing free blacks in western Africa (areas that would become Liberia and Sierra Leone). The American Colonization Society typified these attitudes. Founded in 1816 with the encouragement of leaders such as Henry Clay, James Madison, and John Marshall, the Society enjoyed widespread support among northern white men and women. While detesting slavery and proclaiming their own benevolent intentions, northern members were uneasy over the growing number of free blacks in their midst. White churches, wishing to combine Christian conversion with colonization, offered financial support and religious sanction for the Society’s work. Southern slave owners saw in colonization a convenient way of reducing the South’s free black population and ridding themselves of troublesome bondsmen. The Society never sent many American blacks abroad, but it did help allay white anxieties.

Although some black leaders, such as Paul Cuffe, were sympathetic to colonization, believing it offered the best promise of true freedom, most black spokesmen vigorously opposed it. They condemned the ideology of black inferiority on which
colonization was based and demanded their full rights as Americans. In joining together to oppose colonization, American blacks gained experience in forging a more effective political voice. That experience would prove valuable training for the abolitionist crusade that lay ahead.

Not all northern whites succumbed to the new racism. The states of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania would soon become hotbeds of a resurgent, multiracial abolition movement. Blacks, moreover, enjoyed greater liberty in the cities of the Northeast than elsewhere in the nation.

Racism reared its ugly head in the West as well. In 1823, a proslavery mob in Illinois torched the state capital and threatened Governor Edward Coles for his efforts to end de facto slavery in the state. Proposals for a new state constitution included calls, ultimately unsuccessful, for legalizing slavery within the state's borders.

In Cincinnati, white citizens grew anxious as the city's black population grew. By 1829, one of every 10 residents was black. In July of that year, city leaders announced that they would begin enforcing Ohio's black laws by requiring black residents to carry certificates certifying their free status.

While whites debated the new policy, black leaders petitioned the state legislature for repeal of the "obnoxious black laws." Soon an antiblack coalition of city leaders, unskilled workers fearing competition for jobs, and members of the Cincinnati Colonization Society began to form. In late August, several hundred whites invaded the town's black neighborhoods. Several people were killed in the ensuing melee. In the months that followed, more than half the city's blacks fled, many seeking sanctuary in Canada.

Though the foreign slave trade officially ended in 1808, government efforts to suppress the continuing practice were sporadic. In addition, American diplomats continued to press England for the return of chattels confiscated during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. During the early years of the republic, the revolutionary promise of equality rang hollow for most black Americans.

Forming Free Black Communities

During the half century following independence, vibrant black communities appeared in port cities along the Atlantic coast. As the lives of Ben Thompson and Phyllis Sherman revealed, emancipation in the North and the increasing number of freed people in the Upper South enabled growing numbers of African Americans to seek the companionship of people of color in places such as New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. In 1776, some 4,000 slaves and several hundred free blacks had called the port cities home; 50 years later, 40,000 African Americans did so.

Black communities provided a measure of security, as well as better chances of finding a marriage partner and establishing a family. Family formation was eased by the fact that many of the urban migrants were women, thus correcting a long-standing gender imbalance in the black urban population. Initially, many blacks formed extended households that included relatives, friends, and boarders. As circumstances allowed, single-family units were formed. By 1820, most blacks in the northern cities lived in autonomous households.

As their numbers grew, African Americans created organizations independent of white control and capable of serving the needs of black communities. Schools educated black children excluded from white academies, mutual-aid societies offered help to the down-and-out, and fraternal associations such as African American Masonic Lodges provided fellowship and mutual support.

Black churches quickly emerged as the cornerstones of black community life. Following the Revolution, growing numbers of free blacks joined integrated Methodist and Baptist congregations, drawn by those churches' strongly biblical theology, enthusiastic worship, and antislavery stand. By 1790, 20 percent of Methodist church members were black. As the numbers of black communicants grew, however, they often found themselves segregated in church galleries, excluded from leadership roles, and even denied communion.

In 1794, a small group of black Methodists led by Richard Allen, a slave-born, itinerant preacher, organized the Bethel African American Methodist Church in Philadelphia. Originally established within American Methodism, Allen's congregation moved toward separatism by requiring that only "Africans and descendants of the African race" be admitted to membership. In 1815, it rejected all oversight by the white Methodist leadership, and a year later joined a similar congregation in Baltimore to form the African Methodist Episcopal Church—the first independent black denomination in the United States. Black Baptists also formed separate churches in Boston, Philadelphia, New Orleans, and St. Louis.

Located in the heart of black communities, these churches nurtured African American forms of worship and provided education for black children and burial sites for families excluded from white cemeteries. Equally important, they offered secure places where the basic rituals of family and community
Black Methodist Church

“African” churches and other organizations were rare before 1800 but grew steadily in the ensuing decades. In this watercolor of a black Methodist church meeting, the Russian traveler and painter Paul Svinin offers his impression of the physical emotion often displayed by black worshipers. What do you make of his presentation? (Pavel Petrovich Svinin, Negro Methodists Holding a Meeting. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1942. (42.95.19) Photograph © 1985 The Metropolitan Museum of Art)

Life—marriages and births, funerals and anniversaries—could be celebrated and where community norms could be enforced. By the 1830s, a rich cultural and institutional life had taken root in the black neighborhoods of American cities.

White hostility, however, remained a reality of black urban life, especially during hard times when free blacks competed with white laborers for scarce jobs and affordable housing. Though overt racial violence was infrequent during the early decades of the century, blacks found themselves increasingly segregated in residence, employment, and social life.

Black life was far different in southern cities, where the vast majority remained enslaved. Of Charleston’s 14,127 blacks (over half the city’s population), 90 percent were slaves. That circumstance, together with the South’s rigid “Black Codes,” frustrated black community building.

In New Orleans, on the other hand, policies established during Spanish colonial rule had produced the largest free black (libre) and mixed race (mulatto) population in North America. While racial hierarchies clearly existed, libres, their numbers augmented by manumitted slaves and refugees fleeing revolutionary Haiti, prospered. By 1820, libres accounted for 46 percent of the black population. They constituted a uniquely prosperous and independent black community.

Yet several developments threatened their privileges. Among them were the thousands of new slaves imported to provide labor for the burgeoning sugar economy (what one historian has called the “re-Africanization” of Louisiana), alarm over black rebellion in nearby Haiti, and the introduction of rigid racial ideologies by new white settlers.

**THE END OF NEOCOLONIALISM**

Following the election of 1808, James Madison, second in the “Virginia dynasty” of presidents, assumed office. As American ships once more ventured into the Atlantic following the embargo’s collapse, and as the British navy renewed its depredations, war fever continued to mount. Within a few years, conflict with England erupted in the War of 1812. The war brought an end to a period of neocolonialism when the United States, though formally independent, was still vulnerable to the actions of England and other European powers. During the two administrations of James Monroe (1817–1825), the Jeffersonian Republicans also fashioned a momentous new role for the United States within the Americas.

**The War of 1812**

As tensions with England increased, the loudest shouts for war came from the West and South. The election of 1810 brought to Congress a new group of western and southern leaders, firmly Jeffersonian in party loyalty but impatient with the administration’s bumbling foreign policy and demanding tougher measures. These War Hawks included such future political giants as Henry Clay of Kentucky and John C. Calhoun of South Carolina.
For too long, cried the War Hawks, the United States had tolerated Britain's presence on American soil, encouragement of Indian raids, and attacks on American commerce. They talked freely of expanding the nation's boundaries north into Canada and south into Spanish Florida. Most of all, these young nationalists resented British arrogance and America's continuing humiliation. No government or political party, they warned, could long endure unless they protected the people's interests and upheld the nation's honor.

Responding to the growing pressure, President Madison finally asked Congress for a declaration of war on June 1, 1812. Opposition came entirely from the New England and mid-Atlantic states—ironically, the regions British policy affected most adversely—whereas the South and West voted solidly for war. Rarely had sectional alignments been more sharply drawn.

Rarely, either, had American foreign policy proven less effective. Madison decided to abandon economic for military coercion just as the British government, under domestic pressure to seek accommodation, suspended its European blockade. Three days later, unaware of Britain's action (it took three weeks for news to cross the Atlantic), Congress declared war.

The war proved a strange affair. Britain beat back several American forays into Canada and launched a series of attacks along the eastern seaboard. On August 14, 1814, a British force occupied Washington, torched the Capitol and president's mansion (soon to be called the White House after being repaired and whitewashed), and sent the president, Congress, and panic-stricken American troops fleeing into Virginia. Britain, however, did not press its advantage, for it was preoccupied with Napoleon's armies in Europe and wanted to end the American quarrel.

Emotions ran high among Federalist critics and Jeffersonian Republican supporters of the war. During bloody riots in Baltimore in June of 1812, several people, including an old Federalist Revolutionary War general, were badly beaten in the streets. In Federalist New England, opposition to the war veered toward outright disloyalty. In December 1814, delegates from the five New England states met at Hartford, Connecticut, to debate proposals for secession. Cooler heads prevailed, but before adjourning, the Hartford Convention asserted the right of a state to "interpose" its authority against "unconstitutional" acts of the government. Now it was New England's turn to play with the nullification fire. As the war dragged on, Federalist support soared in the Northeast, while elsewhere bitterness grew over New England's disloyalty.

Before the war ended, American forces won several impressive victories, among them Commander Oliver Hazard Perry's defeat of the British fleet on Lake Erie in 1813. That victory ended any threat of a British invasion from Canada and weakened the British–Indian alliance that had menaced American interests in the region. The most dramatic American triumph was Andrew Jackson's smashing victory in 1815 over an attacking British force at New Orleans. But it had little to do with the war's outcome, for it occurred after preliminary terms of peace had already been signed.

Increasingly concerned about Europe, the British government offered to begin peace negotiations. Madison eagerly accepted, and on Christmas Eve in 1814, at Ghent, Belgium, the two sides reached agreement. Britain agreed to evacuate the western posts, but the treaty ignored other outstanding issues, including impressment, neutral rights, and American access to

The Capitol Building Destroyed  During the War of 1812, British troops set fire to the House and Senate wings of the Capitol in Washington, D.C., the only time in the nation's history when the building has been seriously damaged. (Library of Congress, LC-DIG-ppmsca-02160)
Canadian fisheries. It simply declared the fighting over, called for the return of prisoners and captured territory, and provided for joint commissions to deal with lingering disputes.

Still, the war left its mark on the American nation. Four thousand African Americans, constituting nearly 20 percent of American seamen, fought in the war, demonstrating their patriotism and challenging white racial stereotypes. At least as many free and enslaved blacks took the opportunity to serve the British as spies, messengers, and guides, much as had occurred during the American Revolution. A hundred or so newly liberated slaves accompanied the troops that burned the Capitol and president's house in the summer of 1814.

The British attack on Fort McHenry in Baltimore harbor inspired a young officer, Francis Scott Key, to
compose a poem titled “The Star Spangled Banner,” which was then set to a familiar English tune. (In 1931, Congress designated it the official national anthem.) In addition, the war made Andrew Jackson a hero and established him as a major political figure. The American people, moreover, regarded the contest as a “Second War of American Independence” that finally secured the nation from outside interference. That belief fed a surge of postwar nationalism.

Following 1815, the nation focused its energies on the task of internal development—occupying the continent, building the economy, and reforming American society. At the same time, European countries entered what would prove to be almost a century free of general war. In the past, European wars had drawn America in; in the twentieth century, they would do so again. For the rest of the nineteenth century, however, that fateful link was broken. Finally, European colonialism was shifting to Africa and Asia, and that diverted European attention from the Americas as well.

**The United States and the Americas**

While disengaging from Europe, the president and Congress fashioned new policies for Latin America that would guide the nation’s hemispheric relations for years to come. Many Americans cheered when Spain and Portugal’s Latin American colonies, holding up the American Revolution as a model of liberation, began their struggle for independence in 1808. U.S. leaders were happy to see European colonialism weakened and held out hope that newly independent nations, no longer suffering under imperial control, would be open to increased trade. But they were skeptical that the racially mixed populations of Latin America, with their history of colonial oppression, could govern themselves effectively. There was concern as well that the newly independent countries might attempt to form a South American confederacy capable of challenging U.S. interests. Brought together “in a single mass,” Jefferson mused, “they would be a very formidable neighbor.”

After initial reluctance (primarily for fear of disrupting delicate efforts then under way to secure Florida from Spain), President Monroe sent Congress a message proposing formal recognition of the Latin American republics. Congress quickly agreed.

Trouble, however, arose in November 1822, when the major European powers talked of helping Spain regain its American empire. Such prospects alarmed Great Britain as well as the United States, and in August 1823, the British foreign secretary broached the idea of Anglo-American cooperation to thwart Spain’s intentions.

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams opposed the idea. John Adams’s son had joined the Jeffersonian camp several years earlier as part of the continuing exodus from the Federalist party. Filled with the spirit of nationalism following the War of 1812 and suspicious of British intentions, Adams called for independent action based on two principles: a sharp separation between the Old World and the New, and U.S. dominance in the Western Hemisphere.

Monroe agreed that the United States should issue its own policy statement. In his annual message of December 1823, he outlined a new Latin American policy. Though known as the Monroe Doctrine, Adams had devised it.

The doctrine asserted four basic principles: (1) the American continents were closed to new European colonization, (2) the political systems of the Americas were separate from those of Europe, (3) the United States would consider as dangerous to its peace and safety any attempts to extend Europe’s political influence in the Western Hemisphere, and (4) the United States would neither interfere with existing colonies in the New World nor meddle in Europe’s affairs.

Monroe’s bold declaration had little immediate effect, for the United States possessed neither the economic nor military power to enforce it. But by the end of the nineteenth century, when the nation’s might had increased, it would become clear what a fateful moment in the history of the Western Hemisphere Monroe’s declaration had been.
At the Philadelphia convention of 1788, Federalists and Anti-Federalists had argued whether such a diverse and sprawling republic could long survive. After the vast area of Louisiana was added and white settlement surged into Trans-Appalachia, those concerns increased. Given the country’s primitive modes of travel, limited forms of communication, and small central government, problems of national unity continued to bedevil the American people. Although the nation would not be securely unified until after the Civil War, progress was clearly evident in the early republic.

Conquering Distance
It has been estimated that within half an hour of President Kennedy’s assassination in Dallas, Texas, in
1963, 68 percent of the American people had learned the news. By contrast, when George Washington died in December 1799 in Alexandria, Virginia, it took 5 days for word to reach Philadelphia (scarcely 140 miles away), 11 days to get as far as Boston, and more than 3 weeks to penetrate west to Lexington, Kentucky. In the absence of modern technologies such as telephones, television, and the Internet, human travel was the only way of communicating across space. By the 1820s, however, improvements in transportation and communication had begun to knit the nation more effectively together.

A flurry of turnpike construction in the northeastern states contributed to the improvement. Most turnpikes consisted of little more than dirt roadways cut through the woods, with tree stumps sawed off just low enough to clear wagon axles. A trip of 25 miles often filled a day. Tolls, moreover, were high. People typically made their way on horseback along crude trails that wound across the countryside.

Still, when a turnpike between Philadelphia and Lancaster, Pennsylvania, proved profitable, dozens of others quickly followed. By 1811, the New York legislature had chartered 137 turnpike companies and the New England states 200 more. By 1830, improvements had cut travel time along these roadways in half.

In the first federal road building project, Congress in 1806 authorized construction of a National Road from Cumberland, Maryland, to the West. By 1818, it had reached Wheeling on the Ohio River and had reduced travel time between its terminals from eight days to three.

Given the difficulties of overland routes, Americans traveled by water whenever possible. During the early years of the century, the first steamboats appeared along the Atlantic coast and began to ply the waters of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. In 1807, Robert Fulton launched his 160-ton sidewheeler Clermont, demonstrating the feasibility of steam travel. Four years later, the New Orleans made the first successful run over the falls of the Ohio River at Cincinnati, then continued down the Mississippi.
Advances in Communication and Transportation

Steamboats, railways, and steam-driven rotary presses would continue to revolutionize communication during the middle decades of the nineteenth century. The process, however, was well underway by 1830. Study the travel map carefully. Did travel rates improve more dramatically moving from east to west, or north to south? Can you explain the findings?

Growth in Communication, 1790–1830

Compare the rates by which the population increased on the one hand and the increases in the number of post offices, miles of post routes, and newspapers on the other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1790</th>
<th>1810</th>
<th>Percent Increase, 1790–1810</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>Percent Increase, 1810–1830</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. population (in thousands)</td>
<td>3,929</td>
<td>7,224</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>12,901</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post offices</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>297%</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>267%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of post routes</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>36,406</td>
<td>185%</td>
<td>115,176</td>
<td>216%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of newspapers</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>261%</td>
<td>910*</td>
<td>133%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated

Mississippi to New Orleans. Within a few decades, steamboats would revolutionize transportation on the nation’s rivers.

Between 1790 and 1830, significant breakthroughs occurred in print communication as well. When Washington assumed the presidency, only 92 newspapers existed. Most were weeklies, and virtually all were printed in cities along the Atlantic coast. The majority had no more than 600 subscribers. By 1830, the number of newspapers had increased to more than 1,000, about one-third of them dailies. Some were published in places as far inland as Pittsburgh and St. Louis.

By 1820, the ratio of newspapers to population was higher in the United States than in Great Britain. The English traveler Frances Trollope commented in amazement on Americans’ “universal reading” of papers, while another visitor claimed that “there is scarcely a hamlet that has not its newspaper.” The widespread practice of reading newspapers aloud in taverns, shops, and homes further extended their reach.

The swelling demand for newspapers was spurred by rising literacy rates (most notably among women and lower-class men), the demand for information generated by the nation’s expanding market economy, the democratic belief in the importance of an informed citizenry, and the growing importance of newspapers as an instrument of party politics.

The circulation of newspapers brought information about distant people and events into formerly isolated communities, expanding people’s horizons and strengthening their sense of shared experience. Only a newspaper, noted one observer, “can drop the same thought into a thousand minds at the same moment.”

During these years, the American postal system expanded similarly. When Washington was inaugurated, there were only 75 post offices in the country. As late as 1792, there were none in the entire trans-Appalachian West. By 1820, nearly 8,500 post offices lay scattered throughout the nation, while the number of letters carried by the postal system increased ninefold. Though it cost 25 cents to send a letter 30 miles or more—a prohibitive sum for most folks when daily wages averaged only a dollar—the cost had declined by half.

**Strengthening American Nationalism**

If improvements in travel and communication, together with the sense of national pride fostered by the War of 1812, strengthened American nationalism, so, too, did the galvanizing experience of the Second Great Awakening. It reinforced belief in America as God’s chosen nation and tied Americans together in networks of shared religious identity woven by the hundreds of itinerant ministers who carried the...
Gospel message into communities in every part of the country. The flood of printed tracts circulated by religious organizations reinforced the sense of religious unity.

Rituals of patriotic celebration on occasions such as Washington’s birthday and the Fourth of July also helped unify the country. Federalists and Jeffersonian Republicans, northerners and southerners, black and white Americans filled these occasions with their own, often conflicting meanings, yet all were eager to claim a voice in shaping the nation’s heritage. Reports of these local celebrations, carried across the land via newspapers and correspondence, knitted communities together in a national conversation of patriotism.

National unity was further strengthened by several key decisions of the Supreme Court. In a series of trailblazing cases, the Court, led by Chief Justice John Marshall, laid down some of the most basic doctrines of American constitutional law. In Marbury v. Madison (1803), the Court established the principle of judicial review, the assertion that the Court had the authority to judge the constitutionality of congressional laws and executive actions. In the case of Martin v. Hunter’s Lessee (1816), the Court claimed appellate jurisdiction over the decisions of state courts.

Three years later, in another landmark decision, McCulloch v. Maryland, the Court set aside claims that Congress had exceeded its authority in chartering the Second Bank of the United States in 1816. In a unanimous decision, Marshall issued a ringing endorsement of the doctrine of loose, as opposed to strict, construction of the Constitution. “Let the end [of a congressional law] be legitimate,” he declared, “let it be within the scope of the constitution, and all means which are appropriate . . . to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the constitution, are constitutional.” The bank’s charter would thus stand.

No state, he further argued, possessed the right to tax a branch of a nationally chartered bank, as Maryland had attempted to do, because “the power to tax involves the power to destroy.” The principle of national supremacy lay at the very
center of Marshall’s finding. The doctrines elaborated in these path-breaking decisions would continue to shape the nation’s history in the years ahead.

The Specter of Sectionalism

Despite the surge of national spirit following the War of 1812, Federalist talk of disunion had revealed just how fragile national unity still was. That became starkly evident in the Missouri crisis of 1819–1820.

Since 1789, politicians had labored to keep the explosive issue of slavery tucked safely beneath the surface of political life, for they understood how quickly it could jeopardize the nation. Their fears were borne out in 1819 when Missouri’s application for admission to the Union raised anew the question of slavery’s expansion. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had prohibited slavery north of the Ohio River while allowing its expansion to the south. But Congress had said nothing about slavery’s place in the vast Louisiana territory west of the Mississippi.

Though there were several thousand slaves in the Missouri Territory, Senator Rufus King of New York demanded that Missouri prohibit slavery before entering the Union. His proposal triggered a fierce debate over Congress’s authority to regulate slavery in the Trans-Mississippi West. Southerners were adamant that the area must remain open to their slave property and were determined to preserve the equal balance of slave and free states in the Senate. Already by 1819, the more rapidly growing population of the free states had given

The House of Representatives  The House of Representatives, depicted in this 1821 painting by Samuel F. B. Morse, later inventor of the telegraph, rang with debate over the Missouri Compromise and other explosive issues. (Samuel F. B. Morse, The Old House of Representatives, 1882, 86 1/2 x 130 1/4 in., oil on canvas. In the Collection of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., Museum Purchase, Gallery Fund 11.14)
In the early nineteenth century, politicians struggled to contain the explosive issue of slavery’s expansion. How was this attempted in the Missouri Compromise of 1820?

In the end, compromise prevailed. Missouri gained admission as a slave state, while Maine (formerly part of Massachusetts) came in as a countervailing free state. A line was drawn west from Missouri at latitude 36° 30’ to the Rocky Mountains. Lands south of that line would be open to slavery; areas to the north of it would not.

Yet the issue would not die. Controversy erupted again when antislavery forces in Congress protested a clause in the Missouri constitution excluding free blacks and mulattoes from the state. They argued that the denial of citizenship and civil rights to free blacks in Missouri would set a precedent for similar denials in other states. The Missouri legislature assured Congress that the offending clause would not be used to abridge the rights of any U.S. citizens, thus assuaging congressional critics and ensuring Missouri’s admission to the union. In spite of such assurances, free blacks continued to be excluded from the state.
For the moment, the issue of slavery’s expansion had been put to rest. It would not be long, however, before the problem would set North and South even more violently against each other.

**POLITICS IN TRANSITION**

For two decades following the election of 1800, Jeffersonian Republicans monopolized the presidency and dominated Congress, while the Federalist party languished. By the late 1820s, however, the Jeffersonian ascendancy had ended, and the Federalist–Jeffersonian party system was in disarray. As that happened, new political alignments began to appear. When they did, America was poised on the threshold of a new political era.

**The Collapse of the Federalist–Jeffersonian Party System**

For a while following the election of 1800, Federalists had maintained a drumfire of attack on the Jeffersonians, including the charge published by a Federalist editor in 1803 that Jefferson had sired several children by his slave Sally Hemings. But Federalists were discredited by accusations of disloyalty during the War of 1812 and were tainted by their lingering aristocratic image. Some Federalists endorsed broad suffrage as essential to social stability and governmental legitimacy, but many did not. “There is a tendency in the majority to tyranny over the minority and trample down their rights,” asserted one New York Federalist, “[and] in the indolent . . . to cast the burthens of society upon the industrious and the virtuous.” Federalists continued to believe that political leadership should be exercised by “the wise and the good.” Saddled with this outlook, the Federalist party gradually collapsed.

The Jeffersonians’ overwhelming political success after the War of 1812, spurred by fresh recruits in the East and the admission of new states in the West, proved their undoing. No single party could contain the nation’s swelling diversity of economic and social interests, deepening sectional divisions, and personal ambitions of newly emerging political leaders.

In response to growing pressures from the West and Northeast, as well as to national sentiment stimulated by the War of 1812, Madison’s administration launched a Federalist-like program of national development. In March 1816, the president signed a bill creating a second Bank of the United States (the first bank’s charter had expired in 1811), intended to stimulate economic expansion and regulate the loose currency-issuing practices of countless state-chartered banks. At Madison’s urging, Congress passed America’s first protective tariff, a set of duties on imported goods intended to protect America’s “infant industries” that had sprung up during the embargo. He also launched a federally subsidized network of roads and canals. By the early 1820s, Henry Clay and others, now calling themselves National Republicans, were proposing an even more ambitious program of tariffs and internal improvements, under the name of the American System.

The administration’s policies drew sharp criticism from so-called Old Republicans, southern politicians who regarded themselves as guardians of the Jeffersonian conscience. Speaking in opposition to the bank bill, Congressman John Randolph of Virginia warned that “the question is whether . . . the state governments are to be swept away; or whether we . . . still . . . regard their integrity and preservation as part of our policy.” Over the following decade, the Old Republicans continued to sound the alarm, even as their numbers dwindled.

The final collapse of the Federalist–Jeffersonian party system was triggered by the presidential election of 1824. For the first time since 1800, when the “Virginia dynasty” of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe began, there was competition for the presidency from every major wing of the Jeffersonian coalition. Of the five candidates, John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts and Henry Clay of Kentucky advocated bold federal programs of economic development. William Crawford of Georgia and Andrew Jackson of Tennessee clung to traditional Jeffersonian principles of limited government, agrarianism, and states’ rights. In between stood John Calhoun of South Carolina, just beginning his fateful passage from nationalism to southern nullification.

When none of the presidential candidates received an electoral majority, the election, as in 1800, moved into the House of Representatives. There, an alliance of Adams and Clay supporters gave the New Englander the election, even though he trailed Jackson in electoral votes, 84 to 99. The Jacksonians’ charges of a “corrupt bargain” gained credence when Adams appointed Clay secretary of state.

Adams’s ill-fated administration revealed the disarray in American politics. His stirring calls for federal road and canal building, standardization of weights and measures, a national university, and government support for science and the arts quickly fell victim to sectional conflicts, political factionalism, and his own scorn for the increasingly democratic politics of the time. Within a year of his inauguration,
Adams's administration had foundered. For the rest of his term, politicians jockeyed for position in the political realignment that was underway.

Women at the Republican Court
Much as aristocratic women had long exerted influence at English and European courts, so elite American women such as Margaret Bayard Smith forged an American style of parlor politics. Initiated at Philadelphia in the 1790s when a national governing community was taking shape, parlor politics became an integral part of the Washington scene after 1800.

As political actors in their own right, women visited the Supreme Court and attended sessions of Congress, frequently circulating on the House and Senate floors and even sitting in members’ seats. “The House of Representatives,” observed Bayard Smith, “is a lounging place for both sexes, where acquaintance is as easily made as at public amusements.” Women also filled the House galleries as electoral votes were counted in the 1808 presidential election, and listened intently to the debates over war in 1812.

They also utilized networks of friendship, dinner parties, and social gatherings to reinforce political alliances, lobby political appointments, and promote legislation. In the process, they contributed to the new government’s effectiveness while challenging the lines separating public (male) and private (female) spheres.

No one participated in the capital’s parlor politics with greater relish than Louisa Catherine Adams, who launched what she called “my campaign” for the candidacy of her husband, John Quincy Adams, in the disputed presidential election of 1824. During his term in office, she continued to work the Washington scene.

If privileged women found it possible to achieve political influence in Washington, however, other women continued to find themselves politically isolated. That was in part because of a conservative backlash against the radically feminist politics evident earlier during the French Revolution. The claims of American women for a greater political voice at home could easily be tarred with the brush of French “anarchy” by anxious American males. Also, American political democracy became more rigidly gendered as male-dominated political parties grew in importance and voting, still limited to men, became the defining act of political participation.

A New Style of Politics
While women, blacks, and Native Americans continued to be excluded from the franchise, white men now flocked to the polls in unprecedented numbers. In state elections, voter turnout at times reached as high as 80 percent of the qualifying electorate, far higher than previously.

The growing strength of democratic beliefs and decisions by state governments to abolish long-established property-owning requirements for the
franchise helps explain the dramatic increase. In addition, state programs of road and canal building, bank regulation, temperance enforcement, and poor relief activated people’s self-interest, thus drawing them into the political arena. And it was in the states that a new generation of political leaders such as Martin Van Buren and Henry Clay, skilled in party organization, sophisticated in the use of a partisan press, and uninhibited by the revolutionary generation’s fear of political “faction” perfected the techniques of mass, democratic politics. By the 1820s, voter registration drives, party conventions, and popular campaigning had become commonplace. The election of Andrew Jackson to the presidency in 1828 represented the culmination of these democratic changes. For the first time, the techniques of mass politics were applied to presidential electioneering, thus changing American politics forever.

### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Indian Intercourse Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>Second Great Awakening begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Invention of the cotton gin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Battle of Fallen Timbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Treaty of Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Gabriel’s Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Marbury v. Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>National Road begun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Fulton’s steamboat Clermont launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>James Madison elected president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Battle of Kithippecanoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Madison reelected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Battle of the Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Treaty of Ghent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814-1815</td>
<td>Battle of Horseshoe Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Battle of New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>James Monroe elected president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Second Bank of the United States chartered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>American Colonization Society founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>African Methodist Episcopal Church established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Adams–Onís Treaty with Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>McCulloch v. Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-1822</td>
<td>Bank panic and depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-1820</td>
<td>Missouri Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Diplomatic recognition of Latin American republics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Monroe Doctrine proclaimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>John Quincy Adams elected president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Cherokee adopt written constitution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

**The Passing of an Era**

In the early nineteenth century, the United States consisted of diverse, often conflicting, and loosely connected regions. Within those regions ordinary citizens such as Mary and James Harrod, Ben Thompson, and Phyllis Sherman struggled to fashion new lives. Their efforts gave human expression to the nation’s values of social equality, individual opportunity, and personal autonomy.

Those values, strengthened by the country’s revolutionary heritage and the Great Awakening, inspired reforms intended to improve the conditions of American life. Though the lives of many white women were bettered, gender restrictions continued to limit women’s opportunities. The reinvigoration of chattel slavery in the South imperiled the lives of countless black slaves, while deepening racism in the North circumscribed the lives of free blacks. To the west, Native Americans, pursuing strategies of resistance and accommodation, gradually gave way in the face of expanding white settlement.
During these same years, American leaders fashioned important new relationships with the outside world. Following the War of 1812, the United States finally ended its neocolonial dependence on England and Europe. In the Monroe Doctrine, it defined a portentous new relationship with the emerging nations of Latin America.

As the country grew, American nationalism was strengthened by improvements in travel and print communication, the widely shared experience of the Great Awakening, and a series of path-breaking decisions handed down by the Supreme Court. At the same time, sectional tensions continued to simmer, breaking ominously through the surface of political life in the Missouri Crisis.

These years brought decisive changes to American politics. Privileged white women exerted influence in the nation’s capital, though most women continued to find themselves politically marginalized. Still, sophisticated political parties enlisted men by the tens of thousands in electoral politics.

By the 1820s, the American people had turned from an era of founding, when the nation was new and the outcome of the republican experiment uncertain, to a new era of national security and development. That transition was dramatized on July 4, 1826, the fiftieth anniversary of American independence, when two of the remaining revolutionary patriarchs, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, died within a few hours of each other. “The sterling virtues of the Revolution are silently passing away,” mused George McDuffie of South Carolina during that jubilee year, “and the period is not distant when there will be no living monument to remind us of those glorious days of trial.” As the anniversary celebrations ended and the revolutionary founders faded into memory, the American people had reason to ponder what the future would bring.

### Questions for Review and Reflection

1. How did the nation’s regions differ in the early republic? To what extent were these differences of long standing, and to what extent did they reflect developments since the end of the Revolutionary War?
2. Why did some Indian tribes follow the path of accommodation to white expansion, while others rose in armed resistance? What differences resulted?
3. What circumstances promoted social reform in the early republic, and what circumstances inhibited it?
4. How and why did the United States refashion its relationship to the outside world in the early nineteenth century?
5. What circumstances served to unite and to divide the nation during these years?

### Recommended Reading

Recommended Readings are posted on the Web site for this textbook. Visit [www.ablongman.com/nash](http://www.ablongman.com/nash)

### Fiction and Film

Discovering U.S. History Online

**Turns of the Centuries Exhibit**
www.americancenturies.mass.edu/turns/index.jsp

**Birch’s Views of Philadelphia in 1800**
www.ushistory.org/birch
This site presents a facsimile of 29 engravings of Philadelphia at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

**Nineteenth-Century Views of Manhattan**
www.nypl.org/research/chss/spe/art/print/exhibits/movingup/opening.htm
This site presents an annotated exhibition of nineteenth-century prints that demonstrate the urban growth in early nineteenth-century Manhattan.

**Charlottesville: A Brief Urban History**
www.iath.virginia.edu/schwartz/cville/cville.history.html
This illustrated history focuses on development of Charlottesville in the nineteenth century.

**The Seminole Tribe of Florida**
www.seminoletribe.com/history/index.shtml
This site is dedicated to the rich history and culture of the Seminole, including the campaigns Andrew Jackson led against the tribe before and during his presidency.

**The Iroquois of the Northeast**
A virtual exhibit of the Iroquois and their way of life.

**Native Americans in North Georgia**
www.nga.org/history/index.html
This site presents a several-part history of Georgia’s Native Americans, especially the Creek and Cherokee.

**Divining America: Religion and the National Culture, the 19th Century**
www.nhc.rtp.nc.us:8080/tserv/nineteen.htm
Using essays and contemporary photos and primary sources, this site includes several essays including “Evangelicalism, Revivalism, and Second Great Awakening” and “Evangelicalism as a Social Movement.”

**Colonization**
www.loc.gov/exhibits/african/afam002.html
This site explores the roots of the colonization movement, including the American Colonization Society.

**A History of African Americans of Delaware and Maryland’s Eastern Shore**
www.udel.edu/BlackHistory
This site offers a collection of several essays on blacks in these colonies, especially the growth of ante-bellum free black communities.

**Judith Sargent Murray Society**
www.hurdsmith.com/judith/
This site presents Murray’s biography, an illustrated tour of her world, and several of her published essays.

**Casebook: The War of 1812**
http://warof1812.casebook.org/index.html
A detailed presentation of the War of 1812, this site presents the people, battles, press coverage contemporary to the war, primary source documents, and a timeline.

**James Madison**
www.jmu.edu/madison
This site explores many aspects of James Madison’s career and the historical events and ideas he influenced.

**Nationalism**
www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/modsbook17.html
This site has collected essays (public domain texts) on the surging global nationalism of the early nineteenth century, giving context to America’s own rising patriotism during those years.

**The Marshall Cases for the American Revolution**
www.odur.let.rug.nl/~usa/D/1801-1825/marshallcases/marxx.htm
This site presents thorough descriptions and text excerpts from court records of John Marshall’s six best-known cases as well as a brief biography.

**The Missouri Compromise**
Created for a class project, this site offers a topical presentation of the Missouri Compromise.
Thomas Jefferson
www.loc.gov/exhibits/jefferson
This extensive, illustrated exhibit presents Jefferson's life and ideas, including the progression of his ideas of federalism and his legacy.

Martin Van Buren—His Early Years
www.mindspring.com/~braniff/mvb-earl.htm
Part of a larger site on Martin Van Buren, this page gives a year-by-year description of his early years.

History of the Fourth of July
www.pbs.org/capitolfourth/history.html
This site presents a colorful illustrated history of Fourth of July celebrations.

Road Through the Wilderness
www.connerprairie.org/ntlroad.html
The National Road was a hot political topic in the early republic and was part of the beginning of the development of America's infrastructure. This site tells the history of the building of the National Road.