NATIONALISM AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1816–1848

A high and honorable feeling generally prevails, and the people begin to assume, more and more, a national character; and to look at home for the only means, under divine goodness, of preserving their religion and liberty.

Hezekiah Niles, Niles’ Weekly Register, September 2, 1815

The election of James Monroe as president in 1816 (less than two years after the last battle of the War of 1812) inaugurated what one newspaper editorial characterized as an “Era of Good Feelings.” The term gained wide currency and was later adopted by historians to describe Monroe’s two terms in office.

The Era of Good Feelings

The period’s nickname suggests the Monroe years were marked by a spirit of nationalism, optimism, and goodwill. In some ways, they were. One party, the Federalists, faded into oblivion and Monroe’s party, the Democratic-Republicans, adopted some of their policies and dominated politics.

This perception of unity and harmony, however, can be misleading and oversimplified. Throughout the era people had heated debates over tariffs, the national bank, internal improvements, and public land sales. Sectionalist tensions over slavery were becoming ever more apparent. Moreover, a sense of political unity was illusory, since antagonistic factions within the Democratic-Republican party would soon split it in two. The actual period of “good feelings” may have lasted only from the election of 1816 to the Panic of 1819.
James Monroe

As a young man, James Monroe had fought in the Revolutionary War and suffered through the Valley Forge winter. He had become prominent in Virginia politics and had served as Jefferson’s minister to Great Britain and as Madison’s secretary of state. He continued the Virginia dynasty: of the first five presidents, four were from Virginia. The other, John Adams, was from Massachusetts.

In the election of 1816, Monroe defeated the Federalist, Rufus King, overwhelmingly—183 electoral votes to 34. By 1820, the Federalist party had practically vanished and Monroe received every electoral vote except one. With no organized political opposition, Monroe represented the growing nationalism of the American people. Under Monroe, the country acquired Florida, agreed on the Missouri Compromise, and adopted the Monroe Doctrine.

Cultural Nationalism

The popular votes for James Monroe were cast by a younger generation of Americans whose concerns differed from those of the nation’s founders. The young were excited about the prospects of the new nation expanding westward and had little interest in European politics now that the Napoleonic wars (as well as the War of 1812) were in the past. As fervent nationalists, they believed their young country was entering an era of unlimited prosperity.

Patriotic themes infused every aspect of American society, from art to schoolbooks. Heroes of the Revolution were enshrined in the paintings by Gilbert Stuart, Charles Willson Peale, and John Trumbull. A fictionalized biography extolling the virtues of George Washington, written by Parson Mason Weems, was widely read. The expanding public schools embraced Noah Webster’s blue-backed speller, which promoted patriotism long before his famous dictionary was published. The basic ideas and ideals of nationalism and patriotism would dominate most of the 19th century.

Economic Nationalism

Parallel with cultural nationalism was a political movement to support the growth of the nation’s economy. Subsidizing internal improvements (the building of roads and canals) was one aspect of the movement. Protecting budding U.S. industries from European competition was a second aspect.

Tariff of 1816 Before the War of 1812, Congress had levied low tariffs on imports as a method for raising government revenue. Then, during the war, manufacturers erected many factories to supply goods that previously had been imported from Britain. Now in peacetime, these American manufacturers feared that British goods would be dumped on American markets and take away much of their business. Congress raised tariffs for the express purpose of protecting U.S. manufacturers from competition. This was the first protective tariff in U.S. history—the first of many to come.
New England, which had little manufacturing at the time, was the only section to oppose the higher tariffs. Even the South and West, which had opposed tariffs in the past and would oppose them in the future, generally supported the 1816 tariff, believing that it was needed for national prosperity.

Henry Clay’s American System  Henry Clay of Kentucky, a leader in the House of Representatives, proposed a comprehensive method for advancing the nation’s economic growth. His plan, which he called the American System, consisted of three parts: (1) protective tariffs, (2) a national bank, and (3) internal improvements. Clay argued that protective tariffs would promote American manufacturing and also raise revenue with which to build a national transportation system of federally constructed roads and canals. A national bank would keep the system running smoothly by providing a national currency. The tariffs would chiefly benefit the East, internal improvements would promote growth in the West and the South, and the bank would aid the economies of all sections.

Two parts of Clay’s system were already in place in 1816, the last year of James Madison’s presidency. Congress in that year adopted a protective tariff and also chartered the Second Bank of the United States. (The charter of the First Bank—Hamilton’s brainchild—had been allowed to expire in 1811.)

On the matter of internal improvements, however, both Madison and Monroe objected that the Constitution did not explicitly provide for the spending of federal money on roads and canals. Throughout his presidency, Monroe consistently vetoed acts of Congress providing funds for road-building and canal-building projects. Thus, the individual states were left to make internal improvements on their own.

**CANAL BUILDING, 1820 to 1840**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>$0.8 million</td>
<td>$0.3 million</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>$6.0 million</td>
<td>$0.5 million</td>
<td>$7.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$8.4 million</td>
<td>$1.2 million</td>
<td>$14.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*
The Panic of 1819

The Era of Good Feelings was fractured in 1819 by the first major financial panic since the Constitution had been ratified. The economic disaster was largely the fault of the Second Bank of the United States, which had tightened credit in a belated effort to control inflation. Many state banks closed and unemployment, bankruptcies, and imprisonment for debt increased sharply. The depression was most severe in the West, where many people were in debt because they speculated on land during the postwar euphoria. In 1819, the Bank of the United States foreclosed on large amounts of western farmland.

As a result of the bank panic and depression, nationalistic beliefs were shaken. In the West, the economic crisis changed many voters’ political outlook. Westerners began calling for land reform and expressing strong opposition to both the national bank and debtors’ prisons.

Political Changes

A principal reason for the rapid decline of the Federalist party was its failure to adapt to the changing needs of a growing nation. Having opposed the War of 1812 and presided over a secessionist convention at Hartford, the party seemed completely out of step with the nationalistic temper of the times. After its crushing defeat in the election of 1816, it ceased to be a national party and failed to nominate a presidential candidate in 1820.

Changes in the Democratic-Republican Party Meanwhile, the Democratic-Republican party, as the only remaining national party, underwent serious internal strains as it adjusted to changing times. Members such as John Randolph clung to the old party ideals of limited government and a strict interpretation of the Constitution. Most members, however, adopted what had once been Federalist ideas, such as the need for maintaining of a large army and navy and support for a national bank. Some members reversed their views from one decade to the next. For example, Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, strongly opposed both the tariffs of 1816 and 1824 but then supported even higher tariff rates in 1828. John C. Calhoun of South Carolina was another Democratic-Republican leader who reversed positions. An outspoken war hawk and nationalist in 1812, Calhoun championed states’ rights after 1828.

Political factions and sectional differences became more intense during Monroe’s second term. When Monroe, honoring the two-term tradition, declined to be a candidate again, four other Republicans sought election as president in 1824. How this election split of the Democratic-Republican party and led to the emergence of two rival parties is explained in Chapter 10.

Marshall’s Supreme Court and Central Government Powers

One Federalist official continued to have major influence throughout the years of Democratic-Republican ascendancy: John Marshall. He had been appointed to the Supreme Court in 1800 by Federalist President John Adams and was still leading the Court as its chief justice. His decisions consistently favored the
central government and the rights of property against the advocates of states’ rights. Even when justices appointed by Democratic-Republican presidents formed a majority on the Court, they often sided with Marshall because they were persuaded that the U.S. Constitution had created a federal government with strong and flexible powers. Several of Marshall’s decisions became landmark rulings that defined the relationship between the central government and the states. The first of these cases, *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), established the principle of judicial review. It was described in Chapter 7. Six others influential cases are described below.

**Fletcher v. Peck (1810)** In a case involving land fraud in Georgia, Marshall concluded that a state could not pass legislation invalidating a contract. This was the first time that the Supreme Court declared a state law to be unconstitutional and invalid. (In *Marbury v. Madison*, the Court ruled a federal law unconstitutional.)

**Martin v. Hunter’s Lease (1816)** The Supreme Court established that it had jurisdiction over state courts in cases involving constitutional rights.

**Dartmouth College v. Woodward (1819)** This case involved a law of New Hampshire that changed Dartmouth College from a privately chartered college into a public institution. The Marshall Court struck down the state law as unconstitutional, arguing that a contract for a private corporation could not be altered by the state.

**McCulloch v. Maryland (1819)** Maryland attempted to tax the Second Bank of the United States located in Maryland. Marshall ruled that a state could not tax a federal institution because “the power to tax is the power to destroy,” and federal laws are supreme over state laws. In addition, Marshall settled the long-running debate over constitutionality of the national bank. Using a loose interpretation of the Constitution, Marshall ruled that, even though no clause in the Constitution specifically mentions a national bank, the Constitution gave the federal government the implied power to create one.

**Cohens v. Virginia (1821)** A pair of brothers named Cohens were convicted in Virginia of illegally selling lottery tickets for a lottery authorized by Congress for Washington, D.C. While Marshall and the Court upheld the conviction, they established the principle that the Supreme Court could review a state court’s decision involving any of the powers of the federal government.

**Gibbons v. Ogden (1821)** Could the state of New York grant a monopoly to a steamboat company if that action conflicted with a charter authorized by Congress? In ruling that the New York monopoly was unconstitutional, Marshall established the federal government’s broad control of interstate commerce.

**Western Settlement and the Missouri Compromise**

Less than ten years after the start of the War of 1812, the population west of the Appalachian Mountains had doubled. Much of the nationalistic and economic interest in the country was centered on the West, which presented both opportunities and new questions.
Reasons for Westward Movement

Several factors combined to stimulate rapid growth along the western frontier during the presidencies of Madison and Monroe.

**Acquisition of American Indians’ Lands** Large areas were open for settlement after American Indians were driven from their lands by the victories of Generals William Henry Harrison in the Indiana Territory and Andrew Jackson in Florida and the South.

**Economic Pressures** The economic difficulties in the Northeast from the embargo and the war caused people from this region to seek a new future across the Appalachians. In the South, tobacco planters needed new land to replace the soil exhausted by years of poor farming methods. They found good land for planting cotton in Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

**Improved Transportation** Pioneers had an easier time reaching the frontier as a result of the building of roads and canals, steamboats, and railroads.

**Immigrants** More Europeans were being attracted to America by speculators offering cheap land in the Great Lakes region and in the valleys of the Ohio, Cumberland, and Mississippi rivers.

New Questions and Issues

Despite their rapid growth, the new states of the West had small populations relative to those of the other two sections. To enhance their limited political influence in Congress, western representatives bargained with politicians from other sections to obtain their objectives. Of greatest importance to the western states were: (1) “cheap money” (easy credit) from state banks rather than from the Bank of the United States, (2) low prices for land sold by the federal government, and (3) improved transportation.

However, on the critical issue of slavery, westerners could not agree whether to permit it or to exclude it. Those settling territory to the south wanted slavery for economic reasons (labor for the cotton fields), while those settling to the north had no use for slavery. In 1819, when the Missouri Territory applied to Congress for statehood, the slavery issue became a subject of angry debate.

The Missouri Compromise

Ever since 1791–1792, when Vermont entered the Union as a free state and Kentucky entered as a slave state, politicians in Congress had attempted to preserve a sectional balance between the North and the South. Keeping a balance in the House of Representatives was difficult because population in the North was growing more rapidly than in the South. By 1818 the northern states held a majority of 105 to 81 in the House. However, in the Senate, the votes remained divided evenly: 11 slave and 11 free states. As long as this balance was preserved, southern senators could block legislation that they believed threatened the interests of their section.

Missouri’s bid for statehood alarmed the North because slavery was well established there. If Missouri came in as a slave state, it would tip the political
balance in the South’s favor. Furthermore, Missouri was the first part of the Louisiana Purchase to apply for statehood. Southerners and northerners alike worried about the future status of other new territories applying for statehood from the rest of the vast Louisiana Purchase.

**Tallmadge Amendment**  Representative James Tallmadge from New York ignited the debate about the Missouri question by proposing an amendment to the bill for Missouri’s admission. The amendment called for (1) prohibiting the further introduction of slaves into Missouri and (2) requiring the children of Missouri slaves to be emancipated at the age of 25. If adopted, the Tallmadge Amendment would have led to the gradual elimination of slavery in Missouri. The amendment was defeated in the Senate as enraged southerners saw it as the first step in a northern effort to abolish slavery in all states.

---

**THE UNITED STATES IN 1821 AFTER THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE**

---

[Map image showing the United States in 1821 after the Missouri Compromise, with areas marked as open or closed to slavery.]
Clay’s Proposals After months of heated debate in Congress and throughout the nation, Henry Clay won majority support for three bills that, taken together, represented a compromise:

1. Admit Missouri as a slave-holding state.
2. Admit Maine as a free state.
3. Prohibit slavery in the rest of the Louisiana Territory north of latitude 36° 30’.

Both houses passed the bills, and President Monroe added his signature in March 1820 to what became known as the Missouri Compromise.

Aftermath Sectional feelings on the slavery issue subsided after 1820. The Missouri Compromise preserved sectional balance for more than 30 years and provided time for the nation to mature. Nevertheless, if an era of good feelings existed, it was badly damaged by the storm of sectional controversy over Missouri. After this political crisis, Americans were torn between feelings of nationalism (loyalty to the Union) on the one hand and feelings of sectionalism (loyalty to one’s own region) on the other.

Foreign Affairs

Following the War of 1812, the United States adopted a more aggressive, nationalistic approach in its relations with other nations. During Madison’s presidency, when problems with the Barbary pirates again developed, a fleet under Stephen Decatur was sent in 1815 to force the rulers of North Africa to allow American shipping the free use of the Mediterranean. President Monroe and Secretary of State John Quincy Adams continued to follow a nationalistic policy that actively advanced American interests while maintaining peace.

Canada

Although the Treaty of Ghent of 1814 had ended the war between Britain and the United States, it left unresolved most of their diplomatic differences, including many involving Canada.

Rush-Bagot Agreement (1817) During Monroe’s first year as president, British and American negotiators agreed to a major disarmament pact. The Rush-Bagot Agreement strictly limited naval armament on the Great Lakes. In time the agreement was extended to place limits on border fortifications as well. Ultimately, the border between the United States and Canada was to become the longest unfortified border in the world.

Treaty of 1818 Improved relations between the United States and Britain continued in a treaty that provided for (1) shared fishing rights off the coast of Newfoundland; (2) joint occupation of the Oregon Territory for ten years; and (3) the setting of the northern limits of the Louisiana Territory at the 49th parallel, thus establishing the western U.S.-Canada boundary line.
Florida

During the War of 1812, U.S. troops had occupied western Florida, a strip of land on the Gulf of Mexico extending all the way to the Mississippi delta. Previously, this land had been held by Spain, Britain’s ally. After the war, Spain had difficulty governing the rest of Florida (the peninsula itself) because its troops had been removed from Florida to battle revolts in the South American colonies. The chaotic conditions permitted groups of Seminoles, runaway slaves, and white outlaws to conduct raids into U.S. territory and retreat to safety across the Florida border. These disorders gave Monroe and General Andrew Jackson an opportunity to take military action in Spanish Florida, a territory long coveted by American expansionists.

Jackson’s Military Campaign  In late 1817, the president commissioned General Jackson to stop the raiders and, if necessary, pursue them across the border into Spanish west Florida. Jackson carried out his orders with a vengeance and probably went beyond his instructions. In 1818, he led a force of militia into Florida, destroyed Seminole villages, and hanged two Seminole chiefs. Capturing Pensacola, Jackson drove out the Spanish governor, and hanged two British traders accused of aiding the Seminoles.

Many members of Congress feared that Jackson’s overzealousness would precipitate a war with both Spain and Britain. However, Secretary of State John Quincy Adams persuaded Monroe to support Jackson, and the British decided not to intervene.

Florida Purchase Treaty (1819)  Spain, worried that the United States would seize Florida and preoccupied with troubles in Latin America, decided to get the best possible terms for Florida. By treaty in 1819, Spain turned over all of its possessions in Florida and its own claims in the Oregon Territory to the United States. In exchange, the United States agreed to assume $5 million in claims against Spain and give up any U.S. territorial claims to the Spanish province of Texas. The agreement is also called the Adams-Onís Treaty.

The Monroe Doctrine

Although focused on its own growth, the United States did not ignore the ambitions of Europe in the Western Hemisphere. The restoration of a number of monarchies in Europe after the fall of Napoleon in 1815 produced a backlash against republican movements. Restored monarchies in France, Austria, and Prussia, together with Russia, worked together to suppress liberal elements in Italy and Spain. They also considered helping Spain to return to power in South America, where a number of republics had recently declared their independence. In addition, Russia’s presence in Alaska worried both Britain and the United States. Using their trading posts in Alaska as a base, Russian seal hunters had spread southward and established a trading post at San Francisco Bay. British and U.S. leaders decided they had a common interest in protecting North and South America from possible aggression by a European power.
British Initiative  British naval power deterred the Spanish from attempting a comeback in Latin America. But to maintain British trade with the Latin American republics required diplomacy. British Foreign Secretary George Canning proposed to Richard Rush, the U.S. minister in London, a joint Anglo-American warning to the European powers not to intervene in South America.

American Response  Monroe and most of his advisers thought Canning’s idea of a joint declaration made sense. However, Secretary of State John Quincy Adams disagreed. He believed that joint action with Britain would restrict U.S. opportunities for further expansion in the hemisphere. Adams reasoned as follows: (1) If the United States acted alone, Britain could be counted upon to stand behind the U.S. policy. (2) No European power would risk going to war in South America, and if it did, the British navy would surely defeat the aggressor. President Monroe decided to act as Adams advised—to issue a statement to the world that did not have Britain as a coauthor.

The Doctrine  On December 2, 1823, President Monroe inserted into his annual message to Congress a declaration of U.S. policy toward Europe and Latin America. The Monroe Doctrine, as it came to be called, asserted

as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

Monroe declared further that the United States opposed attempts by a European power to interfere in the affairs of any republic in the Western Hemisphere.

Impact  Monroe’s bold words of nationalistic purpose were applauded by the American public but soon forgotten, as most citizens were more concerned with domestic issues. In Britain, Canning was annoyed by the doctrine because he recognized that it applied, not just to the other European powers, but to his country as well. The British too were warned not to intervene and not to seek new territory in the Western Hemisphere. The European monarchs reacted angrily to Monroe’s message. Still, they recognized that their purposes were thwarted, not by his words, but by the might of the British navy.

The Monroe Doctrine had less significance at the time than in later decades, when it would be hailed by politicians and citizens alike as the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America. In the 1840s, President James Polk was the first of many presidents to justify his foreign policy by referring to Monroe’s warning words.

A National Economy  In the early 1800s, the Jeffersonian dream of a nation of independent farmers remained strong in rural areas. As the century progressed, however, an increasing percentage of the American people were swept up in the dynamic
economic changes of the Industrial Revolution. Political conflicts over tariffs, internal improvements, and the Bank of the United States reflected the importance to people’s lives of a national economy that was rapidly growing.

**Population Growth**

Population growth provided both the laborers and the consumers required for industrial development. Between 1800 and 1825, the U.S. population doubled; in the following 25 years it doubled again. A high birthrate accounted for most of this growth, but it was strongly supplemented after 1830 by immigrants arriving from Europe, particularly from Great Britain and Germany. The nonwhite population—African Americans and American Indians—grew despite the ban on the importation of slaves after 1808. However, as a percentage of the total population, nonwhites declined from almost 20 percent in 1790 to 15 percent in the 1850s.

By the 1830s, almost one-third of the population lived west of the Alleghenies. At the same time, both old and new urban areas were growing rapidly.

**UNITED STATES POPULATION, 1790 to 1860**

![Graph showing population growth from 1790 to 1860](image)

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*
Transportation

Vital to the development of both a national and an industrial economy was an efficient network of interconnecting roads and canals for moving people, raw materials, and manufactured goods.

Roads Pennsylvania’s Lancaster Turnpike, built in the 1790s, connected Philadelphia with the rich farmlands around Lancaster. Its success stimulated the construction of other privately built and relatively short toll roads that, by the mid-1820s, connected most of the country’s major cities.

Despite the need for interstate roads, states’ righters blocked the spending of federal funds on internal improvements. Construction of highways that crossed state lines was therefore unusual. One notable exception was the National, or Cumberland Road, a paved highway and major route to the west extending more than a thousand miles from Maryland to Illinois. It was begun in 1811 and completed in the 1850s, using both federal and state money, with the different states receiving ownership of segments of the highway.

Canals The completion of the Erie Canal in New York State in 1825 was a major event in linking the economies of western farms and eastern cities. The success of this canal in stimulating economic growth touched off a frenzy of canal-building in other states. In little more than a decade, canals joined together all of the major lakes and rivers east of the Mississippi. Improved transportation meant lower food prices in the East, more immigrants settling in the West, and stronger economic ties between the two sections.

Steamboats The age of mechanized, steam-powered travel began in 1807 with the successful voyage up the Hudson River of the Clermont, a steamboat developed by Robert Fulton. Commercially operated steamboat lines soon made round-trip shipping on the nation’s great rivers both faster and cheaper.

Railroads Even more rapid and reliable links between cities became possible with the building of the first U.S. railroad lines in the late 1820s. The early railroads were hampered at first by safety problems, but by the 1830s they were competing directly with canals as an alternative method for carrying passengers and freight. The combination of railroads with the other major improvements in transportation rapidly changed small western towns such as Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, and Chicago into booming commercial centers of the expanding national economy.

Growth of Industry

At the start of the 19th century, a manufacturing economy had barely begun in the United States. By midcentury, however, U.S. manufacturing surpassed agriculture in value, and by century’s end, it was the world’s leader. This rapid industrial growth was the result of a unique combination of factors.

Mechanical Inventions Protected by patent laws, inventors looked forward to handsome rewards if their ideas for new tools or machines proved practical. Eli Whitney was only the most famous of hundreds of Americans whose long hours of tinkering in their workshops resulted in improved
technology. Besides inventing the cotton gin in 1793, Whitney devised a system for making rifles out of interchangeable parts during the War of 1812. Interchangeable parts then became the basis for mass production methods in the new northern factories.

**Corporations for Raising Capital** In 1811, New York passed a law that made it easier for a business to incorporate and raise capital (money) by selling shares of stock. Other states soon imitated New York’s example. Owners of a corporation risked only the amount of money that they invested in a venture. Changes in state corporation laws facilitated the raising of the large sums of capital necessary for building factories, canals, and railroads.

**Factory System** When Samuel Slater emigrated from Britain, he took with him the British secrets for building cotton-spinning machines, and he put this knowledge to work by helping establish the first U.S. factory in 1791. Early in the next century, the embargo and the War of 1812 stimulated domestic manufacturing, and the protective tariffs enacted by Congress helped the new factories prosper.

---

**MAJOR CANALS, ROADS, AND RAILROADS 1820–1850**

![Map of major canals, roads, and railroads in the United States between 1820 and 1850. The map shows the network of railroads, roads, and canals connecting major cities such as Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Charleston, Savannah, Detroit, and Chicago. The map also indicates distances in both miles and kilometers.](image-url)
In the 1820s, New England emerged as the country’s leading manufacturing center as a result of the region’s abundant waterpower for driving the new machinery and excellent seaports for shipping goods. Also, the decline of New England’s maritime industry made capital available for manufacturing, while the decline of farming in the region yielded a ready labor supply. Other northern states with similar resources and problems—New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—followed New England’s lead. As the factory system expanded, it encouraged the growth of financial businesses such as banking and insurance.

**Labor** At first, factory owners had difficulty finding workers for their mills. Factory life could not compete with the lure of cheap land in the West. In response to this difficulty, textile mills in Lowell, Massachusetts, recruited young farm women and housed them in company dormitories. In the 1830s, other factories imitated the Lowell System. Many factories also made extensive use of child labor. (Children as young as seven left home to work in the new factories.) Toward the middle of the century northern manufacturers began to employ immigrants in large numbers.

**Unions** Trade (or craft) unions were organized in major cities as early as the 1790s and increased in number as the factory system took hold. Many skilled workers (shoemakers and weavers, for example) had to seek employment in factories because their earlier practice of working in their own shops (the crafts system) could no longer compete with lower-priced, mass-produced goods. Long hours, low pay, and poor working conditions led to widespread discontent among factory workers. A prime goal of the early unions was to reduce the workday to ten hours. The obstacles to union success, however, were many: (1) immigrant replacement workers, (2) state laws outlawing unions, and (3) frequent economic depressions with high unemployment.

**Commercial Agriculture**

In the early 1800s, farming became more of a commercial enterprise and less a means of providing subsistence for the family. This change to cash crops was brought about by a blend of factors.

**Cheap Land and Easy Credit** Large areas of western land were made available at low prices by the federal government. State banks also made it easy to acquire land by providing farmers with loans at low interest rates.

**Markets** Initially, western farmers were limited to sending their products down the Ohio and Mississippi rivers to southern markets. The advent of canals and railroads opened new markets in the growing factory cities in the East.

**Cotton and the South**

Throughout the 19th century, the principal cash crop in the South was cotton. Eli Whitney’s invention of the cotton gin in 1793 transformed the agriculture of an entire region. Now that they could easily separate the cotton fiber from the seeds, southern planters found cotton more profitable than tobacco and indigo, the leading crops of the colonial period. They invested their capital in the purchase of slaves and new land in Alabama and Mississippi and shipped most of their cotton crop overseas for sale to British textile factories.
Effects of the Market Revolution

Specialization on the farm, the growth of cities, industrialization, and the development of modern capitalism meant the end of self-sufficient households and a growing interdependence among people. These changes combined to bring about a revolution in the marketplace. The farmers fed the workers in the cities, who in turn provided farm families with an array of mass-produced goods. For most Americans, the standard of living increased. At the same time, however, adapting to an impersonal, fast-changing economy presented challenges and problems.

Women As American society became more urban and industrialized, the nature of work and family life changed for women, many of whom no longer worked next to their husbands on family farms. Women seeking employment in a city were usually limited to two choices: domestic service or teaching. Factory jobs, as in the Lowell System, were not common. The overwhelming majority of working women were single. If they married, they left their jobs and took up duties in the home.

In both urban and rural settings, women were gaining relatively more control over their lives. Marriages arranged by one’s parents were less common, and some women elected to have fewer children. Nevertheless, legal restrictions on women remained. For example, they could not vote.

Economic and Social Mobility Real wages improved for most urban workers in the early 1800s, but the gap between the very wealthy and the very poor increased. Social mobility (moving upward in income level and social status) did occur from one generation to the next, and economic opportunities in the United States were greater than in Europe. Extreme examples of poor, hard-working people becoming millionaires, however, were rare.

Slavery At the outset of the 19th century, many people throughout the nation believed and hoped that slavery would gradually disappear. They thought that the exhaustion of soil in the coastal lands of Virginia and the Carolinas and the constitutional ban on the importation of slaves after 1808 would make slavery economically unfeasible. However, the rapid growth of the cotton industry and the expansion of slavery into new states such as Alabama and Mississippi ended hopes for a quiet end to slavery. As the arguments over the Missouri Compromise suggested, the slavery issue defied easy answers.
Population of Enslaved African Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>20,613</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>106,635</td>
<td>102,994</td>
<td>87,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>346,671</td>
<td>469,767</td>
<td>490,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>59,699</td>
<td>217,531</td>
<td>462,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>117,549</td>
<td>435,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>65,659</td>
<td>436,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>111,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All States</td>
<td>893,605</td>
<td>2,009,043</td>
<td>3,953,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State-level data from Historical Census Browser from the University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Data Center. Data drawn from the U.S. Census

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES: WHAT LED TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

The Monroe Doctrine is an example of where historians agree on the basic facts—the words of the document and the events that led up to it—but disagree on the interpretation of them. They disagree on (1) who was chiefly responsible for the Monroe Doctrine, (2) what its primary purpose was, and (3) the extent to which it was influenced by British diplomacy.

Some historians argue that the original inspiration for the doctrine came from Thomas Jefferson, while others attribute the astute thinking of Secretary of State John Quincy Adams. Those crediting Jefferson with the policy of nonintervention in the Western Hemisphere point to his idea of the political world falling into “two spheres,” one European and the other American. Those stressing the key role played by John Quincy Adams argue that Adams (1) had consistently opposed further colonization by a European power and (2) had written the original draft of Monroe’s message to Congress containing the doctrine. Other historians say that, regardless of the roots of the doctrine, Monroe himself deserves the real credit for having made the policy choice and issuing the doctrine.

A second area of contention concerns the real purpose behind the doctrine. Was it aimed primarily, as some historians argue, at stopping the territorial ambitions of Spain, France, and Russia? In the early 1820s, France was threatening to reconquer Spanish colonies in South America, and Russia was advancing southward from Alaska toward the California coast. A contrary view is that Monroe and Adams were chiefly concerned...
about sending a message to Great Britain. Not only was Britain the dominant seapower in 1823, but it was also regarded with suspicion as a traditional foe of American liberty.

A third question revolves around the role of British Foreign Secretary George Canning, whose suggestion for a joint Anglo-U.S. communiqué against the restoration of the Spanish colonies precipitated President Monroe’s declaration. Historians disagree about Canning’s motivation for suggesting the communiqué. Was he more concerned with protecting British political interests by attempting to block a European alliance? Or was he chiefly concerned with cultivating U.S.-British economic cooperation so as to lower U.S. tariff barriers and promote British trading interests?

Historians also disagree on the impact of the Monroe Doctrine. They take conflicting positions on Latin Americans’ perception of U.S. policy and on the influence of the doctrine on U.S. policy in the second half of the 20th century. Amassing facts is just the start of a historian’s task. Equally important is applying critical thought and analysis.

### KEY TERMS BY THEME

**Public Confidence (NAT)**
- Era of Good Feelings
- sectionalism
- James Monroe
- cultural nationalism
- economic nationalism

**Industry (WXT)**
- Tariff of 1816
- protective tariff
- Henry Clay; American System
- Second Bank of the United States
- Panic of 1819
- Lancaster Turnpike National (Cumberland) Road

**Making the Law (POL)**
- Erie Canal
- Robert Fulton; steamboats
- railroads
- Eli Whitney; interchangeable parts corporations
- Samuel Slater
- factory system
- Lowell System; textile mills
- industrialization
- specialization
- unions
- cotton gin
- market revolution

**Foreign Affairs (WOR)**
- John Marshall
- Fletcher v. Peck
- McCulloch v. Maryland
- Dartmouth College v. Woodward
- Gibbons v. Ogden
- implied powers
- Tallmadge Amendment
- Missouri Compromise (1820)

- Stephen Decatur
- Rush-Bagot Agreement (1817)
- Treaty of 1818
- Andrew Jackson
- Florida Purchase Treaty (1819)
- Monroe Doctrine (1823)