

Second Constitution Hypocrisy And Slavery

Posted on September 18, 2018

The Founding Crisis and the Limits of Confederation

I do not think that there is evidence that the founding fathers expected a civil war to break out into slavery. The Founding Fathers were mainly against the institution of slavery, but the Southern delegates (where the economy depended entirely on slavery) were for the institution. Some steps have been taken to mitigate the effects of slavery. The Constitution does not mention the word "slave" or "slavery". The import of slaves was to become illegal in 1808, so the founders had a system of limiting the increase by import. The southern states wanted slaves to be considered complete people for appropriation purposes, but this eventually narrowed to 3/5. The reality was that the founders did not think that they could force the US to work without the support of the southern states, and as such, they were kicking about the problem of slavery but managed to get into power to regulate slavery with an import ban. Discussions in the Constitutional Agreement indicate a desire to put an end to this institution but nothing about a potential war that could lead to the institution remaining (Finkelman, 1987).

Hardly every day, we hear and read about a split in America, which history did not know. The country is really split into two irreconcilable camps. Democrats hate Donald Trump, and all the Republicans for him. Yes, of course, the country is split, but to say that the history of the country did not know this means to be at odds with history. In the decades leading up to the Civil War, the country experienced a much greater split. The disagreement between the Northern and Southern states regarding the institution of slavery was just the tip of the iceberg of disagreements. North and South shared many other problems, the main of which was, of course, the problem of foreign trade. The industrial northern states considered it necessary to increase customs duties on imports from European countries. The agrarian southern countries did not doubt that after that, Europeans would increase the customs tariffs, and this, for sure, would affect the export of cotton. The split led to war – the most bloody in the history of the country.

Historian Joseph Ellis wrote a book about how George Washington, John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and James Madison organized the "Second [American Revolution](#)". Ellis, the author of ten books on the revolutionary pore and its heroes (he is a Pulitzer laureate for the book "Founding Brothers" /), correctly chose the time for the publication of the Quartet. The country is split, and it is useful for her to be acquainted with the time of the even greater split and find out how politicians have found compromises while working on the Constitution. The present is not a sin to learn from them ... (Ellis, 2016)

The idea to write a book was born in Ellis in a Vermont school where his son is teaching. The son invited his father to a history lesson in which his students recited the Gettysburg speech of Abraham Lincoln by heart. In this short – less than two-minute speech – Lincoln said November 19, 1863, at the opening of the soldiers' cemetery in Gettysburg (Pennsylvania), where in early July this year, there was a battle between the armies of the North and the South. Lincoln began the following speech: "Eighty-seven years have passed since our fathers founded a new nation on this continent." However, Ellis, an excellent expert on the history of America's revolutionary period, knew that Lincoln was wrong in saying "87 years". Lincoln counted from 1776 when Independence was proclaimed. However, in 1776, the new nation was not founded. The new one was founded only in 1789 when the first government was created – with the president, the bicameral Congress, and the Supreme Court ... Ellis decided to write a book that corrects one of Lincoln's most famous speeches. That is how the "Quartet" was born.

Hamilton and the Demand for National Union

Hamilton was probably the first of four who concluded that the Articles of Confederation were not suitable, he said, "for both war and peace." Hamilton wrote about this in 1780, when the war was still going on, and he, 25, was the adjutant and personal secretary of the army commander, General Washington. It is necessary, he wrote, "a strong alliance," in which every member is "obliged to fulfill" the decisions of the common government.

In 1783, Hamilton, as the representative of New York in the Congress of the Confederation, proposed a resolution to hold a special congress that would amend the Articles of Confederation. Hamilton was supported by John Jay, a representative of New York who was responsible for the Congress of the Confederation for International Affairs. He came to the conviction that "the design of the federal government is fundamentally wrong" and that the state of affairs in the union "can lead to a crisis".

"We are either a single nation or not," George Washington wrote in 1785, two years after the end of the war. "There is no man who is more than I realize the need for reform of our present Confederation." During the army command, he personally became convinced of the inability of the Congress of the Confederation to resolve any issues. Historical scholarship has also challenged the simple characterization of the early American state as uniformly "weak," emphasizing the capacities and institutions that developed alongside constitutional reform (Novak, 2008).

Madison, Shays' Rebellion, and Constitutional Reform

James Madison, the last of the quartet, concluded that the Articles of Confederation were an unsuitable instrument for governing the country. He was convinced of this in August 1786, when two thousand farmers in the western regions of Massachusetts rebelled against taxes and demanded to

cancel their debts. The uprising was led by Daniel Shays, a former Washington Army officer in the War of Independence. The Massachusetts government appealed for help from other members of the Union, but others did not care about what happened at the far end of the earth.

The Shays rebellion was not yet suppressed, and in September of the same year, 1786, in Annapolis, the capital of Maryland, a conference was opened to condemn the amendment to the Articles of Confederation concerning the lifting of customs barriers between the members of the Union. The conference was approved by the Congress of the Confederation, but only Virginia, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania sent their representatives. Most members of the Union ignored the meeting. Naturally, those who came to Annapolis could not solve anything with regard to customs barriers. However, before departing with anything, the arrivals – including Virginia Madison – unanimously accepted the proposal of the New York delegate Hamilton about the “future Convention” to discuss common problems. The resolution even set the date and venue for the meeting: the second Sunday in May 1787 in Philadelphia...

“Perhaps no one with any hint of having common sense could believe that Hamilton’s proposal has at least the slightest chance of success,” Ellis writes. However, a miracle happened. The Congress of the Confederation approved Hamilton’s proposal to meet and discuss the changes in the Articles of Confederation. Hamilton and Madison intended to go to Philadelphia not to amend the Articles of Confederation but to completely abandon them and replace them with a new constitution. To carry out the plan, Washington should be persuaded to take part in the Convention, that is, to give up this soon after the victory in the War. For the independence of the public, promise “never again get involved in public affairs.”

The Philadelphia Convention and the Drafting Process

After the Congress of the Confederation agreed to convene the Convention in Philadelphia, Hamilton and Jay began to “process” Washington with letters. In addition, Virginia Madison personally visited the Washington Virgin. All three reminded the general of the words he had said about the need for reform of the Confederation and that the people should be united. They believed that only one presence in Washington could contribute to the implementation of what they had conceived – the replacement of the Articles of Confederation and the creation of a new capable government.

Washington agreed to be in Philadelphia, and when the Convention was opened on May 25, 1787, the delegates unanimously elected him a chair. On the same day, Madison presented to the audience a plan for radical reform – the rejection of the Articles of Confederation. This plan compelled the delegates of the Convention to deal not with changes in the Articles of Confederation – for which they came to Philadelphia, but with the elaboration of a new Constitution based on which a new government would be formed – instead of the Congress of Confederations.

The Constitutional Convention worked for almost four months – until September 17, when the Constitution was adopted. In the summer of 1787 in Philadelphia, it was hot and stuffy, and the windows in the hall where the meetings were held were tightly closed. There was no communication with the outside world of the delegates of the Convention. None of them, except Madison, did not record the discussion, and disputes occurred on almost every issue. Journalists had no idea what was being discussed and how.

Ratification, Compromise, and the New Federal Order

However, the approval of the Constitution at the Convention in Philadelphia did not stop there. The Constitution could enter into force not earlier than it is ratified by nine of the thirteen members of the Union. Opponents of ratification were more than enough, especially in New York and Virginia. Hamilton decided to persuade opponents of the Constitution ... pen. He was invited to participate in the project Madison and Jay, and this trio wrote 85 essays, each of which interpreted various articles and provisions of the Constitution. The essays were published from October 1787 to August 1788 in two New York newspapers, and in the autumn of the 88th, they were published in a collection entitled “The Federalist”. The Constitutional Convention in New York ratified the Constitution with a minimal advantage: 30 for and 27 against. However, even before the vote in New York, the Constitution was ratified by ten members of the Union and, therefore, entered into force...

Today, one can only wonder how long the Union would last if the Articles of Confederation were not replaced by the Constitution and the three-headed government did not come to replace the Confederation’s Congress – with the executive, legislative and legal branches of power. The longevity of the original Union was doubted not only by European observers but also by many founding fathers of the United States. The conspiracy of four allowed the “second American revolution”, as Ellis emphasizes, to create the United States of America (not on paper, but in practice).

Participants in the quartet of conspirators were the future first president (Washington ton), the forthcoming fourth president (Madison), the future first chairman of the Supreme Court (Jay), and the future first minister of finance (Hamilton) ..

References

1. Ellis, Joseph J. *The Quartet: Orchestrating the Second American Revolution, 1783-1789*. Vintage, 2016.
2. Finkelman, Paul. “Slavery and the Constitutional Convention: making a covenant with death.” *Beyond confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American national identity* 188 (1987).
3. Gibbons v. Ogden (1824) “Part 1,” Epp. 1 of Thomas Jefferson (in-class film clips) “Liberty in the Air,” Epp. 2 of Slavery and the Making of America

4. Ellis, Joseph J. *The Quartet: Orchestrating the Second American Revolution, 1783-1789*. Vintage, 2016.
5. Novak, William J. "The Myth of the "Weak" American State" William J. Novak *The Myth of the "Weak" American State.* *The American Historical Review* 113, no. 3 (2008): 752-772.
6. Novak, William J. "The Myth of the "Weak" American State" William J. Novak *The Myth of the "Weak" American State.* *The American Historical Review* 113, no. 3 (2008): 752-772.
7. Ellis, Joseph J. *The Quartet: Orchestrating the Second American Revolution, 1783-1789*. Vintage, 2016.
8. Ellis, Joseph J. *The Quartet: Orchestrating the Second American Revolution, 1783-1789*. Vintage, 2016.
9. "From the Country to the City," ep. 1 of New York
10. Finkelman, Paul. "Slavery and the Constitutional Convention: making a covenant with death." *Beyond confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American national identity* 188 (1987).
11. Finkelman, Paul. "Slavery and the Constitutional Convention: making a covenant with death." *Beyond confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American national identity* 188 (1987).
12. Dworkin, Ronald. 1996. "Freedom's Law: The Moral Reading of the American Constitution." *Ethics* 108 (3): viii, 404. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111\(97\)90029-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(97)90029-1).
13. Sheldon, Garrett Ward. 2008. "Constituting the Constitution: Understanding the American Constitution through the British Cultural Constitution." *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*.
14. Easterbrook, Frank H. 2006. "Foreign Sources and the American Constitution." *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy* 30 (1):223-30.
15. Souders, Mott. 1938. "Viscosity and Chemical Constitution." *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 60 (1):154-58. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja01268a048>.
16. Congress, Library of. 2015. "13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Primary Documents of American History (Virtual Programs & Services, Library of Congress)." Library of Congress Research Guide. 2015. <http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/13thamendment.html>.
17. Balkin, Jack M. 2013. "THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION AS 'OUR LAW.'" *Yale J.L. & Human.* 25 (Winter):113-48.
18. DAM, Kenneth W. 1977. "The American Fiscal Constitution." *University of Chicago Law Review* 44 (2):271-320.
19. Elkin, Stephen L. 1996. "Madison and After: The American Model of Political Constitution." *Political Studies* 44 (3):592-604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb00602.x>.
20. Goldford, Dennis J. 2005. *The American Constitution and the Debate over Originalism. The American Constitution and the Debate Over Originalism.* <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511756214>.