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Question 3

To what extent did political parties contribute to the development of national unity in the United States between 1790 and 1840?

The 8–9 Essay
- Contains a clear, well-developed thesis that addresses the extent to which political parties contributed to the development of national unity in the United States between 1790 and 1840.
- Develops the thesis with substantial and relevant historical information on the extent to which political parties contributed to the development of national unity in the United States between 1790 and 1840.
- Provides effective analysis of the extent to which political parties contributed to the development of national unity in the United States between 1790 and 1840; coverage of the time period may be somewhat uneven.
- May contain minor errors that do not detract from the quality of the answer.
- Is well organized and well written.

The 5–7 Essay
- Contains a partially developed thesis that addresses the extent to which political parties contributed to the development of national unity in the United States between 1790 and 1840.
- Supports the thesis with some relevant historical information.
- Provides some analysis of the extent to which political parties contributed to the development of national unity between 1790 and 1840, but coverage of the time period may be uneven.
- May contain errors that do not seriously detract from the quality of the essay.
- Has acceptable organization and writing.

The 2–4 Essay
- Contains an unfocused or limited thesis, or simply paraphrases the question.
- Provides minimal relevant information, or lists facts about political parties and the period 1790–1840 with little or no application to the question.
- Provides limited or no analysis of the extent to which the political parties affected national unity; may address only part of the time period indicated in the question.
- May have major errors.
- May be poorly organized and/or written.

The 0–1 Essay
- Lacks a thesis or simply restates the question.
- Demonstrates an incompetent or inappropriate response.
- Has numerous errors.
- Is organized and/or written so poorly that it inhibits understanding.

The — Essay
- Is completely off topic or blank.
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- Permanent political parties were not envisioned by the founders.
- The first and second party systems were national parties: compromise was necessary in order to function.

Federalists (Washington, who had Federalist leanings; Hamilton; Adams)

- Loose constructionists; strong central government; “contract theory” of government.
- Supporters were merchants, shippers, commercial farmers, and manufacturers in New England and along the Atlantic seaboard; identified more with Britain.
- Favored Hamilton’s financial plan, which benefited the wealthier groups and the propertied classes; prosperity would trickle down to the rest of the population.
  - National Bank: necessary and proper clause; implied powers.
  - Protective tariff.
  - Assumption of state debts; paying off the foreign debt; funding the debt at par; holding a manageable national debt.
  - Excise tax on whiskey, which led to the Whiskey Rebellion.


- Strict constructionists; supported strong state governments and the “compact theory” of government; favored the inclusion of a Bill of Rights in the Constitution.
- Supporters were small farmers in the South and West; appealed to the middle class and to the masses; favored an agrarian society and rule by an educated middle class; identified more with France.
- Did not support Hamilton’s financial plan.
- Favored reducing the size of the military.

The Time of the First Party System (1790s–1817)

- Original election procedure in the Constitution provided that the top two vote-getting candidates would be president and vice president; later changed by the 12th Amendment (1804).
- Jay Treaty with Britain (1794).
- Pinckney Treaty with Spain (1795).
- Washington’s Farewell Address (1796).
- Election of 1796: Jefferson vs. Adams; Adams won.
- Alien and Sedition Acts (1798); Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions (1798); expiration or repeal of acts by 1802.
- Election of 1800: Jefferson vs. Adams; Revolution of 1800 (“We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists”); peaceful transfer of power from the Federalist to the Democratic–Republican Party.
- Midnight judges (1801).
- Marbury v. Madison (1803) and other decisions of the Marshall Court.
- Louisiana Purchase (1803).
- Tertium Quid was the name given to various factions of the Democratic–Republican Party during the period 1804–1812; Quid was used pejoratively to describe cross-party coalitions of Federalists and moderate Democratic–Republicans united in opposition to Jefferson.
- Embargo Act (1807); Non-Intercourse Act (1809); Macon’s Bill #2 (1810).
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- War of 1812: support for the war was greatest in Democratic–Republican areas near the frontier, Canada, and Florida and was weakest in the Federalist maritime areas; “Mr. Madison’s War”; Clay, Calhoun, and Webster were war hawks.
- Hartford Convention (1814); Federalist negative response to the War of 1812; led to the death of the Federalist Party.
- Surge of nationalism following the War of 1812.
- Second National Bank (1816).
- Tariff of 1816: first protective tariff in U.S. history.
- Henry Clay’s American System proposed.
- “Era of Good Feelings” (1817–1824).
- Tallmadge Amendment (1819).
- Panic and depression of 1819.
- Missouri Compromise (1820).
- Foreign policy in the “Era of Good Feelings”; Monroe Doctrine (1823).
- Reelection of Monroe (1820).
- Favorite-son election of 1824: Clay, J. Q. Adams, Jackson, Crawford.

Information List: 1824–1840

The Time of the Second Party System (1824–1840)

- Split of Democratic–Republicans into National Republicans (and later Whigs) and Democratic–Republicans (later Jacksonian Democrats → Democrats).
- Indian Removal Act (1830).
- Peggy Eaton.
- Election of 1832: Jackson (Democrat) vs. Clay (National Republican), John Floyd (National Republican), and William Wirt (Anti-Masonic, the first third party).
- Jackson’s veto of the bill to re-charter the Second Bank of the U.S. (1832); Nicholas Biddle, pet banks.
- Election of 1836: Democrat Van Buren vs. four Whig candidates.
- Liberty Party founded (1839); James G. Birney, candidate in the election of 1840; antislavery party.
- Election of 1840: Election of William Henry Harrison, the first Whig president; first “modern” election with vigorous campaigning on both sides; common man moving front and center and dominating elections; beginning of a more dynamic two-party system.

Emergence of the National Republicans (from the Democratic–Republicans) → Whig Party and Its Ideas

- Supported a stronger federal government; loose construction; Second National Bank.
- Supported internal improvements (American System of Henry Clay).
- Favored social reforms.
- Favored the evolution of a market economy, business, and industry; supported by small businessmen, professionals, manufacturers, and some southern planters.
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- Opposed to Jacksonian spoils system, executive power, “common man.”
- Opposed to Indian removal.
- Presidents: Harrison, Tyler (closet Democrat); prominent leaders: Henry Clay, Daniel Webster.
- Dissolved over sectional differences, particularly about slavery.

Ideas of the Democrats (emerged from the Democratic–Republicans, Jacksonian Democrats)

- Favored strict construction and states’ rights.
- Supported state banks and a tariff for revenue only.
- Favored western expansion.
- Opposed to internal improvements at federal expense and Clay’s American System.
- Not opposed to slavery or its extension.
- Supported Indian removal.
- Supported by Irish and German immigrants, poor farmers in the North and Midwest, small planters in the South, skilled and unskilled workers in cities and towns, the “common man.”
- Presidents: Jackson, Van Buren; prominent leaders: John C. Calhoun, James K. Polk (House Speaker), Thomas Hart Benton.

Note: The Know-Nothing and Free Soil parties are outside the time period and were generally not relevant to the essays.
National unity in the United States has always been threatened by various problems, economic separation, class distinctions, racial distinctions, etc. But political parties in the fledgling United States between 1790 and 1840 generally separated the nation economically and politically, with unity achieved mostly through the first five Presidents.

George Washington warned in his farewell address that adherence to political parties would threaten national unity, so for the first four Presidents, unity was a priority. Both John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, despite being Federalist and Democratic-Republican respectively, agreed on the importance of neutrality in the Anglo-French wars. Also, the adherence by all presidents from 1790 to 1840, to the two term limit implied by Washington, proved that power would be the same for all parties, which strengthened unity.

The peaceful handling of power by the Federalists, notably Adams, to the Republicans, Democratic-Republicans further instituted the respect of each party for the other; this made it so people knew that above all party distinction, we were Americans and would treat each other as such. The Hartford Convention, in which the Federalists considered secession follow the War of 1812, actually strengthened national
unity as almost all Americans would vote for James Madison the next election in an effort to cast out the Federalists. Madison would usher in the Era of Good Feelings, under which political tensions subsided and unity blossomed.

After Madison's term,

During this period there were a few unity threateners, one being the War of 1812 which sprung the Hartford Convention. President Madison's involvement in the war was widely seen as forced by Southern war hawks in Congress. Also, Jackson's presidency saw the first mark of tensions between Western rural farmers and Eastern city merchants that would plague US History from then on. His Embargo Act was misconstrued as an attack on the Eastern enterprise which his fellow despised. In fact, Jefferson's whole presidency was criticized by Federalists for his habit of preaching strict constructionism and the violating it with such things as the Embargo Act and the Louisiana purchase. Adams' Alien and Sedition Acts also divided the nation as their obvious intent was to quiet and subdue opposition to Adams' government policies. The years of Federalist and
Democratic-Republican political fighting led to an implied but unspoken rift, not only between East and West but also between North and South, as the Federalists held strong support in New England and the Democratic Republicans held unwavering support in Southern farmers and plantation owners. Three years after and even during Monroe’s presidency saw national unity threatened by political parties. The debate over the Missouri Compromise led to huge sectionalism between the pro-slavery South and the anti-slavery North. Andrew Jackson’s presidency and the following suffrage of all white adult males led to increased tension by the more populous West and the more wealthy industrial Northeast. Jackson’s spoils system also threatened national unity as it forced losing party federal employees out causing masses of bitter jobless individuals. Jackson’s killing of the Second National Bank of the United States and the subsequent panic led voters to the Whig Party headed by Henry Clay’s American System, which promoted manufacturing as the nation’s primary industry. This was strongly reminiscent of the political party fighting between backers of Alexander Hamilton and backers of Jefferson during Washington’s presidency, the same fighting that prompted Washington to warn of political parties and their threat to unity.
Also the heavily debated Election of 1828, which included fierce mudslinging campaigns attacking the love interests of candidates Jackson and John Quincy Adams, was hotly debated throughout the states leaving many American distrustful of the government and their sectional opposites. The alleged secret deal between Adams and Henry Clay to win Adams the presidency further inflamed the protests of the other side, as Adams’s inability to pass any of his political agenda through Congress signified public discontent with its leader, a major precursor to national disunity. In the end, Washington’s warning about political parties proved to be right, though only adhered for a few decades after his presidency. Political parties led to talks of secession, the upbringing of a federal army on individual states (secession crisis), and staunch political rivalry which all the national unity.
After the ratification of the Constitution in 1789, two main political parties formed: the Federalists and the Republicans. As the Federalist Party began to decline after the War of 1812, other political parties emerged such as the Democrats and the Whigs. Between 1820 and 1840, political parties did not contribute to the development of national unity because of the continuous battles between states' rights and a strong federal government.

After George Washington was elected president of the United States, two main leaders also emerged by his side. Alexander Hamilton, a Federalist along with George Washington, often disagreed with the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, a Republican. Hamilton favored industry over agriculture, and desired to establish a National Bank and for the federal government to assume all state debts. Thomas Jefferson disagreed, while favoring an agrarian agricultural lifestyle over industry and opposing a National Bank and protective tariffs. Even at the start of America as a country, there were already disagreements on the role of the federal government.

In 1798, John Adams passed the Sedition Act, which made it illegal to speak or write against the government. As a result, Thomas Jefferson and his Republican counterpart James Madison drafted the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, which favored the right of a state to "nullify" a federal law or declare it null and void. When Thomas Jefferson became president in 1800, it was known as the
"Revolution of 1800" because it began the rapid decline of Federalist ideals, which included the idea of expanding the federal government. Thomas Jefferson limited federal income to only land sales and customs duties. This exemplified the Republican ideal of little interference in domestic affairs, known as laissez-faire. However, when the northern Federalists felt their states' rights being violated with entrance in the War of 1812, the Federalists began supporting the idea of states' rights.

With the coming of the War of 1812, the "War Hawks," led by Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, favored war against Great Britain, while the Federalists met at the Hartford Convention in 1814 to draw up means for secession due to the lack of support for northern interests by president James Madison. Madison was president until 1820, when James Monroe took over, another Republican. This ushered in the "Era of Good Feelings," an era of a sense of national unity and pride after the War of 1812. Within the "corrupt bargain" election in 1824, supporters of Andrew Jackson decried John Quincy Adams for winning this corrupt election. Jackson, a Democrat, took over in 1829 and was challenged even by his vice president John C. Calhoun, who supported states' rights and nullification.

John C. Calhoun called the Tariff of 1828 the "Tariff of Atrocities" because it hurt southern interests in agricultural development. Calhoun declared the right of a
state to nullify a federal law. This resulted in the “nullification crisis” and the emergence of the Anti-Mary Party, who opposed Jackson’s policies. They wanted a National Bank, no protective tariffs, and they liked western expansion, which brought up the issue of slavery in the West, especially during the presidency of James K. Polk when the Mexican-American War ended and there was a question whether to ban slavery in these territories.

The emergence of political parties after George Washington was elected president led to a disunity over the issue of states’ rights. This debate led all the way to the 1840s, when slavery in the western territories was a big issue which eventually led to sectional divide and the Civil War in 1860.
National Unity was a long developed process that was aided by the political parties between 1790 and 1840. The early political parties were nearly the same, but not completely. Each side shared its own views yet some ideas proved to be what everyone was looking for. In the years following the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, our nation was slowly forming.

Our colonies of the early 19th century were separated by a few different things, such as: Slavery, tolerance and political party parties. The biggest issue however, was the division of the political parties. For a while both sides were somewhat equal, but with time they soon became opposed to each other. The Democratic Republicans gave way to the new political parties, the Democrats and the Republicans. However, before that could happen, both sides needed to be one with each other. They both sought out to obtain leaders and to complete their goals.

National unity created a time of political equality and kept this toddler nation together. Up until the decades before the Civil War, slavery was a topic discussed by both sides of the political table. That soon became a heated debate which led to complete separation and the Civil War. Yet we must look at the upside of that situation. The formation of political parties led to something no one could have ever imagined. Despite the downfall of the united parties, the nation did not completely fall apart. Thus, this would mark national unity as a positive in history.

With all this said, we can safely say that the political parties of the early 19th century contributed sufficiently enough to create a future of unity in the US.
Question 3

Overview

The question asked students to what extent political parties contributed to national unity in the United States between 1790 and 1840. It required them to explain the people, ideas, and events related to the development of the first and second party systems and then to show how these people, ideas, and events led to national unity or disunity. The question expected students to understand cause and effect, as well as change over time.

Sample: 3A
Score: 7

This essay develops its thesis with a solid discussion, arranged chronologically and thematically, of how political parties threatened national unity. It supports the thesis with relevant historical information (a good party history from the rise and fall of the Federalists to the rise of the Whigs and the sectionalism evident during Jackson’s presidency) and a fairly balanced treatment of both the first and the second party systems. The reference to the “alleged secret deal” between Adams and Clay is confusing but not necessarily incorrect.

Sample: 3B
Score: 5

This essay contains a partially developed thesis and supports it with some relevant information (Federalist and Republican beliefs, Sedition Act, Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, Revolution of 1800, Hartford Convention, Tariff of Abominations) that spans both the first and second party systems, though there is more detail on the first party system. There is some analysis of the extent to which political parties contributed to the development of national unity (Monroe’s presidency ushered in an Era of Good Feelings, resulting in a sense of national unity), with the student choosing to link political parties and unity through the lens of “the continuous battles between states' rights and a strong federal government.”

Sample: 3C
Score: 2

This essay contains a thesis that sidesteps the question of to what extent political parties contributed to the development of national unity and a second paragraph that does not develop the thesis. The essay provides minimal relevant information (Democratic-Republicans giving way to the Democrats and the Republicans) and a number of generalizations that focus on issues such as slavery and tolerance rather than political parties and their relationship to national unity. There is virtually no analysis, and the essay addresses only the very earliest part of the first party system.