THE "why" in history and in the other social sciences is one of those perennial questions. Students of anthropology give a picture of primitive man which is fairly uniform in certain respects. Regardless of place or time primitive man is sure that virtually all causation is outside his control—events are inspired by spirits, devils, or some other unknown. All of this is some distance removed from an essay on the formative period of American political parties, which is the subject matter of this book. But it is not without point. The question of theories of causation is related to the matter of research methodology. Whatever methodology is pursued means the acceptance of some theory of causation. Some students of the social sciences attempt to ignore the problem of method. Others examine it. Without attempting a review of historiography, it is of some importance to review some recent writings and establish their points of view.

Thirty years ago historians still living today began to study the origin of the party divisions in American history. Without considering here those studies relating to the colonial period, I should mention several writers who have treated the revolutionary period and the constitutional period. Arthur Meier Schlesinger in his *Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution* finds the origin of the pre-Revolutionary American Whigs in the American mercantile groups. Somewhat earlier, Charles A. Beard had presented a rather extreme statement of the economic basis of politics in his *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of*
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the United States. Discussing the dividing line between parties, he then wrote a more balanced work in his Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy. These writings have influenced the interpretation of American history ever since. Also Frederick Jackson Turner, in his later writings, and especially The United States, 1830-1850, arrived at something of a synthesis of social, economic, and political history.

The method adopted herein is not so conclusive, although definitely influenced by these earlier works. All that has been definitely attempted is to follow a formula stated recently by Professor R. M. MacIver as: "causal analysis centers its attack on the investigation of differences between comparable situations." At the same time the reader of this work should have two other explanations. First, there are several threads throughout this work, since I have found it necessary to undertake a treatment which seeks to present multiple causation. Second, I shall attempt, in line with Max Weber's dicta on the need of an explanation as to values, to state the frame of reference of the work.

In the United States from 1789-1803 there existed a developing national state, sparsely settled. What were the factors that promoted the successful development of this experiment in self-government? What role did political theory, economic theory, social, sectional, economic and class divisions play? How did the background of experience as British colonies affect the new state? How did the great continental struggle between France and England play its role in the American picture? How far were political parties the means of reconciling group conflicts in the central government? How far was geographic isolation from Europe a factor in permitting the United States opportunity to develop apart from the conflicts elsewhere? Other states were emerging at this period. Still later, as in the nineteenth century,
Germany and Italy became unified. But during this time the United States continued the successful development of self-government along the pattern already set by England. Numerous crises occurred but were surmounted. What factors distinguished American development from that of these European continental nations and states? If some answer (even tentatively) can be given to the problems raised, then perhaps some light may be shed on the difficulties attendant upon the development of self-government in a new area.

The point of view of this book is that the first duty of the student of the social sciences is to depict the actual social structure of a period. If this period is one in the past, this is primarily the work of the social, economic, and cultural historian. The next point of view is that theories and governmental policies must be examined in relation to their effect upon various groups of the population, comprising sections of different economic, religious, and cultural background. Finally, in a political society with free elections, and with some experience in politics, the elections should be examined to ascertain whether or not there are patterns of political behavior. In this book the voting pattern of members of the United States House of Representatives in the period 1794-1802 is examined to see if it reflects the point of view of their constituents. For this purpose some 105 votes have been charted and analyzed, and the information given in the appendices. The narrative considers the point of view of the political leaders, their economic and political ideas and policies against this background.

The period that has been chosen is a good one because it covers both the rise and breakup of the first American political party alignments. Specifically, the analysis of the Hamiltonian Federalists versus the Jeffersonian Republicans has mainly confirmed earlier interpretations, especially those of Beard. There does emerge, however, a better understanding of other political leaders including John Adams and John Taylor. As a by-product, articles interpreting them have been published by me earlier.7 I am

7 Cf. Dauer, Manning J., "The Political Economy of John Adams," Political Science Quarterly, LVI, 545-72; and Dauer, Manning J. and Hammond,
grateful to the editors of the Political Science Quarterly for permission to reprint much of my article on "The Political Economy of John Adams" as Chapter 4 of this book.

This book has been in progress since 1931. One of the chief difficulties was the task of constructing the vote charts. This necessitated much work in establishing the boundaries of election districts for members of the United States House of Representatives. To do this it was necessary to trace the laws in the early session acts of State legislatures, then to find contemporary maps showing the county lines. Finally, there was the problem of using contemporary newspapers, biographies, and correspondence to determine the location of the congressmen in their districts. A preliminary version of part of this work constituted my doctoral dissertation at the University of Illinois in 1933 (unpublished).

Under the Historical Records Project of the W. P. A., Clifford Lee Lord, now Director of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, directed a research project to map all the votes of congress in the manner I have indicated. This was not known to me until the publication of his Atlas of Congressional Roll Calls for the Continental Congress. After World War II the unfinished materials of the larger project for the congresses after 1789 were housed at Columbia University. Dr. Lord kindly permitted me to examine these materials. The only parts I examined were those concerning the working maps and the lists of congressmen by districts. The project is, however, incomplete for the years of the Federalist period, and much of the material had not been checked. Consequently, it was necessary to return to the checking of maps, charts, and congressmen from source materials. If completed, the herculean work on the votes of all the congresses would be of inestimable importance for American historians and other students of the social sciences. It would provide a means of checking social and economic data against political trends and voting behavior. An equally important need is for a searching study which would provide election returns. Such a compilation
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of election returns could be used in countless studies. Where greater detail is necessary, voting behavior in comparable studies of state legislatures could provide information on the alignment of political groups. It is regrettable that data such as this, including election returns, is not readily provided by state and local historical societies. It is also regrettable that more dissertations and monographs do not treat such topics, which could be useful in broader interpretations.

The objection may be made that all of this is a multiplication of detail. But is this true? As matters are, much that is written is merely descriptive or narrative. How can we integrate political history with social and economic data before we know the skeleton of the story, before we have the basic facts? Again, how can we evaluate theorists—political, economic, or religious—before we can determine the effects of their theories on broad sections of the population? How can we evaluate political leadership unless we have objective data as to the effects of policies on divergent sections and groups?

Today there is an appreciation of such material in the field of public opinion sampling. We also have much data to determine the effect of advertising, especially in measurement techniques, to determine the effect of radio advertising. But often data to analyze more important social phenomena are lacking, or are not used. In the absence of data, writers may deny its utility. Recently Allan Nevins has written an essay in the New York Times denying that basic differences are apparent among American political parties.9 As to one interpretation of history, Bernard DeVoto has denounced, “the naive mythology called economic determinism.”10 Perhaps the extreme type of interpretation attacked is an oversimplification, but Mr. DeVoto has offered nothing more convincing than one writer controverting another. Or again, in times of stress, we have heroic attempts to determine cause by writers attempting to treat a long period, or even all

10 The Year of Decision, 1846 (New York, 1943) 11, quoted by MacIver, op. cit.
world history, in accord with some philosophy of history. Fre­quently these take the form of mechanistic or cyclical theories developed in periods of sharp disillusionment. But are the social sciences at the stage to permit such mechanistic theories to be proven? Do such mechanistic theories actually provide an explana­tion of the social process? Or, in a more sophisticated age than that of primitive man, do they merely provide an explanation freeing man of his own responsibility for his actions? Such a cyclical theory was attempted by Oswald Spengler after World War I in his *Decline of the West*.\textsuperscript{11} During the depression of the 1930's Arnold J. Toynbee's *A Study of History*\textsuperscript{12} appeared. This work in the one volume abridgment has received wide popular acclaim since World War II. Finally, Charles A. Lindbergh has added an even more mystical statement in his recent book, *Of Flight and Life*.\textsuperscript{13}

The objection to these cyclical attempts, it seems to me, is that they attempt to formulate laws and rules for the social sciences. But these laws and rules are by analogy to mathematical patterns already predetermined, or in some cases the pattern is determined intuitively by the writer. Then the data from the social sciences is selected to fit the pattern.\textsuperscript{14}

Certainly the student of the social sciences should try to formulate laws when possible. But the most fruitful results have come from those studies which analyzed the data first, and then attempted to formulate conclusions and laws. To illustrate the procedure discussed, certain studies in various fields of the social sciences may be considered.

In sociology some of the studies which carefully analyze segments of the population produce results so indisputable as to

\textsuperscript{11} Originally *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (München, 1919-22) translated, New York, 1926-28.
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\textsuperscript{14} Analysis of social phenomena which proceeds by analogy to the laws of either physical or biological sciences, which have been evolved from data in those fields, is also likely to produce strange results in the social sciences.
limit the scope of debate. For example, the Lynds’ studies of American culture in *Middletown* and in *Middletown in Transition* provide accurate data on life and culture in a small American urban center. The case and survey methods employed by Gunnar Myrdal and associates in *An American Dilemma* provide material on the Negro in America that is most useful. Regional studies such as Rupert B. Vance’s *Human Geography of the South* and Howard W. Odum’s *Southern Regions* are also comprehensive. The study by William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant* and by E. A. Stauffer and others on *The American Soldier* employ significant empirical methods. *The American Soldier* also verges into the area of social psychology.

Some writings in economics also fall in the categories being considered. Many of the studies of the United States Census Bureau have long been indispensable for basic data. Government reports such as those of Sir William Beveridge in England, or the reports on income of the Federal Reserve Board, the reports on living costs of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, various studies on distribution of wealth, and the data provided by the Council of Economic Advisors to the President, the monographs of the Senate Committee on the *Investigation of*
Concentration of Economic Power,24 are all examples of analyses presenting pertinent data.

In the field of political science, certain works which use the quantitative approach may be mentioned. These include A Study of War, by Quincy Wright and his University of Chicago associates.25 While some of the materials in the appendices to this work are of interest, others are probably too ambitious in the light of the data available. But there are in this work many interesting and suggestive ideas. Professor William Anderson’s The Units of Government in the United States26 is another type of work which prepares the way for analysis and appraisal. Writings on political parties and groups will be considered presently.

While giving a general endorsement to the quantitative method in the social sciences, it should be recognized that statistics do not interpret themselves. Nor is the mere accumulation of unrelated facts an end in itself. To indulge in that would be as escapist as romanticism itself. The student in the social sciences, when he turns to the present, is faced with the pressure of tremendous decisions which must be made every day. But at the same time there is the necessity for trying to develop techniques whereby competent students of the same question may independently come closer to comparable results when studying the same questions. This is one of the difficulties in any governmental system. Perhaps in countries with a background of democratic experience, the public may develop a degree of sophistication which stands it in good stead. But if the democratic process is to operate in countries without such background, any criteria which might be evolved to aid in the appraisal of problems in the social sciences would be of great value. For that matter such would also be the case in any state. Not the least of the problems to be studied is the operation of the democratic process itself.

26 (Chicago, 1942).
Questions as to the stability of the democratic process to varying cultures, to countries at varying levels of political and economic development, with varying types of resources—all these might better be answered if there could be better analysis of the operation of the democratic process itself.

The scope of this present work is merely suggestive. I have had to omit certain detailed analyses which would have required more time and additional data to complete. Furthermore, complete accuracy on all the maps and district lines is not claimed. Local study in various areas may readily provide corrections. Nor is the claim made that the social and economic data are treated or evaluated in terms of their full influence; only here and there have inter-relationships which are apparent been examined. That is the most that can be stated. Statistical techniques might also be used if some of the data were secured in greater detail for certain localities.\textsuperscript{27}

Some may raise the question, why is the work of analyzing the composition of the House of Representatives' Districts, and of charting the votes necessary? Why not simply write the political narrative from published and unpublished correspondence, the newspapers and pamphlets, the debates in congress, and other sources? I believe the best answer has been given by Prof. William F. Ogburn of the University of Chicago in the following parable: \textsuperscript{28}

I once heard of a man who was wonderfully skilled as a wool-tester. He could feel a piece of wool with his fingers and tell how durable it would be, how much warmth it would hold, how much shoddy was in it, and could describe many other qualities of the wool and of the sheep that produced it. He could not, though, transmit his art to others, for he scarcely knew how he did it, though his results were


good. About the same time I read an account of a method, developed in a laboratory, of measuring the properties of wool with the aid of a microscope, by counting the fibers, by measuring thickness, and by dimensioning air pockets and enumerating them per unit of area. By this means the weight of blankets necessary on a night with a temperature of, say, 30 degrees to keep the air surrounding the body at 98.6 degrees could be determined by anyone who could count and measure.

Thus the hope is that by establishing certain facts basic to the narrative, it may be possible to demonstrate certain points which will find general acceptance. There may be less room for argument, greater chance that other investigators will find the materials presented lead to the same conclusions.

On the other hand, others may feel that with the statistical methods of multiple correlation and factor analysis which are available, the use of quantitative methods is far too scanty in this study. I am aware of this. The only defense is that for later periods the availability of economic data, and the availability of election returns, makes the use of such techniques possible. But a great deal more spade work would need to be done to assemble election returns before anything like such a method could be used in the period prior to 1800. Likewise more careful examination as to the availability of tax rolls, church preferences, etc., would have to be made on a local basis.

Another limitation on this work is that it does not attempt a history of the period or its events. The chief events of the period are mentioned, but most attention is given to the Adams wing of the Federalist party, and the program which Adams stood for. This is the explanation for the rather long chapters on the political and economic ideas of John Adams. At the same time the chapters use Adams as the vehicle, because of two factors. First, the beliefs of Hamilton and Jefferson have previously been fully treated by other writers already named. Second, because of his mid-way position between the two, the main schools of political and economic ideas can be brought in fairly accurate perspective. From this examination, the attempt is made to show
the interplay of these political and economic ideas with the actually developing economic and political life of the country, and to suggest certain conclusions as to their influence.

The conclusions of this study, expressed in Chapter 17, emphasize the importance of the function of political parties in the democratic process. A number of studies on later periods of American politics have reached much the same conclusion. Under this interpretation one of the primary results is the reconciliation of a majority of group interests, economic, sectional, religious, and social, into the common policy of a political party. Part of this idea was expressed by A. F. Bentley in his Process of Government,

which was generally influenced by G. Ratzenhofer and the works of sociologists contemporary with him. Other writers who have been concerned with the problem of groups in politics include, in broader scope, A. N. Holcomb, Charles E. Merriam,

Peter H. Odegard, E. P. Herring, Merle Fainsod, and Wilfred E. Binckley. Charles A. Beard, Harold F. Gosnell and V. O.

(Chicago, 1908); also, D. P. Truman, The Governmental Process (New, York, 1951).

Wesen und Zweck der Politik. 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1893). Possibly the corporative idea of some of the theorists of the Middle Ages and early modern period may also be mentioned. But to carry this idea too far can result in emphasis on particularism, which is beside the point. The essence of the contemporary idea is that a common policy emerges and results in action. Whether this is a resultant, a compromise, or a major modification of separate group desires into something approaching a national policy, this common policy does develop. That the two-party rather than the multi-party system is more likely to produce a positive program instead of a compromise of stalemate, is the conclusion of most present-day students, especially those who have studied the problem comparatively with European parties. My own study touches but lightly on this question of the two-party versus the multi-party system.
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Key, Jr.,\textsuperscript{37} have already been mentioned. More specialized studies by E. E. Schattschneider,\textsuperscript{38} H. L. Childs,\textsuperscript{39} Belle Zeller\textsuperscript{40} and Paul Lazarsfeld\textsuperscript{41} also shed light on the problem. Finally, David Easton’s \textit{The Political System} is an excellent systematic analysis and criticism of the study of the group process.
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