

# Handout A: Student Document Packet

## Document Pair 1: Articles of Confederation and U.S. Constitution

### Source:

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/artconf.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/artconf.asp)

### Introduction:

In the Philadelphia Convention, the framers set out to correct some of the problems that had resulted from the weak central authority established in the former governing document, the Articles of Confederation.

| Vocabulary:                                       | Text:   |
|---|---|
| <b>perpetual:</b> (adj)<br>permanent; everlasting | <b>Articles of Confederation, 1781</b><br><br>We the undersigned Delegates of the States . . . agree to certain Articles of Confederation and <b>perpetual</b> Union between the states of New Hampshire, Massachusetts-bay Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. . . .<br><br>Article II. Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.<br><br>Article III. The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever. |
|   | <b>United States Constitution 1789</b><br><br>Preamble<br><br>We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.   |

| Vocabulary: | Text:  |
|-------------|--|
|             | <p><b>Article VI, Section 1, Clause 2:</b></p> <p>“Supremacy Clause”</p> <p>This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.</p> <p>Amendment 10</p> <p>The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.</p> |

### Comprehension and Principles Questions:

1. What were the components of the Union in the Articles of Confederation?
2. What were the components of the Union in the Constitution?
3. According to the Articles of Confederation, where did sovereignty reside?
4. According to the Constitution, where did sovereignty reside?

### Historical Reasoning Questions:

1. What is the difference between a “firm league of friendship” and a “more perfect Union”?
2. Compare the purposes of the league of friendship, as listed in Article III of the excerpt above, with the purposes of the more perfect Union as shown in the Preamble of the Constitution.
3. Place each document name in the appropriate positions on your copy of the spectrum in your notes. Be prepared to explain your reasoning.

\_\_\_\_\_

We the People

We the States

## Document Pair 2: Alien and Sedition Acts, Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions 1798, 1799

### Source:

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/sedact.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/sedact.asp)

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/virres.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/virres.asp)

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/kenres.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/kenres.asp)

### Introduction:

Less than a decade after establishing the Union through the Constitution and implementing individual protections in the Bill of Rights, Congress and President John Adams enacted the Alien and Sedition Acts, which made it a crime to criticize the government. In 1798, in the midst of the Quasi-War with France, these laws reflected the Federalist Party's fears of subversion and dissent thought to be caused by immigrants who were likely to support the Jeffersonian Republican Party. In the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, respectively, anonymously proclaimed each state's loyalty to the Union, but objected to the laws' restrictions on expression and argued that the statutes were unconstitutional. In the Virginia Resolution, Madison wrote that if the central government enacted unconstitutional laws, it was the responsibility of each state to interpose itself, or stand between the citizens and the unjust laws. He later suggested some actions by which the states might use constitutional means to do so. In the Kentucky Resolutions, Jefferson went further, advocating the novel position that the states nullify unconstitutional federal laws by declar-

| Vocabulary: | Text:  |
|-------------|--|
|             | <b>Alien and Sedition Acts 1798</b><br><br>Sedition Act, Section 2<br>If any person shall write, print, utter or publish . . . any false, scandalous and malicious writing . . . against the government of the United States, or either house of the Congress . . . or the . . . President . . . to bring them . . . into contempt or disrepute . . . or to stir up sedition . . . then such person, being thereof convicted before any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment not exceeding two years. |
|             | <b>Virginia Resolution 1798</b><br><br>RESOLVED, That the General Assembly of Virginia, doth unequivocally express a firm resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of this State, against every aggression either foreign or domestic, and that they will support the government of the United States in all measures warranted by the former. . . .  |

**Vocabulary:****Text:**

**compact** (n): voluntary agreement or covenant

**palpable** (adj): obvious; noticeable

**interpose** (v): to stand or insert between one thing and another

That this Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare, that it views the powers of the federal government, as resulting from the **compact**, to which the states are parties; as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting the compact; . . . and that in case of a deliberate, **palpable**, and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, the states who are parties thereto, have the right, and are in duty bound, to **interpose** for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them. . . .

That this state having by its Convention, which ratified the federal Constitution, expressly declared, that among other essential rights, "the Liberty of Conscience and of the Press cannot be cancelled, abridged, restrained, or modified by any authority of the United States," . . . it would mark a reproachable inconsistency, and criminal degeneracy, if an indifference were now shewn, to the most palpable violation of one of the Rights, thus declared and secured;

**nullification** (n): the act of canceling something; declaring something to be empty, null and void

### Kentucky Resolution 1799

THE representatives of the good people of this commonwealth in general assembly convened, . . . respecting certain unconstitutional laws of Congress, commonly called the alien and sedition laws, would be faithless indeed to themselves, and to those they represent, were they silently to acquiesce in principles and doctrines attempted to be maintained in all [the states' responses to the Alien and Sedition Acts], that of Virginia only excepted. . . .

RESOLVED, That this commonwealth considers the federal union, upon the terms and for the purposes specified in the late compact, as conducive to the liberty and happiness of the several states: That it does now unequivocally declare its attachment to the Union, and to that compact, agreeable to its obvious and real intention, and will be among the last to seek its dissolution:

That if those who administer the general government be permitted to transgress the limits fixed by that compact, . . . annihilation of the state governments, and the erection upon their ruins, of a general consolidated government, will be the inevitable consequence: That the principle . . . that the general government is the exclusive judge of the extent of the powers delegated to it, [leads to] despotism; . . . That the several states who formed that instrument, being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction; and that a nullification, by those sovereignties, of all unauthorized acts done under colour of that instrument, is the rightful remedy: . . .

## Comprehension and Principles Questions:

1. In what way were the Alien and Sedition Acts considered unconstitutional? Explain what constitutional principles were at issue.
2. According to the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, whose responsibility was it to protect people against unconstitutional laws enacted by the U.S. government?
3. What constitutional principles are at issue in debates about the relative power of state government compared with national government? Explain your response.

## Historical Reasoning Questions:

1. What elements did the Virginia Resolution and the Kentucky Resolutions have in common?
2. How is Washington's use of the word "consolidate" in the 1787 passage different from the Kentucky Resolutions' use of the term?
3. Explain the concepts of interposition and nullification in your own words.
4. Of the remedies advocated in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, which was more extreme: interposition or nullification? In other words, which remedy goes beyond the structure established in the Constitution? Explain your response.
5. Place each document name in the appropriate positions on your copy of the spectrum in your notes. Be prepared to explain your reasoning.

---

We the People

We the States

## Document Pair 3: : Tariff of 1828 and the South Carolina Exposition and Protest

### Source:

<https://history.house.gov/Historical-Highlights/1800-1850/The-Tariff-of-Abominations/>  
[https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/South\\_Carolina\\_Exposition\\_and\\_Protest](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/South_Carolina_Exposition_and_Protest)  
[https://dc.statelibrary.sc.gov/bitstream/handle/10827/21911/HOUSE\\_CR\\_Exposition\\_and\\_Protest\\_1828-12-19.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://dc.statelibrary.sc.gov/bitstream/handle/10827/21911/HOUSE_CR_Exposition_and_Protest_1828-12-19.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

### Introduction:

Westward movement to claim the vast lands of the Louisiana Purchase brought sectional disputes into sharp relief. Expansion of slavery into new states would tip the balance of power in the U.S. Senate in favor of the slave-based agriculture of the South (although the Three-Fifths Compromise in Article 1, Section 2, limited the extent to which the enslaved population was counted) and against the factory interests of the North. In the Missouri Compromise of 1820, Henry Clay brokered a temporary solution, but sectional controversies remained the main theme of American politics.

President John Quincy Adams and other proponents of the Tariff of 1828, which set a 38 percent tax on almost all imported goods, presented it as a way to protect U.S. industry from British competition. Adams's support of the tariff helped contribute to his defeat by Andrew Jackson in the presidential election that year. Because he was a southerner and a westerner, President Jackson had been expected to oppose the tariff. However, he surprised many by supporting it. Southern leaders saw the tariff as a plot to undermine the South by raising prices on northern goods and cripple the institution of slavery, which had been primarily in the realm of states' powers. In December 1828, Vice President John C. Calhoun wrote and anonymously distributed his "South Carolina Exposition and Protest," in which he maintained the power of the states to veto any national law that violated the U.S. Constitution.

| Vocabulary: | Text:   |
|-------------|---|
|             | <p><b>Tariff of Abomination: The Effects, 1828 (from U. S. House of Representatives Historical Highlights)</b></p> <p>On . . . April 22, 1828, the Tariff of 1828—better known as the Tariff of Abominations—passed the House of Representatives, 105 to 94. The tariff sought to protect northern and western agricultural products from competition with foreign imports; however, the resulting tax on foreign goods would raise the cost of living in the South and would cut into the profits of New England's industrialists. . . . Later that year in response to the tariff, Vice President John C. Calhoun of South Carolina anonymously penned the South Carolina Exposition and Protest, articulating the doctrine of nullification. The doctrine emphasized a state's right to reject federal laws within its borders and questioned the constitutionality of taxing imports without the explicit goal of raising revenue. . . . While other southern states disagreed with the tariff, South Carolina was the only state to invoke nullification. Following a few tense months, South Carolina eventually accepted a compromise tariff in the winter of 1833. The constitutional crisis was only temporarily averted, as tensions remained throughout the Union.</p> |



**Vocabulary:****Text:**

**sovereign** (adj): possessing supreme or ultimate power to rule

**South Carolina Exposition and Protest 1828**

The constitution grants to Congress the power of imposing a duty on imports for revenue which power is abused by being converted into an instrument of rearing up the industry of one section of the country on the ruins of another. . . .

If it be conceded, as it must be by every one who is the least conversant with our institutions, that the sovereign powers delegated are divided between the General and State Governments, and that the latter hold their portion by the same tenure as the former, it would seem impossible to deny to the States the right of deciding on the infractions of their powers, and the proper remedy to be applied for their correction. . . . In fact, to divide power, and to give to one of the parties the exclusive right of judging of the portion allotted to each, is, in reality, not to divide it at all; and to reserve such exclusive right to the General Government (it matters not by what department) to be exercised, is to convert it, in fact, into a great consolidated government, with unlimited powers, and to divest the States, in reality, of all their rights. It is impossible to understand the force of terms, and to deny so plain a conclusion. . . .

The Representatives of the good People of this Commonwealth, anxiously desiring to live in peace with their fellow citizens, and to do all that in them lies to preserve and perpetuate the union of the States and the liberties of which it is the surest pledge, but feeling it to be their bounden duty to expose and resist all encroachments upon the true spirit of the Constitution, . . . do, in the name of the Commonwealth of South Carolina, claim to enter upon the Journals of the Senate, their protest against [the Tariff of 1828] as unconstitutional, oppressive, and unjust.

**Comprehension and Principles Questions:**

1. According to Calhoun, why was the Tariff of 1828 unconstitutional? (Refer to U.S. Constitution Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.)
2. According to Calhoun's reasoning, why did the Tariff of 1828 violate the rule of law?

**Historical Reasoning Questions:**

1. What elements did the ViWhat earlier documents did Calhoun echo by saying that the states must have "the right of deciding othe infractions of their powers, and the proper remedy to be applied for their correction"?
2. Place each document name in the appropriate positions on your copy of the spectrum in your notes. Be prepared to explain your reasoning.

We the People

We the States

## Document Pair 4: The Webster-Hayne Debate 1830

### Source:

[https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Webster-Hayne\\_debate](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Webster-Hayne_debate)

### Introduction:

Calhoun was widely presumed to be the author of the “South Carolina Exposition and Protest,” but he did not acknowledge it until later. Other than having five thousand copies of the document printed and distributed, the South Carolina legislature took no official action directly responding to the pamphlet in 1828. However, in the U.S. Senate, South Carolina Senator Robert Young Hayne gave voice to the Southern objections against the protective tariff. In a series of four speeches between January 19 and January 27, 1830, Hayne and Massachusetts Senator Daniel Webster explored their differing interpretations regarding constitutional powers and the nature of the Union.

| Vocabulary:  | Text:  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>deprecate</b> (v): to de-spise</p> <p><b>dissolution</b> (n):<br/>dissipation, decadence</p> | <p><b>1830 Webster-Hayne Debate</b></p> <p><b>Robert Y. Hayne, South Carolina, January 19, 1830</b></p> <p>Sir, I am one of those who believe that the very life of our system is the independence of the states, and that there is no evil more to be deprecated than the consideration of this government. It is only by a strict adherence to the limitations imposed by the constitution on the federal government, that this system works well, and can answer the great ends for which it was instituted. I am opposed, therefore, in any shape, to all unnecessary extension of the powers, or the influence of the legislature or executive of the union over the states; [or the people of the States;] and, most of all, I am opposed to those partial distributions of favors whether by legislation or appropriation, which has a direct and powerful tendency to spread corruption through the land—to create an abject spirit of dependence—to sow the seeds of dissolution—to produce jealousy among the different portions of the union, and, finally, to sap the very foundations of the government itself.</p> |
|  | <p><b>Daniel Webster, Massachusetts, January 20, 1830</b></p> <p>“In all our deliberations on this subject, we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American, the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds led each state in the convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude, than might have been otherwise expected.”</p> <p>This, sir, is General Washington’s consolidation. This is the true constitutional consolidation. I wish to see no new powers drawn to the general government; but I confess I rejoice in whatever tends to strengthen the bond that unites us; and encourages the hope that our union may be perpetual. . . .</p>   |



| Vocabulary: | Text:  |
|-------------|--|
|             | <p>What they said I believe; fully and sincerely believe, that the union of the states is essential to the prosperity and safety of the States. I am a unionist, and in this sense a national republican. I would strengthen the ties that hold us together.</p> |

### Comprehension and Principles Questions:

1. Senator Hayne objected to what he called the “consolidation of this Government.” How did he explain why that consolidation prevented the system from working well?
2. According to Hayne, what would be the result if the federal government continued to violate the rule of law by implementing laws that extended favoritism to some regions over others?
3. Senator Webster said he did not want new powers drawn to the general government, but he favored “whatever tends to strengthen the bond that unites us.” In your opinion, was it possible for the federal government to strengthen the bond without creating new powers for the general government?

### Historical Reasoning Questions:

1. George Washington in 1787, and Robert Hayne and Daniel Webster in 1830, all used the term “consolidation” to describe changes in the government of the United States. What were the differences in their understanding of this term?
2. Place each speaker’s name in the appropriate positions on your copy of the spectrum in your notes. Be prepared to explain your reasoning.

---

We the People

We the States

## Document Pair 5: South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification and President Jackson's Proclamation to the People of South Carolina 1832

### Source:

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/ordnull.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/ordnull.asp)

<https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsl&fileName=011/llsl011.db&recNum=816>

### Introduction:

After 1828, South Carolina voters elected more politicians who opposed the tariffs, and talk of nullification increased. The Nullification Crisis intensified when Congress enacted the Tariff of 1832, which actually lowered some tariff rates. South Carolina's leaders still considered it a protectionist tariff that threatened the entire economy and way of life in their state. The South Carolina legislature called for a nullification convention based upon Thomas Jefferson's nullification doctrine from 1798–1799. In November 1832, the convention adopted the Ordinance of Nullification, which declared that both the Tariff of 1828 and the Tariff of 1832 were unconstitutional. The ordinance threatened secession if the federal government used force to collect the tariffs in South Carolina, and the state's government prepared for military action. Jackson responded by firmly maintaining the federal government's authority to collect the tariffs, explaining why South Carolina's leaders had misunderstood the nature of the Union, and preparing to use military measures to enforce federal law. At the same time, Jackson worked with members of Congress to implement a compromise tariff bill.

| Vocabulary:  | Text:  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>deprecate</b> (v): to depise</p> <p><b>dissolution</b> (n):<br/>dissipation, decadence</p> | <p><b>South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification, 1832</b></p> <p>We, therefore, the people of the State of South Carolina, in convention assembled, do declare and ordain . . . that the [Tariffs of 1828 and 1832] are unauthorized by the constitution of the United States, and violate the true meaning and intent thereof and are null, void, and no law, nor binding upon this State, its officers or citizens;...</p> <p>And it is further ordained, that it shall not be lawful for any of the constituted authorities, whether of this State or of the United States, to enforce the payment of duties imposed by the said acts within the limits of this State; but it shall be the duty of the [South Carolina] legislature . . . to prevent the enforcement and arrest the operation of the said acts...</p> <p>And it is further ordained, that all persons now holding any office of honor, profit, or trust, civil or military, under this State (members of the legislature excepted), shall, . . . take an oath well and truly to obey, execute, and enforce this ordinance, and such act or acts of the legislature as may be passed in pursuance thereof...</p> |

| Vocabulary:  | Text:  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>compact</b> (n): voluntary agreement or covenant</p> <p><b>palpable</b> (adj): obvious; noticeable</p> <p><b>interpose</b> (v): to stand or insert between one thing and another</p> | <p>We will not submit to the application of force on the part of the federal government, to reduce this State to obedience, but that we will consider the passage, by Congress, of any act authorizing the employment of a military or naval force against the State of South Carolina, her constitutional authorities or citizens; . . . to enforce the acts hereby declared to be null and void, . . . as inconsistent with the longer continuance of South Carolina in the Union; and that the people of this State will henceforth hold themselves absolved from all further obligation to maintain or preserve their political connection with the people of the other States; and will forthwith proceed to organize a separate government, and do all other acts and things which sovereign and independent States may of right do.</p>   |
| <p><b>nullification</b> (n): the act of canceling something; declaring something to be empty, null and void</p>  | <p><b>Proclamation [to the People of South Carolina], 1832</b></p> <p>The said ordinance prescribes to the people of South Carolina a course of conduct in direct violation of their duty as citizens of the United States, contrary to the laws of their country, subversive of its constitution, and having for its object the destruction of the Union. . . .</p> <p>[Our] social compact, in express terms declares, that the laws of the United States, its Constitution, and treaties made under it, are the supreme law of the land. . . .</p> <p>If the doctrine of a State veto upon the laws of the Union carries with it internal evidence of impracticable absurdity, our constitutional history will also afford abundant proof that it would have been repudiated with indignation had it been proposed to form a feature in our government. . . .</p> <p>I consider, then, the power to annul a law of the United States, assumed by one State, incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed. . . .</p> <p>On such expositions and reasonings, the ordinance grounds not only an assertion of the right to annul the laws of which it complains, but to enforce it by a threat of seceding from the Union if any attempt is made to execute [those laws].</p> |

**Vocabulary:****Text:**

This right to secede is deduced from the nature of the Constitution, which, they say, is a compact between Sovereign States, who have preserved their whole sovereignty, and therefore, are subject to no superior; that, because they made the compact, they can break it when, in their opinion, it has been departed from by the other States. Fallacious as this course of reasoning is, it enlists State pride, and finds advocates in the honest prejudices of those who have not studied the nature of our government sufficiently to see the radical error on which it rests.

The people of the United States formed the Constitution, acting through the State legislatures in making the compact, to meet and discuss its provisions, and acting in separate conventions when they ratified those provisions; but the terms used in its construction, show it to be a government in which the people of all the States, collectively, are represented. . . .

The Constitution of the United States then forms a government not a league; and whether it be formed by compact between the States, or in any other manner, its character is the same. It is a government in which all the people are represented, which operates directly on the people individually, not upon the States—they retained all the power they did not grant. But each State having expressly parted with so many powers as to constitute, jointly with the other States, a single nation, cannot, from that period, possess any right to secede . . . Secession, like any other revolutionary act, may be morally justified by the extremity of oppression; but to call it a constitutional right, is confounding the meaning of the terms, and can only be done through gross error, . . .

**Comprehension and Principles Questions:**

1. According to the first paragraph of the Nullification Ordinance excerpt, why were the Tariffs of 1828 and 1832 null, void, and not binding in South Carolina?
2. According to the second paragraph of the Nullification Ordinance excerpt, what did the ordinance require of the South Carolina legislature?
3. What did the third paragraph of the Nullification Ordinance excerpt require officials of South Carolina to do?
4. According to the fourth paragraph of the Nullification Ordinance excerpt, how would South Carolina respond to any use of force by the national government to collect the tariffs within the state?

5. Explain what constitutional principle(s) the authors sought to appeal to in this statement from the Ordinance of Nullification: “the people of this state will henceforth hold themselves absolved from all further obligation to maintain or preserve their political connection with the people of the other states...”
6. The Constitution’s Supremacy Clause in Article VI, Section 2 states, “The Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties...shall be the supreme law of the land . . .” What point did Jackson make in referring to this provision of the Constitution? What principles of government were at issue regarding this point?
7. According to Jackson, why did the idea of secession seem attractive to some people?
8. List at least three terms Jackson used to describe the Ordinance of Nullification and to explain why it was misguided.
9. According to Jackson, under what circumstances would secession be justified?

### Historical Reasoning Questions:

1. What choice did the Nullification Ordinance require citizens of South Carolina to make?
2. Place each speaker’s name in the appropriate positions on your copy of the spectrum in your notes. Be prepared to explain your reasoning.

---

We the People

We the States

# Document Pair 6: “Slavery as a Positive Good,” 1837

**Source:**

<https://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/slavery-a-positive-good/>

**Introduction:**

Although the immediate context of the Nullification Crisis was tariff law, it was clear to all that a government that could enforce tariffs in a state despite widespread objections to those laws could also enforce laws regulating slavery. Since the nation’s Founding, the issue of slavery had threatened the Union, and those threats had been managed by leaving slavery mostly under the jurisdiction of each state. Westward expansion after the Louisiana Purchase and the great wealth available to people able to capitalize on King Cotton brought Southern interests into increasing conflict with the interests of the burgeoning factory economy in the North with respect to national policy. At the same time, reformers inspired by the Second Great Awakening attacked social ills of all kinds. By the 1830s, abolitionism gained strength and its adherents flooded the U.S. Congress with hundreds of thousands of abolitionist petitions. Southerners, seeing their entire economy and social structure jeopardized, articulated a new defense of slavery. They moved away from discussing slavery as a “peculiar institution” and a necessary evil protected by the Constitution as they had during the Founding. Now, southerners defended it as a “positive good,” or an essential component of all civilized and prosperous societies in world history. Furthermore, defenders of slavery rejected the self-evident truth proclaimed at the Founding “that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.” Instead, they sought justification of the idea that the inequality of the races was a scientific and moral truth. John C. Calhoun had long believed that abolitionism and Union could not survive together; in 1837, he gave voice to that view in the U. S. Senate.

| Vocabulary: | Text:  |
|-------------|--|
|             | <p><b>Slavery a Positive Good, 1837</b></p> <p>By the necessary course of events, if left to themselves, we must become, finally, two people. . . . Abolition and the Union cannot coexist. As the friend of the Union I openly proclaim it—and the sooner it is known the better. . . . We of the South will not, cannot, surrender our institutions. To maintain the existing relations between the two races, inhabiting that section of the Union, is indispensable to the peace and happiness of both. It cannot be subverted without drenching the country in blood,.</p> <p>But let me not be understood as admitting, even by implication, that the existing relations between the two races in the slaveholding States is an evil—far otherwise; I hold it to be a good, as it has thus far proved itself to be to both, and will continue to prove so if not disturbed by the fell spirit of abolition....</p> |



| Vocabulary: | Text:  |
|-------------|--|
|             | <p>Compare [the slave’s] condition with the tenants of the poor houses in [the North and in Europe] —look at the sick, and the old and infirm slave, on one hand, in the midst of his family and friends, under the kind superintending care of his master and mistress, and compare it with the forlorn and wretched condition of the pauper in the poorhouse. . . .</p> <p>There is and always has been in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts us from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and which explains why it is that the political condition of the slaveholding States has been so much more stable and quiet than that of the North.</p> |

### Comprehension and Principles Questions:

1. According to the first paragraph of the Nullification Ordinance excerpt, why were the Tariffs of 1828 and Explain why Calhoun believed that “Abolition and the Union cannot coexist”.
2. What did Calhoun assert regarding a comparison between enslaved workers and the poor factory workers of cities?
3. Explain at least one constitutional principle implicit in Calhoun’s reasoning.

### Historical Reasoning Questions:

1. Why do you think John C. Calhoun initially wrote the 1828 South Carolina Exposition and Protest anonymously? Why do you think he was willing to openly present his thoughts on slavery in a Senate speech in 1837?
2. How did John C. Calhoun’s position on slavery differ from the way the Constitution’s framers handled the slavery issue?
3. Place each speaker’s name in the appropriate positions on your copy of the spectrum in your notes. Be prepared to explain your reasoning.

\_\_\_\_\_

We the People

\_\_\_\_\_

We the States

# Student Handout Part 2 Version A

## Guiding Question

Civics Connection Unit 3 Guiding Question: How did the expansion of the country and slavery lead to a sectional debate about the nature of the Union and the doctrine of nullification? Why is it significant to understand the nature of the Union?

## Graphic Organizer:

Nature of the Union and Nullification Version A

## Instructions:

The government of the United States can be described as having been organized by “We the People” or “We the States” with documents over time expressing both themes. Use your analysis of the documents in part 1 of this packet to complete the part 2 graphic organizer: Nature of the Union and Nullification.

First, write the name of each document in the proper column below: We the People or We the States. Then, for each excerpt in part 1, fill in the main idea in your own words, and write how it helps readers understand the debate over the nature of the Union. Also fill in constitutional principles addressed in each document excerpt and be prepared to explain your choices. Among others, be sure to consider constitutional principles of federalism, rule of law, and consent. The first pair of documents is filled in as an example.

- Articles of Confederation, 1781
- U.S. Constitution, 1789
- Alien and Sedition Acts, 1798
- Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, 1798, 1799
- Tariff of 1828 (“Tariff of Abominations”)
- South Carolina Exposition and Protest, 1828
- Webster-Hayne Debate: Daniel Webster, 1830
- Webster-Hayne Debate: Robert Hayne, 1830
- South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification, 1832
- Proclamation to the People of South Carolina, 1832
- “Slavery as a Positive Good” speech, John C. Calhoun, 1837

| We the People:   | Principles:             | We the States:  |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| <b>U.S. Constitution, 1789</b><br>We the People were sovereign; this frame of government was designed to provide for a “more perfect Union.” | Rule of law; federalism | <b>Articles of Confederation, 1781</b><br>The states were sovereign; this plan provided for a firm league of friendship. The central government was too weak to provide a competent government for the new nation, leading to the 1787 convention, which produced a new constitution. |
|  |                         |   |
|  |                         |   |
|  |                         |   |
|  |                         |   |
|  |                         |   |

## Student Handout Part 2 Version B

### Guiding Question

Civics Connection Unit 3 Guiding Question: How did the expansion of the country and slavery lead to a sectional debate about the nature of the Union and the doctrine of nullification? Why is it significant to understand the nature of the Union?

### Graphic Organizer:

Nature of the Union and Nullification Version B

### Instructions:

The government of the United States can be described as having been organized by “We the People” or “We the States” with documents over time expressing both themes. Use your analysis of the document excerpts in part 1 of this packet to complete the part 2 graphic organizer: Nature of the Union and Nullification. For each document excerpt listed, fill in the main idea in your own words, and write how it helps readers understand the debate over the nature of the Union. Also fill in constitutional principles addressed in each excerpt and be prepared to explain your choices. Among others, be sure to consider constitutional principles of federalism, rule of law, and consent.

| We the People:                                     | Principles: | We the States:                                      |
|--|-------------|---|
| U.S. Constitution, 1789                            |             | Articles of Confederation, 1781                     |
| Alien and Sedition Acts, 1798                      |             | Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, 1798, 1799       |
| Tariff of 1828 (“Tariff of Abominations”)          |             | South Carolina Exposition and Protest, 1828         |
| Senator Daniel Webster, 1830                       |             | Senator Robert Young Hayne, 1830                    |
| Proclamation to the People of South Carolina, 1832 |             | South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification, 1832     |
|  |             | “Slavery as a Positive Good,” John C. Calhoun, 1837 |