Appendix II

THE ALIGNMENT OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN 1796

This study of the Federalist party from 1796 to 1800 attempts to find the relationship between the political measures advanced by the Federalists and the support accorded these measures on account of economic, social, and geographical factors. The line of divergence, in both theory and practice, which separated the Adams Federalists from the Hamiltonian wing of the party is the chief matter under consideration. The aim is to show the origin of this split and the cause of it. Further, the leaders on each side are considered, and, insofar as possible, the rank and file of the party are classified on one side or the other.

To a considerable extent this study is based upon the vote charts and maps, which cover the fourth through the first session of the seven Congresses, 1795–1803. It will be observed that these extend both before and after the dates marked out for more intensive treatment. This is for the purpose of comparison, with the aim of providing a fuller opportunity to observe the various trends which developed than would be possible if the period covered were too restricted.

A brief explanation of the manner in which these maps and charts have been prepared may be of service. For the eight sessions under consideration the yea and nay votes on the principal measures have been charted. A Federalist vote is indicated by an asterisk, a Republican vote by capital X. 0 indicates the member in question was absent when the vote was taken. The record of each member's votes is then totalled both for the session and for the entire Congress.

Where the total of votes cast for Federalist measures, as against the total cast for Republican measures, is greater than four to one, the members are classified as Federalists. Where the same ratio is maintained in regard to the total for Republican measures, the members are classified as Republicans. In mapping the votes the Federalists and Republicans are indicated in accordance with the legend shown before Map 1, cf. p. 332. There remain to be considered those representatives whose votes on measures do not fall under
either the Federalist or the Republican classification. On the maps, these are indicated by a separate code, cf. p. 332. It also remains to secure a term which will distinguish them. Non-partisans or neutrals is erroneous, as generally they secured their election under the label of one party or the other. In most cases, though this predominance is not so strongly marked in the Fourth Congress as in the succeeding ones, these men were Federalists. Moreover, it is to the Federalists of this type, rather than the Republicans, that closest attention is given. Therefore in most instances the term, "Half-Federalist," 1 will be used. This term was originated by Fisher Ames, long the Federalist leader in the House. Where the entire group, both Half-Federalists and Half-Republicans, is referred to, the term "moderate" will be used. This still carries more of an implication of non-partisanship than is actually the case. There was in use at the time a word which best expresses the actual situation, "Betweenites." 2 As, unfortunately, this never came into good grammatical usage, it is probably best not to adopt it.

An example or two will be given in order to complete this explanation. During the first session of the Fourth Congress Andrew Gregg represented the 9th Pennsylvania District (Map 1), consisting of Cumberland and Mifflin Counties (Appendix I). During this session he voted for six Republican and two Federalist measures, and was absent once (Vote Chart I). As this ratio is not greater than four to one, Gregg is represented as a moderate on Map 1. It will be observed on vote 3 on Vote Chart I, which is the vote on the appropriation for Jay's Treaty, that Gregg was in favor of the appropriation. It was through securing the support of such Half-Republicans as him that this appropriation was granted. It so happens that during the second session Gregg maintained the same ratio (Vote Chart II); consequently he appears again as a moderate on Map 2, representing the second session, and on Map 3, representing the entire Congress. On the other hand, Andrew Moore, of the 2nd Virginia district (Map 1), consisting of Augusta, Rockingham, Shenandoah, Rockbridge and Bath Counties in the upper Shenandoah Valley (Appendix I), had the following record: first session, Republican by eight to one; second session, Republican by seven to two. In the first session his
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2 Boston Columbian Centinel, June 28, 1800.
ratio is greater than four to one, as, of course, is the total for the Congress. Consequently Moore is represented as a Republican on Maps 1 and 3. On the other hand his vote for the second session is less than four to one and he is represented as a moderate on Map 2.

The advantage of this system, when considered in connection with election returns for important elections, is that it provides a better measure of the sentiment of the various sections on certain measures in the party programs than a straight mapping of each yea and nay vote. This is particularly true of a party made up of diversified interests. When the material from the charting of votes is studied in connection with the speeches, the correspondence of political leaders, and the arguments presented in the newspapers of the period, the pattern of party alignment becomes clearer. That is the chief purpose of the narrative part of this work—to tie the voting pattern together with the political events.

As already indicated in Chapter 1, the main pattern of Federalist leadership in the Hamiltonian wing of the party is commercial. The main pattern of the Jeffersonian group is agrarian. However, there is insufficient strength numerically in the commercial group to form a majority. For the Federalists to succeed they must join together the commercial groups with the wealthier farming sections which are not self-sufficient but which grow crops for export. There is likewise need for support from the pioneering western sections, which might be won because of the need for national defense establishments against the Indians, and because a strong foreign policy would offer a way of securing the Mississippi territory and the right to navigate the river.

With the general characteristics of the Federalist and Republican parties set forth (cf. Ch. 1 and Ch. 2), it will now be well to give a more detailed survey of some sectional and local factors which operated to modify or strengthen the general trend. Starting with the South, Georgia, as a section in an exposed position both as regards the Indians and the Spanish, did not fully share the orthodox Republican doctrine of a decrease of military strength to virtual nullity. In the Fourth Congress her two representatives, Baldwin and Milledge, were Republicans. In accordance with this feeling, therefore, they did not vote with the party on matters of economy, which accounted for a considerable number of votes in the second session of the Fourth Congress. Therefore these representatives appear as moderates on Map 2.
In South Carolina Federalism was strongest in the coastal plain and shipping sections. But a word of explanation is necessary in regard to Robert Goodloe Harper, the representative of the district of Ninety-Six, in the Piedmont area. He had been originally chosen as a violent Republican, a member of a Democratic Society, and a firm believer in the rights of man.\(^3\) In Congress, however, he had changed under the influence of the reaction against France and was rapidly becoming an extreme Federalist. Although this was hardly in accord with the viewpoint of his constituents, his rapid rise to prominence and ability as an orator and pamphleteer, together with the lack of a strong Republican party before 1800 in South Carolina, enabled him to retain his seat.

In Charleston there was a sharp division of parties between the poor and the rich. The leader of the Charleston radicals was Charles Pinckney, cousin of the Federalist Pinckneys, Thomas and Charles Cotesworth. By the conservatives he was called “Blackguard Charlie” to distinguish him from his reputable kinsmen.\(^4\)

North Carolina, with less interest in commercial matters than South Carolina, was correspondingly stronger in its Republicanism. Republicanism was strongest in the Piedmont section, back from the coast. The large plantations were in the Wilmington section on the Cape Fear, and in the Edenton and Washington sectors (District 8 on the Maps), in the extreme north-eastern coastal and river area. In the first two Congresses these last two districts had been represented by Federalists. In the redistricting after the census of 1790 they had been separated in a manner which added Republican agrarian counties to overbalance the Federalists. This resulted in the curious arrangement of the eighth, ninth, and tenth districts to be observed in Map 1. It has, with justice, been termed an early Gerrymander.\(^5\) In the Wilmington district, the radicals under Timothy Bloodworth, a blacksmith, kept this section safe for the Republicans. Bloodworth was a

\(^3\) Cobbett, W., Porcupine’s Works, IX, 327. Cobbett’s paper represented the extreme Anglo-Federal viewpoint. However, Harper incurred his animosity by his failure to defend successfully a libel suit brought against Cobbett by the Republicans, McKean and Rush. Of Harper he wrote that he was “seduced from the Jacobin Club by the good dinners, and gay parties of the merchants of Philadelphia.” Also Porcupine’s Gazette, Mar. 25, 1797, giving Harper’s letter of Mar. 24, 1797, explaining his change. Gazette extracts in Porcupine’s Works, V, 139.


partisan of the famous Willie Jones of Halifax, leader of the movement that delayed the ratification of the Constitution by North Carolina. For the Fourth Congress (1795) Bloodworth was chosen to the federal Senate for North Carolina. In the western section of the state, sectional differences from the rest of the state, combined with a desire for defense measures, produced a stronger Federalist trend than in the central portion. These factors produced a strong Federalist from this section in the election of 1798 (Cf. Maps 8, 9, and 10 covering the Sixth Congress) to be considered hereafter.

One other portion of North Carolina deserves special treatment. This is the Seventh, or Fayetteville district on the upper Cape Fear, which was steadily Federalist in elections. The principal reason for the situation is to be found in the character of the inhabitants of this sector. They were Highland Scots, who had been loyalists during the Revolution. From this territory had come the forces which opposed the Whigs in the battle of Moore's Creek Bridge during the Revolution. Consequently, in line with the general tendency of Tories to support the Federalists, this heavy concentration in the Seventh District produced North Carolina's lone Federalist in the Fourth and Fifth Congresses, William Barry Grove. He voted, however, with the Republicans on many issues, not being from a commercial district.

Turning to Virginia, a variety of influences produced Federalism in several sections of the state, although the state was generally Republican. In the first place, the Norfolk sector (District 11, Map 1) showed a Federalist tendency. The representative of this district during the Fourth Congress, Josiah Parker, had started as a Republican, but was now tending towards Federalism, in which camp he stayed. The agrarian tide-water territory was also closely contested. A sector which is generally different from the rest of the state is the Northern Neck, that tract lying between the Potomac and Rappahannock Rivers, one of the oldest and wealthiest portions of the state. This together with the counties along the Potomac to the Shenandoah Valley was the scene of conflict between Federalists and Republicans.

A third region of the state which always produced one or more Federalists was the Shenandoah Valley, lying between the Blue Ridge
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7 Dodd, William E., Life of Nathaniel Macon (Raleigh, 1903), 18-19.
and Alleghenies. This was an important trade route, and was fairly rich farming country. Further it showed a stronger nationalism and a sectional differentiation from the more provincial farmers to the east of the Blue Ridge. These sectional differences likewise operated to make the entire part of the state which is now West Virginia a region where Federalism showed strength.⁸

In Maryland, much the same influence which operated in the Shenandoah and trans-Allegheny counties' territory influenced the western portion of the state for Federalism.⁹ The eastern part was Federalist for a different reason. In that part of the state, the closeness to water transportation made it possible to carry crops readily to market and the growing of money crops was widespread. This produced Federalist strength in the farming territory.¹⁰ In Baltimore City the Republicans were generally in the majority, due in part to resentment over the location of the capital on the Potomac,¹¹ and also the general trend of city masses, when enfranchised, toward Jeffersonian Republicanism.

Pennsylvania, by virtue of strongly organized democratic societies among the poorer classes of the metropolis, generally returned Republicans from the First and Second Districts, Philadelphia City and County, respectively.¹² The surrounding counties of thrifty farmers, York (District 3), Lancaster (District 7), and Chester and Delaware (District 8), were conservative and Federalist. District 4, Montgomery, Bucks, and Northampton, was populated by Germans, whose antipathy to the ideas of the French Revolution and general prosperous condition, caused them to elect Federalists until the direct tax of 1798–99 provoked both a literal revolution in the shape of the Fries's Rebellion and a corresponding change of sentiment at the polls. After that these counties became Republican (Cf. Maps 8 and 9 and compare with Map 5).

Further to the west the region of the Whiskey Rebellion was

⁹ Libby, Orin G., Geographical Distribution of the Vote of The Thirteen States on the Federal Constitution, 49.
¹⁰ Paullin, Charles O., Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States. Plate 67 B and C.
¹¹ Luetkenscher, G. D., Early Political Machinery in the U. S., 60.
¹² Ibid., 55-60; Tinkcom, Harry M., Republicans and Federalists in Pennsylvania, 1790-1801.
strongly Republican, and the surrounding counties were of similar complexion. The exception came in 1799 when the Federalists swept the extreme West with the upsurge of national feeling which has already been noticed (Chs. 1 and 2) in the case of western North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland. This shows only in the state elections, not on any of the maps showing Federalist votes, but will be treated in the proper place.

Two regions which were exceptions to the Republican trend of the Pennsylvania west were Luzerne County in the north, the territory of the Connecticut immigrants, who brought their politics with them, and Huntingdon County in the west. This latter had been the Tory center of Western Pennsylvania during the Revolution. In Delaware much the same situation existed as in Pennsylvania. Wilmington in New Castle County was Republican, while the stable farming country of Kent and Sussex was Federalist.

The party majorities in New York State after 1792 represented almost a complete geographic reversal from the sectional alignment which had brought about the adoption of the Constitution. This was due to a shift in the balance of power between the parties. As a result, New York City and the surrounding counties were Republican by 1795 in Congressional elections, although these very sections had produced the vote for adoption of the Constitution. This had been brought about by the rise in importance of the vote of the mechanic (or labor) interests, which the Federalists were no longer able to control. Of great importance, also, was the influence of Burr, working through Tammany Hall; and the accession of Livingston to Republicanism, influenced by the unwillingness of Hamilton to share the spoils. This was of considerable importance in the counties surrounding New York City, where the Livingstons, Clintons and Van Cortlandts wielded great power. In Albany City and County the Van Rensselaers and Schuylers were able to hold this prosperous

12 Luetscher, Early Political Machinery, 155.
13 "Gazette of United States, October 12, 1796. Also see Donnan, Elizabeth, Papers of James A. Bayard (Vol. II of American Historical Association Report for 1915), 116.
sector for Federalism. The rest of the western part of New York was Federalist on account of the great influx of New England immigrants to this territory, a situation which could not be expected to have a permanent effect, unless the Federalist policy considered the agrarian interest.

By the time of the elections of 1798 and 1800 western New York began to leave the Federalist party. The same general situation as in the rest of the country is apparent in New England. The concentration of commerce in this sector operated to intensify its Federalism. Above all, however, the influence of the Congregational clergy, backed by the traditions of a century and a half, prevented the general spread of Republicanism until a later date. The Rev. Jedidiah Morse, D. D., in his American Geography, wrote of the state of Connecticut, "The Clergy, who are numerous and respectable, have hitherto preserved a kind of aristocratical balance in the very democratical government of this state; which has happily operated as a check on the overbearing spirit of republicanism." And Dr. Morse, in the course of his activities as Congregational minister, Federalist politician, orator, pamphleteer and newspaper editor, should have known whereof he spoke.

This does not, however, mean that the poorer agrarian sections of New England departed from the general trend. They were Republican. On the other hand the broad stretch of the Connecticut River Valley, extending through Connecticut, Massachusetts, Eastern Vermont and Western New Hampshire was an area of almost unbroken Federalism. With prosperous farms and a fairly equable distribution of wealth, it formed a stronghold of Congregationalism and Federalism which delighted the heart of Dr. Timothy Dwight, himself. Throughout New England, as in the rest of the country, the banks were used as engines of Federalism which were of great service to the cause.

18 Hockett, Homer C., Western Influences on Political Parties to 1825 (Ohio State University Bulletin, XXII, No. 3, August, 1917), 63. Also Hammond, op. cit., I, 52, 99.
19 Quoted by Callender, James T., History of the United States for 1796 (Philadelphia, 1797), 67. The quotation is from Morse's American Geography (London edition, 1792).
22 Robinson, Jeffersonian Democracy in New England, 103.
APPENDIX II

The State of Massachusetts was the largest state and provided many important Federalist leaders. It will be observed, in examining Federalist areas on Maps 2, 3, and 4, that there is a fair correspondence between Republicanism and the poorer counties in per capita wealth as shown in Table 14. Upon the resignation of the strongly

TABLE 14

Population and Land Tax in Massachusetts Counties, 1796.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Tax per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk &amp; Suffolk</td>
<td>44,875</td>
<td>$22,264.70</td>
<td>$.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td>19,023.58</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>42,727</td>
<td>15,582.11</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>56,807</td>
<td>18,798.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>59,681</td>
<td>16,406.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>30,291</td>
<td>7,625.42</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>29,535</td>
<td>8,490.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>31,709</td>
<td>7,699.09</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnstable</td>
<td>17,354</td>
<td>3,009.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukes</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>751.39</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>653.47</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federalist Theodore Sedgwick after the first session of the Fourth Congress a moderate who voted Republican appears from Berkshire (District 1 W, or First Western). Similarly the three southern districts are represented by moderate Federalists throughout much of the period (see Maps 3 and 4). The Cape Cod Counties, Dukes, Nantucket, and Barnstable, on account of the fishing industry, had a somewhat greater proportion of wealth than appears in Table 14. Also they naturally were influenced favorably by the Federalist commercial program. The Second Middle District, which was Republican, consisted of the western part of Middlesex and the eastern townships of Worcester, which is the highest ground in these counties, the poorest

23 The table is compiled from the census of 1790 and the Massachusetts Assessment Act of 1796, Acts and Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1796 (Boston, 1896), Ch. 61.
farming country, and the area in the east least affected by shipping
and shipbuilding.

The representative from the Second Middle District, J. B. Varnum,
stressed in his campaign the fact that he was a farmer, while his
opponent, Samuel Dexter, who served during the Third Congress,
was a lawyer.24

In Boston, as in all the American cities, there was a strong Repub­
lican organization among the poorer citizens, with the result that the
race in the First Middle District was always closely contested. Until
1800, however, the Boston seat was always held by a Federalist. The
town of Salem, in Essex County, formed a Republican oasis in an
otherwise strongly Federal Congressional District, designated the
Third Middle District.25 The Maine counties (1st, 2nd, and 3rd
Eastern Districts) influenced by the background of the inhabitants
and their interest in shipbuilding and shipping, remained dominantly
Federalist until after 1800.

Connecticut was by far the strongest state for Federalism. It has
been pointed out that the rule of this state was chiefly in the hands
of the aristocracy.26 With a number of shipyards in the towns on
Long Island Sound, and the prosperous condition of the Connecticut
Valley,27 the state was perfectly satisfied in its Federalism. Further­
more the grip of the Congregational clergy was here almost unshaken.
Timothy Dwight came to the presidency of Yale in 1795. To the
Republicans he became “Pope Dwight.” At the commencement exer­
cises each year the politicians gathered and agreed on nominations
under his sanction. It is not necessary to consider Republican areas
in this state until 1800.

Rhode Island, as the last state to ratify the Constitution, was in a
different category from the rest of New England. Here the weakness
of Congregationalism was strongly felt. The agrarian part of the state
was Republican. On the other hand, Providence, mindful of the long
struggle between the city and the back country which had even
brought forth a threat of secession on the part of Providence, was
strongly Federalist.28 The Governor, Arthur Fenner, steered a middle

25 Ibid., 101.
26 Welling, J. C., “Connecticut Federalism,” in Addresses, Paper and Other Essays,
307 ff.
28 Field, Edward, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations . . . a History
(Boston, 1902), I, 291.
course in politics, though his sympathies were with the Republicans, in which camp he definitely settled after 1800. In the 1794 elections for Representative, the Federalist candidates won by a 750 majority out of 3000 votes.

In New Hampshire a strong Republican and personal organization supporting John Langdon, Senator from the State, was the only group whose opposition to Federalism was noteworthy in 1796. The Federalists acquiesced in the election of Langdon rather than run the risk of having him active throughout the state. The farming part of the state was generally Federalist.

Vermont presented a sharp division between the East and the West. In the eastern section which included the Connecticut Valley there were virtually no Republicans; but on the western side of the Green Mountains, the Republicans were in complete sway among the more self-sufficient farmers of this area. The western portion was newly settled, chiefly from Connecticut, it is true. But the strong sectional opposition against the East, which had always existed in this state, engulfed the newcomers.

With the survey of the East complete, the West is now deserving of consideration. In recapitulation, a generalization may be made concerning the more western sections of the seaboard states (except for New England). In each case it was pointed out that whereas the more orthodox of the Republican doctrines found their strongest support in the central agricultural section, a stronger national feeling in the western sections is manifest, especially where defense from Indian attack is a factor. The region in question, stretches from New York to Georgia, and includes the state of Georgia in its entirety. At the present time no analysis of the reaction of this region to particular measures will be undertaken. But the generalization is pointed out, in order to provide a basis for future references.

The only New England State with characteristics of the West at this date is Vermont. Berkshire County, Massachusetts, and part of the Maine area, might be included, but hardly with accuracy. Western Vermont, however, agrees in characteristics more with Tennessee and
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29 Ibid., 288.
30 Ibid., 288.
31 Columbian Centinel, Mar. 22, 1800 traces the rise of the Republican party in New Hampshire.
32 Ibid.
Kentucky than with any part of New England proper. In all of these
ewestern states the feeling of kinship with the rest of the Union was
but slight. Tennessee and Kentucky were primarily interested in
gaining free access to the Mississippi. Pinckney's Treaty had demon-
strated that the Union was of some value, but it was not until the
Louisiana Purchase that they were to feel definitely cemented to it
and a sense of nationalism was to grow strong. Meanwhile the benefits
of protection from the Indians were perhaps overbalanced by restric-
tions placed upon them in the shape of treaty lines on which they
must not encroach. Politically, they found most in common with
the Republicans, although one of the Kentucky Senators, Marshall,
was a Federalist and had voted for Jay's Treaty.

It has already been asserted that no detailed survey of the measures
of the Fourth Congress will be undertaken. One or two points in
connection with the maps and charts of this Congress (Map 1, 2,
and 3 and Vote Charts I and II) deserve notice, however. In the
first place the number of moderates of both parties is striking. As
of that date there was still considerable latitude within the parties,
still room for the exercise of independent judgment. Moreover, some
states, as in the case of New Hampshire with John Langdon, still
clung to a prominent Revolutionary leader.

In some instances the members voted so regularly with the party
opposite to that which elected them, as to fall under the classification
not of moderates, but of the opposition. Rutherford of the 1st
Virginia District, Grove of the 7th North Carolina District, and T. J.
Skinner and W. Lyman of the 1st and 2nd Western Massachusetts
Districts, were chosen as Federalists but voted with the Republicans
(Cf. Map 3). With the exception of Grove, who somewhat redeemed
himself by voting for Jay's Treaty, there was widespread dissatis-
faction among the Federalists who had chosen them. In the elections
for the Fifth Congress, Skinner was able to secure re-election with
the aid of the Republicans, and Grove was accorded full Federalist
support in his district. The others of the group, however, were not
returned, being replaced in the Fifth Congress by firmer Federalists.36

34 Morse, Anson E., Federalist Party in Massachusetts to the Year 1800 (Princeton,
1919), 164.
35 Ames to C. Gore, Phil., Nov. 18, 1794, Ames's Works, I, 182; Ames to Dwight
Foster, Dedham, Jan. 4, 1796, Ibid., 182.
36 Cf. Maps 4, 5, and 6 and Vote Charts IV-V.
On the other side, one Republican, Samuel Smith of the Baltimore, Maryland District, voted with the Federalists. Smith was a wealthy merchant who, in debate, prided himself on his moderation. He was in favor of Jay's Treaty.

Of those who fall under the classification of moderates, there are a total of twenty-nine for this Congress who appear as such on Map 3 (also cf. Table 15, p. 297). Two districts are included which were represented by a member of one party but then, upon the resignation of this member during Congress, by a man elected by the opposing party. In the Fifth Pennsylvania District Daniel Hiester (R) was followed by George Ege (F). In the Massachusetts 1st Western District Sedgwick was followed by a moderate, Skinner, who proved satisfactory to the Republicans. It should also be noted that party ties were sufficiently loose that in addition to the twenty-nine, there were three who were elected as Federalists but appear as moderates on Map 3 because they voted with the Republicans, and one elected as a Republican who voted with the Federalists also indicated as a moderate.