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When Thomas Jefferson became president of the United States in 1801, the Democratic-Republican party appeared to be strong and united. Yet throughout the years of 1804-1806, a third party composed of discontented Republicans and some Federalists appeared in the states of Pennsylvania, New York, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware and Virginia. These Republicans obtained the title of "Tertium Quids," meaning "a third something." The Quid revolt eventually extended into the United States Congress, where John Randolph, a major Republican leader in the House of Representatives, broke with the president. But by 1808 almost all of the Quids had rejoined the party by helping to elect James Madison to the presidency. The purpose of this study is to determine the circumstances surrounding the Quid revolt, to examine the intricate state and national politics of the period, and to observe how Jefferson handled this challenge to his authority.

The Randolph Papers, located at the University of Virginia, are unavailable on microfilm, but some of Randolph's
correspondence are in the *James Monroe Papers*, and his speeches from 1804 to 1808 are in the *Annals of Congress*. The *Philadelphia Aurora General Advertiser* describes the politics of Pennsylvania and other states. Jefferson's correspondence in the *Works of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Paul L. Ford (1904-1905), provides information about the president's attitudes and policies toward the Quid revolt.

Only New York and Pennsylvania had organized Quid factions. In Pennsylvania the Quids supported Governor Thomas McKean, the existing state constitution and a gradual reform of the judiciary system. The majority Republicans were anti-McKean and favored constitutional revision and rapid judicial reform. In New York two influential families, the pro-Quid Livingstons and the Clintonians, were fighting for the control of the Republican party. Republican divisions within the other states were the result of local controversies over political patronage, state policies and personalities. Jefferson conducted a policy of neutrality toward state revolts by permitting Republicans to achieve reconciliation among themselves.

John Randolph publicly broke with the national administration in 1806, when he declared that he was a Quid. Jefferson did not ignore this Quid revolt in Congress but retaliated by
removing Randolph's followers and forcing the passage of legislation opposed by Randolph. Randolph and his supporters never united with the Quids on the state level. When Randolph broke with the administration, it would have been logical for him to have created a national third party. Yet the Virginian made no effort to consolidate discontented Republicans, and he did not request the aid of powerful Quids in New York or Pennsylvania.

The presidential election of 1808 proved that Jefferson's policy toward the Quids was a success. When the Quids in the states returned to the Republican party, they continued their loyalty to the national administration by supporting James Madison, Jefferson's chosen successor, because they had no ill feelings toward Jefferson's policy of neutrality in state politics. Since the president had successfully crushed the Quid revolt in Congress, those who opposed his administration on the national level became associated with Randolph and his followers. Thus James Monroe, whom Randolph and his Quids supported, could never attack the administration publicly because Republicans and the public would associate him with "traitors" to Jefferson and the Republican party.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1801 Thomas Jefferson became the third president of the United States. At this time the Democratic-Republican party appeared to be strong and united, while the Federalists were the weak opposition party. Yet in 1804 Jefferson predicted that the Federalists would make a concerted effort to return to political power. They intended to accomplish their objective by dividing the Democratic-Republicans and joining with a minority Republican faction. In order for the minority Republicans and Federalists to work together, both groups had to sacrifice principles. Jefferson declared that "a bastard system of federo-republicanism will rise on the ruins of the true principles of our revolution."¹

Throughout the years of 1804-1806, Jefferson's predictions appeared to be correct. A third party composed of discontented Republicans and some Federalists appeared in the states of Pennsylvania, New York, Rhode Island, New

Jersey, Delaware and Virginia. These Republicans obtained the title of "Tertium Quids," meaning "a third something." The Quid revolt eventually extended into the United States Congress, where John Randolph, a major Republican leader in the House of Representatives, broke with the president. Other Republicans that joined John Randolph included Nathaniel Macon, Speaker of the House, Joseph Nicholson, representative from Maryland and Joseph Clay, representative from Pennsylvania. But by 1808 almost all of the Quids rejoined the party by helping to elect James Madison to the presidency. The purpose of this study is to determine the circumstances surrounding the end of the Quid revolt in 1808, to examine the intricate state and national politics of the period, and to observe how Jefferson handled this challenge to his authority.
CHAPTER II

JEFFERSON AND PENNSYLVANIA

The word "Quid" probably originated in June of 1803 in the pro-Jeffersonian Philadelphia Aurora General Advertiser. The newspaper attacked moderates within the Republican party of Pennsylvania as "mediums between good and evil." Since the moderates did not clarify their political views, they were "Tertium Quids." In another issue, the Aurora defined a "Tertium Quid" as "a thing of a negative character or a neutral quality, which is like John Adams' republicanism, . . . anything or nothing." 2

By 1804 the term "Quid" had become an established political word in the Aurora. In May, 1804, the Aurora attacked the Quids for attempting to take control of Philadelphia County from the majority Republicans. The Aurora also defended Michael Leib, who had been attacked by the Freeman's Journal, a Quid paper, declaring that Leib was an outstanding United States representative from

1Philadelphia Aurora General Advertiser, 22 June 1803. Hereafter cited as the Aurora.

2John Adams was, of course, a Federalist. Ibid., 21 May 1804.
Philadelphia. In a later issue the *Aurora* stated that Tench Coxe, purveyor of supplies in Philadelphia, was the leader of the Quids in Pennsylvania and the major writer of the *Freeman's Journal*. It asserted that Coxe was an "intriguer and a traitor." The Quid revolt thus began in Pennsylvania with these incidents. As early as 1803 Albert Gallatin, secretary of the treasury, had warned Jefferson of the approaching schism among Keystone State Republicans. The president informed Gallatin that he realized "a schism was taking place in Pennsylvania between the moderates and high flyers." These moderates were conservative Republicans, who supported Governor Thomas McKean, the present state constitution, and a gradual reform of the judiciary system. The "high flyers" were radical Republicans, who favored Michael Leib and William Duane, editor of the *Aurora*, constitutional revision and rapid judicial reform.

---

3 Ibid., 19 May 1804.

4 Ibid., 24 August 1804.


In 1802 McKean had won a second term as governor of Pennsylvania by a 30,000-vote majority. The future of the Democratic-Republicans appeared to be bright in Pennsylvania. Nevertheless dissension occurred between 1803 and 1804, when the legislature attempted to modify the judicial system and to impeach judges of the state courts. McKean opposed these measures, which alienated Republicans within his party.  

Each year the governor had recommended judicial reform in his opening address to the legislature. McKean suggested that the number of judges on the Pennsylvania Supreme Court should be increased in order to handle the greater volume of business. The county courts should be reorganized, and the High Court of Errors and Appeals should be abolished. Instead the legislators proposed their own reforms. They believed that the courts should be returned to the people; the means of accomplishing this objective was to increase the powers of the justices of the peace. In 1803 McKean

---


vetoed such an act by declaring that the law gave too much jurisdiction to magistrates, with no rules for their conduct. 9 The assembly or the lower house of the legislature overruled his veto, but the state senate failed to comply. Next year both houses of the legislature passed the Hundred Dollars Act, which allowed justices of the peace to handle civil cases under $100. McKean did not sign the law, but according to the state constitution it became law within ten days without the governor's signature.10

Alexander Addison was a Federalist judge of the fifth Pennsylvania judicial district and many times had criticized the principles of democracy to grand juries. Both McKean and the legislature agreed to impeach him. At one trial Addison refused to permit John Lucas, associate judge of Allegheny County, to address the grand jury. Lucas took the case to the state supreme court, which ruled that every judge had a right to express his opinion. Lucas tried again to speak to a grand jury at an Addison court, but was denied. Addison's refusal became the means by which the senate convicted him, with a two-thirds majority vote.11

10 Aurora, 22 March 1804, 14 April 1804.
11 Higginbotham, Keystone in the Democratic Arch, pp. 53-55.
One of the more controversial cases in Pennsylvania history was the Passmore Case. Thomas Passmore had his ships insured by several insurance companies. When one of the vessels became damaged, Passmore submitted his claim to an arbitration court, which ruled in his favor. A few weeks later the firm of Pettit and Bayard, one of the insurers, filed an exception, an oral or written legal objection, in the state supreme court to the judgment. At this time Passmore hung upon a coffee-house door a paper denouncing Pettit and Bayard. They brought it before the state supreme court, saying that Passmore should be summoned for contempt, since an exception was on file. The court summoned Passmore and told him to give a public apology. Passmore informed the court that he was not aware of an exception against him and refused to give an apology. The court fined him fifty dollars and sentenced him to thirty days in jail.\textsuperscript{12} Then Passmore sent a petition to the legislature asking for relief. The House complied by impeaching Chief Justice Edward Shippen and Associate Justices Jasper Yates and Thomas Smith for their misconduct in the Passmore Case by a vote of fifty-seven to forty.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12}Aurora, 6 February 1804, 20 March 1804.
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., 22 March 1804.
The controversy accelerated when Hugh Brackenridge, associate justice of the state supreme court, sent a letter dated March 22, 1804, to the assembly asking to be impeached. He stated that he had not been present at the first and second hearings but had concurred with the other three judges. Brackenridge believed that their impeachment was politically motivated because they were Federalists, and he was the lone Republican on the court. \textsuperscript{14} Two-thirds of the legislature retaliated by adopting a resolution requiring McKean to remove Brackenridge. \textsuperscript{15}

McKean refused to remove the judge, causing the \textit{Aurora} to enter into the controversy on the side of the legislature. Since the legislators represented the will of the people, and two-thirds of the legislature had passed a resolution without the governor's consent, McKean had to obey the law. The governor's reason for dissent was that "the legislature has done what they ought not to have done, and left undone that which they ought to have done." The \textit{Aurora} declared that this was libel, and McKean had no right to tell the legislature what it ought or ought not to do. \textsuperscript{16} Ironically

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 28 March 1804.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 5 April 1804.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 6 April 1804.
on January 28, 1805, the three judges failed to be convicted by the senate with the necessary two-thirds majority.\textsuperscript{17}

In addition to party friction at the state level, there was factionalism at the local level. In the early 1800's William Duane and his close associate Michael Leib controlled the politics of the city and county of Philadelphia. In 1802 a group of moderates attempted to defeat Leib, then a candidate for the United States Congress. Again in 1803 the Rising Sun faction, which acquired its name from a protest meeting at the Rising Sun Inn, tried to oppose party regulars in the county, without any success. In 1804 opposition to Duane and Leib increased when William McCorkle established the Freeman's Journal to oppose the Aurora. In that year these minority Republicans, referred to as Quids by the Aurora, tried to oppose Leib's reelection to the United States Congress by selecting William Penrose. Leib won by a small majority. Duane and Leib believed that McKean had secretly supported the Quids in Philadelphia because such opposition leaders as Tench Coxe and Alexander J. Dallas, federal district attorney, were friends of McKean.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., 30 January 1805.

\textsuperscript{18}James Hedley Peeling, "Governor McKean and the Pennsylvania Jacobins," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 54 (1930):333-34.
To complicate Pennsylvania politics further, a fight over federal patronage reached the boiling point in Philadelphia in 1803, bringing Jefferson into the conflict. Duane and Leib organized a movement to force Jefferson to remove Federalist officeholders. Then a group of United States congressmen drew up a letter in February, 1803, declaring that they supported the work of Jefferson and that opposition to his policies came from a "small minority," particularly from "interested individuals."\(^{19}\) Because of the disapproval of Leib and Duane, a second letter was prepared which deleted the above words. Neither letter ever reached Jefferson. Yet, according to the Aurora, Tench Coxe circulated the first letter in Philadelphia, causing further dissension among Republicans.\(^{20}\) A number of ward meetings occurred in Philadelphia which produced memorials urging the president to remove Federalists and those who were hostile to Republican principles.\(^{21}\)

In a letter to Gallatin, Jefferson expressed his concern about the ward meetings in Philadelphia. Both men agreed

---

\(^{19}\) The representatives who signed the letter were Andrew Gregg, Robert Brown, J. Vanhorn, John Stewart, James Hanah, John Smily and William Jones. \textit{Aurora}, 6 August 1805.

\(^{20}\) \textit{Ibid.}

\(^{21}\) \textit{Ibid.}, 11, 17, 31 March 1803.
that the memorials should be answered; however, the best alternative was to send an answer to one of the members who attended some of these meetings. Jefferson decided to write to Duane, one of the signers, to explain his policies about removals. He believed that the schism in Pennsylvania would create a faction to oppose him.\(^{22}\)

Jefferson planned to inform Duane that he acknowledged receipt of the addresses from the ward meetings, but he could not answer the memorials publicly. He feared that an opposition party would make use of his reply and asked Duane to keep the letter private. Jefferson stated that he believed the federal constitution gave him the power to decide upon appointments and removals with approval by the United States Senate. The petitions from ward meetings were an additional infringement upon his powers. At the present time only 130 Federalists held offices out of 316 appointed by Jefferson. Of the federal offices in Pennsylvania five out of eight major offices were occupied by Republicans. Jefferson also approved McKean’s removal policies as acceptable to the citizens of Pennsylvania.\(^{23}\)


\(^{23}\)Jefferson to William Duane, 24 July 1803, ibid., pp. 131-32.
Gallatin saw the intended letter to Duane, but he did not see the need for sending it. He believed that the letter would commit Jefferson to an inflexible removal policy. According to the secretary of treasury, a schism would occur, but there would be only a few malcontents and the people would cure the evil. Jefferson complied with Gallatin's wishes and never sent the letter to Duane. After several months the issue of federal patronage ceased to be a volatile one in Philadelphia.

Gallatin did not have the same faith in McKean as did Jefferson. Gallatin believed that McKean's measures and the desire for jobs for his relatives in 1802 had caused the split. Also Michael Leib added to the dissension and was waiting for the appropriate moment to increase his political power. Gallatin said, "The vanity, the nepotism, and the indiscretion of Governor McKean afforded that opportunity." Duane had added to the schism by believing that he alone had overthrown the Federalists and had not been amply rewarded by Jefferson or McKean. In revenge he used the Aurora to produce division. Thus Republican


leaders, in Gallatin's eyes, had created a schism in Pennsylvania. 26

By 1804 Republican quarrels in Pennsylvania had become serious. There were disputes about federal patronage, the influence of the Leib-Duane faction in Philadelphia and state politics, and the struggle of Governor Thomas McKean with the state legislature over judicial reform and impeachment. In 1805 the legislature and the Duane-Leib faction formed an alliance against McKean. The Freeman's Journal declared that the Quids supported McKean in his struggle against the legislature. 27 Jefferson wrote, "Pennsylvania seems to have in its bowels a good deal of volcanic matter and some explosion may be expected." 28 That explosion was the gubernatorial election of 1805.

After the justices failed to be removed by the state senate, the Aurora provided another issue to divide Republicans. On February 9, 1805, the Aurora urged that an amendment be added to the constitution to reduce the tenure


27 Higginbotham, Keystone in the Democratic Arch, p. 75.

of judges and to simplify judicial proceedings. The paper asserted that the people should release themselves from lawyers by altering the constitution. 29

In the latter part of February there were a number of petitions sent to the legislature calling for a constitutional convention. These suggested certain revisions: each senator should be elected annually rather than every four years; the patronage and the veto power of the governor should be limited; judges should be elected yearly; and judicial proceedings simplified. The Aurora hoped that the legislature would comply with these memorials. 30

The Society of Constitutional Republicans, supported by the Quids, was formed in March of 1805, to oppose requests for a constitutional convention aimed at altering the state constitution. This society established a correspondence committee to organize supporters throughout the state and issued an address supporting McKean. 31

In retaliation, the Democrats or majority Republicans created the Society of the Friends of the People. Their leaders included Thomas Leiper, Joseph Clay, Michael Leib

29 Aurora, 9 February 1805.
30 Ibid., 28 February 1805.
31 Higginbotham, Keystone in the Democratic Arch, p. 162.
and William Duane. Its constitution required each member to affirm his belief in the Declaration of Independence and his desire to amend the state constitution. The penalty for disobeying the rules of the society was expulsion. The society formed a committee of correspondence to organize support for constitutional revision throughout Pennsylvania.  

Gradually the county societies of the Democrats and Quids replaced the Republican county committee systems. Each society attempted to send the largest number of memorials to the legislature for and against revision of the state constitution. A special committee from the assembly gave its report in April. It decided that not enough petitions had been received from the people and recommended waiting until the next session of the legislature to reach a decision. The assembly accepted the committee's report, and the call for a constitutional convention was postponed indefinitely. The Constitutional Republicans had won a victory with the delay; however, the call never occurred.

McKean further alienated the legislature by vetoing two more bills in March, 1805. One bill would have granted the

32 In order to distinguish between the two Republican factions, both the Duane-Leib group and the anti-McKean Republicans will be referred to as Democrats, and the minority Republicans as Quids. Aurora, 29 March 1805.

33 Ibid., 2 April 1805.
legislature power to appoint the comptroller and registrar-generals. The governor declared that this was an invasion of his appointive powers, that the legislature was a poor judge of character, and that one person was better qualified to make appointments. The other act would have made changes within the judicial process. McKean opposed the measure because the accused could not have a trial by jury "until after the cause shall be tried and decided by referees." If the first trial found the accused guilty, the second trial with a jury could have already prejudged the case. The governor explained that according to the state constitution a judge's salary could not be diminished while in office; however, this act proposed to lower a judge's salary by $1,300. McKean declared that the law was unconstitutional. Both houses of the legislature were unable to override the governor's veto.

On April 3, 1805, a caucus of legislators nominated Simon Snyder of Northumberland, speaker of the house, for governor. On the same day thirty-four members of the

34 Reed, ed., Pennsylvania Archives, 4th ser., 4:560-64.


36 Aurora, 5 April 1805.
legislature, including all eight Federalists, nominated McKean. At last the schism was official. The governor had the support of the Quids and later the Federalists. The Leib-Duane faction and a majority of the legislature supported Snyder. Gallatin estimated that the Quids strength was one-fourth or one-third of the Republican party.

The issue of constitutional revision, the Federalists' alliance with the Quids, and the German voters in Berks and Northampton Counties would decide the campaign of 1805. First the Aurora attempted to attack McKean's stand on constitutional revision by producing statements from Daniel Montgomery and Abraham McKenny, state assemblymen, who described a conversation they had with the governor. The men stated that McKean had referred to the originators of the constitutional convention as "liars, rascals and villains," and supporters of the measure as "stupid geese." The governor further added that the present constitution had been created by intelligent men, and there was no need for a group of "ignorant clodhoppers" to alter the document.

37 Higginbotham, Keystone in the Democratic Arch, p. 89.
39 Aurora, 20 May 1805.
In a letter to the *Aurora* McKean gave his version of the incident. The governor said he had used the word "clodpole" rather than "clodhoppers" to refer to a writer of an article who had returned to farming and would oppose lawyers and the rich classes in the next election. According to McKean the promoters of the constitutional convention were "weak, mischievous and wicked," and people who signed the petitions were "grossly ignorant." The *Aurora* attacked the letter as erroneous.

The above letter did not do much damage to McKean's campaign. The Quids attacked the Democrats as being against McKean and the existing constitution. The Democrats attempted to make the election a refutation of the governor's policies and later in the campaign tried to ignore constitutional revision as an issue. But it was too late, for the constitutional question had caused the Federalists to join the Quids. Although Alexander Dallas wanted the Federalists to support the constitution and the Quid candidates, he feared that the Federalists would control the Quids through a political union. By September, 1805, the Quids were

---

40 McKean to Dallas, 25 May 1805, *ibid.*, 3 June 1805.
willing to obtain Federalist support, and in turn the Federalists gave their assistance to McKean.\textsuperscript{41}

The final blow to the Democrats was a letter read by Joseph Hiester from Peter Muhlenberg before a group of German farmers in Berks County. Both men had served in the Pennsylvania legislature and had considerable influence with the German population in the state. Muhlenberg wrote that he had supported McKean because "an alteration would . . . produce the most unhappy consequences to the peaceable farmer." He referred to a toast made at a July 4th Democratic meeting, which asked for an "equal distribution of property." At the thought of losing their large farms, the German farmers opposed Snyder's election. The \textit{Aurora} declared that the toast was for an "equal distribution of justice," but the damage had been done.\textsuperscript{42} With the aid of the Quids, Federalists and German farmers, McKean was reelected governor by a slim majority of 4,766 votes.\textsuperscript{43} Jefferson's fears for the formation of a "bastard system of federo-republicanism" appeared to be correct.

\textsuperscript{41}Higginbotham, \textit{Keystone in the Democratic Arch}, pp. 94-96.

\textsuperscript{42}Excerpts of the Muhlenberg letter are found in the \textit{Aurora}, 21, 24 September 1805.

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., 24 December 1805.
Throughout 1804-1805 both factions of Pennsylvania Republicans requested help from Jefferson's administration by sending letters to members of his cabinet and to the president. Andrew Ellicott, a Quix, informed Secretary of State James Madison that he had anticipated McKean's reelection in 1805. He predicted that the alliance of discontented Republicans would continue to oppose the Aurora and the ambitions of Michael Leib and Joseph Clay. Ellicott was upset by the claims of Duane and Leib that they possessed the full confidence of Jefferson. He said, "By this finesse, the popularity of the president is brought forward by a few unprincipled adventurers to aid them in their attacks upon government and constitution." Ellicott insinuated that he would like to have Madison refute these claims of confidence by Leib and Duane.44

Albert Gallatin, who was from Pennsylvania, received a large amount of correspondence from friends. Joseph Nicholson, representative from Maryland, warned Gallatin that Duane intended to attack Madison and him in the Aurora.45


45 Nicholson to Gallatin, 10 May 1803, Adams, Life of Gallatin, p. 311.
Alexander Dallas informed Gallatin that the *Aurora* had attacked the state constitution and McKean. He said, "The evil of the day has obviously proceeded from the neglect of Dr. Leib's official pretensions, and Duane's assertions that he possesses the confidence and acts at the instance of the President . . . ." 46 In another letter Dallas asserted that the administration should take some positive steps in order to prevent Republicanism from falling into anarchy. He accused Duane and Leib of abusing their privilege of freedom of the press and asserted that efforts must be made "to resist the tyranny of printers." 47

In 1804 Jefferson informed Gideon Granger, the postmaster general, that he could not believe that loyal Republicans in Pennsylvania would join with Federalists in a political alliance. If this did happen, the two factions would be unable to influence other states in a revolt against his authority. 48 Yet the next year in a letter to Wilson Cary Nicholas, Republican leader of Virginia, Jefferson

---

46 Dallas to Gallatin, 4 April 1805, ibid., p. 330.

47 Dallas to Gallatin, 16 January 1805, ibid., p. 327.

stated that he anticipated Republican divisions, but these schisms disturbed him. 

In a number of letters Jefferson explained how he would handle the divisions among Keystone State Republicans. He wrote to Secretary of the Navy Robert Smith, "We must be neutral between the discordant republicans, but not between them and their common enemies [Federalists]." In another letter to George Logan, a Quid, he wrote, "The duty of an upright administration is to pursue its course steadily, to know nothing of these family dissensions, and to cherish the good principles of both parties." In order to demonstrate his neutrality between the two factions he told Michael Leib that he would not take sides against Snyder or McKea in the gubernatorial election of 1805, and he had "long since made up my mind on the propriety of the general government's taking no side in state quarrels."

Jefferson's policy was obviously one of neutrality. By not supporting either Quids or Democrats in Pennsylvania, neither faction would have a motive to resist Jefferson's

49 Jefferson to Nicholas, 26 March 1805, ibid., p. 137.
50 Jefferson to Smith, 28 August 1804, ibid., p. 99.
51 Jefferson to Logan, 11 May 1805, ibid., p. 142.
52 Jefferson to Leib, 12 August 1805, ibid., p. 143.
hegemony within the Republican party. Throughout the remainder of his administration, Jefferson continued with an impartial attitude toward the two factions. In 1806 the president told William Duane that he did not have a preference for moderates or Quids for federal offices. Later he wrote to Andrew Ellicott, "For my part I determined from the first dawn of the first schism never to take part in any schism of republicans, nor in disturbing the public trusts ever to ask of which section a party was."

After the gubernatorial election of 1805, Jefferson's policy of neutrality appeared to be succeeding. The Federalists and the Quids were subject to divisions. The first sign of a split occurred on November 18, 1805, when the Federalists selected one John Hallowell for state senator from Philadelphia. Two days later the Federalists met with the Quids; whereby they agreed upon a quid as chairman for the meeting. Then Dallas and part of the Quids walked out because a Federalist had been selected as secretary. Dallas and his group had a separate meeting and selected for senator, Samuel Wetherill, who refused the nomination. Dallas had

53 Jefferson to Duane, 22 March 1806, ibid., p. 242.
54 Jefferson to Ellicott, 1 November 1806, ibid., p. 200.
the Society of Constitutional Republicans disbanded in mid-December, 1805, and urged discontented Republicans to rejoin the Republican party. The Democrats chose John Dorsey, who won by 200 votes.55

Trouble occurred in the assembly, when the Democrats added an amendment to a bill, suggesting that the legislature expressed their "confidence in the executive of the United States." The purpose of the Democrats was to get the Federalists and Quids to vote along traditional party lines. The amendment passed by a narrow margin. Since there were thirty-six nays, some Quids voted with the fourteen Federalists against the amendment.56 These two incidents showed that the Pennsylvania Quids were in a dilemma. They did not want to be dominated by the Federalists, and they desired to continue their allegiance with the national administration. Yet the Democratic leaders would not permit them to return to the Republican party.

McKean further embarrassed the Quids when he removed a large number of Democrats from office and placed his relatives and supporters in positions of importance. In his

55Higginbotham, Keystone in the Democratic Arch, pp. 104-05.
56Aurora, 27 December 1805.
opening address to the legislature in December, 1805, he continued to urge that the number of judges be increased. The governor also launched an attack upon those newspapers, which had injured the Quid's relations with the press. 57

The newspapers retaliated against his assaults, especially the Aurora, which said that McKean had a "despotic character, a selfish and cold-blooded malignity," and was insolent and arrogant. 58

In the elections of 1806 the disheartened Quids again faced problems with their Federalist allies in Philadelphia. Both parties met at a general ward meeting and agreed upon a slate of Federalist and Quid candidates, except for the city ticket. Then they had separate meetings. In the city the Federalists selected their candidates and in the county the Quids made their choices. 59 With separate tickets the Quids and Federalists had little hope of crushing Leib's and Duane's influence.

The Quids decided to put almost all of their efforts into the sheriff's race, which proved to be the more controversial. The Aurora accused William Donaldson, the Quid

58 Aurora, 17 January 1806.
59 Ibid., 24 September 1806.
candidate, of taking public money for private use when he was president of the Philadelphia board of health.\textsuperscript{60} Later Mahlon Dickerson, state adjutant general, accused Frederick Wolbert, the Democratic candidate, of gross negligence as collector of city taxes.\textsuperscript{61} Naturally both candidates denied the charges; whereby each then claimed that his opponent was corrupt. The election was close, with Wolbert winning the election, but supporters of Donaldson claimed that their candidate was the true victor.

The disputed results went to McKean for a decision. The governor referred the controversy over the sheriff's election to a special commission, which declared ninety-one votes to be illegal and gave seven votes to Donaldson. Since no one knew for whom the illegal votes had been cast, McKean proposed that the present sheriff, John Barker, a McKean man, would continue in office until the next general election.\textsuperscript{62} Leib and Duane believed that the governor had used his power to prevent the election of their candidate; however, the Democrats obtained a majority of six in the house.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{60}Ibid., 20 September 1806.
\textsuperscript{61}Ibid., 7 October 1806.
\textsuperscript{63}\textit{Aurora}, 19 November 1806.
For purposes of revenge Leib and Duane decided to have Thomas McKean impeached. On January 27, 1807, Leib, now in the assembly, declared the governor had not signed bills, but had placed his personal stamp upon them. Leib claimed that according to the constitution McKean must place his signature on all public documents. A few days later Leib submitted a resolution asking for a committee to examine the governor's conduct. Not until March 3, was a committee established to inquire into McKean's actions.  

A few weeks later the committee urged the impeachment of the governor. Some of the major counts were: (1) McKean had prevented Wolbert from being elected sheriff; (2) he had used his stamp upon public documents rather than signing his name; (3) and he forced Duane to withdraw his case against Joseph B. McKean, the governor's son, and others for their assault upon Duane in 1799. In April of 1807, the assembly impeached McKean by a vote of forty-four to forty. The impeachment trial of McKean had to wait until the next session of the legislature, when the trial received a general postponement.

---

64 Ibid., 29 January, 7 February, 6 March 1807.
65 Ibid., 3 April 1807.
66 Ibid., 11 April 1807.
By March, 1807, the Duane-Leib faction still controlled the politics of Philadelphia, and Leib appeared secure in the legislature. Nevertheless the election of 1807 proved to be a disaster for them. The Synderites began to compete with Duane and Leib for control of the Democrats. Leib had made the mistake of secretly opposing Snyder in 1805 for the governor's race and again opposed him for the speakership of the assembly in 1806. The supporters of Snyder believed that they could not trust Duane and Leib; whereby they decided that there should be another newspaper in Philadelphia to oppose the Aurora. Their selection was the Democratic Press, whose editor was John Binns.

During the early 1800's John Binns had been editor of the Republican Argus in Northumberland County. Both Duane and Binns advocated the same candidates, supported the same principles, and were close friends. Early in 1807 Binns went to Philadelphia to establish a paper. Duane and other Republicans feared the paper would create divisions, but the editor of the Aurora gave information to Binns about influential societies and individuals who could help him.  

---

67 Ibid., 5 October 1807.

At this time Binns met Michael Leib. Duane and Leib preferred to have one Republican paper in Philadelphia, but Duane removed Leib's suspicions. After the two men became friends, Leib had Binns deliver the "Long Talk" before the Tammany Society on St. Tammany's day in 1807. The society made copies of his speech and offered him their "gracious thanks." 69

On March 27, 1807, Binns published his first issue of the Democratic Press with the motto of "The Tyrant's Foe; the People's Friend." According to Binns in his memoirs the Democratic Press was the first newspaper in the United States published under the name Democratic, and some years later a party and other newspapers adopted it. 70 The tranquil relations between the Aurora and Democratic Press soon changed. The Aurora declared that it had promoted the establishment of the Democratic Press in complete faith; however, the editor had discovered that this paper had "... been suddenly converted into an engine of wanton and unmerited detraction." Its purpose was to produce dissension among the Democrats of Philadelphia. Duane said that he withdrew his approval of the Democratic Press and predicted it would

69 Ibid., p. 197.
70 Ibid.
go into oblivion. In another issue Duane declared that
the purpose of the Democratic Press was "of writing down
Dr. Leib and the Aurora!" He was correct because the
Snyderites desired to see Duane's and Leib's power weakened,
and the election of Simon Snyder as governor in 1808.

The election of 1807 was close throughout the state.
After the election ended, the Democrats had a majority of
one in the assembly and a majority of three in the senate.
In Philadelphia the Democratic ticket for the assembly won
by a 400-500 vote majority. Leib barely won reelection to
his seat in the assembly, and Duane lost to the Federalist
candidate for the state senate by a large majority. In
the sheriff's race, William Donaldson defeated Frederick
Wolbert, the latter supported by Duane and Leib. With
campaign propaganda the Democratic Press had successfully
weakened the power that the Duane-Leib faction had among
Democrats in the state and Philadelphia.

The last ten months of McKean's tenure were peaceful.
This was the last term for the governor because the state

71 Aurora, 4 September 1807.
72 Ibid., 25 September 1807.
73 Ibid., 15, 31 October 1807.
74 Ibid., 15 October 1807.
constitution stated that he could only serve three terms. On March 7, 1809, a Democratic congressional caucus nominated Simon Snyder for governor. The Quids selected John Spayd of Berks County, and the Federalists chose John Ross.

By 1808 the Quids desired to return to the Republican party. They preferred to vote for Snyder rather than for James Ross. Yet the Quids could not support Snyder because the Aurora had attacked them throughout its issues, and their leaders had been expelled from many of the Republican societies. 75

William McCorkle, editor of the Freeman's Journal, could not compete with the Federalist press in Philadelphia. He came out in support of Ross over Snyder, causing many of his Quid friends to desert him. The Quids would not vote for Ross or subscribe to the Aurora. 76 The Democratic Press was the means to bring the Quids back into the Republican party. With its attacks upon the Aurora, many of the Quids subscribed to the paper. Since the Snyderites appeared to have dominance over the Duane-Leib faction, they returned to the Republican party without any qualms.

75 Binns, Recollections of Binns, p. 192.
76 Ibid.
Spayd, the Quid candidate, publicly announced his withdrawal from the governor's race in October, 1808. He had been supported by the Muhlenbergs and Hiesters of Berks County. Neither family could support Ross or Snyder. Peter Muhlenberg and Joseph Hiester desired the governor's seat for themselves, but Snyder was about to take that opportunity away from them. John Spayd, the son-in-law of Joseph Hiester, received about 5,000 votes, mainly from Berks County.

On the day of the election the Federalists attempted one last trick. They circulated a story that Snyder had been murdered by some criminals, and his corpse was in a field covered with branches and fence posts. Their scheme had no effect upon the election, for Snyder had an approximate 24,000 vote majority.

While the factions of the Republican party achieved reconciliation, Jefferson did not deviate from his policy of neutrality. In a letter to a Pennsylvania Republican, he said that he refused "to show any difference between descriptions of republicans, all of whom are in principle,

77 *Aurora*, 8 October 1808.
78 *Binns, Recollections of Binns*, p. 204.
79 Ibid., pp. 210-11.
and cooperate with the government." Jefferson wrote to James Sullivan, the governor of Massachusetts, that he accepted the participation of Republican minorities with the Federalists, but they should never give the Federalists patronage or political power. The president said, "I do not think that the Republican minority in Pennsylvania has fallen into this heresy." Jefferson had analyzed the situation in Pennsylvania correctly.

Jefferson's policy of neutrality succeeded in Pennsylvania. By being impartial in the conflict, he kept the allegiance of both factions. Although the Quids had a temporary alliance with the Federalists, they could not oppose the Jefferson administration for fear of being called "traitors" by the Democrats and suffering the loss of federal patronage. But Jefferson's policy of neutrality was not the only factor that reunited the Democrats and Quids. As long as the Duane-Leib faction controlled the Democrats, the Quids could not return to the Republican party, because of their hatred for those two men. Following

---


the establishment of the Democratic Press and the decline of Duane and Leib's power after the elections of 1807, they gladly returned to the Republican party.
CHAPTER III

OTHER STATE REVOLTS

Another major state to experience a Quid revolt was New York. During the early 1800's, three major factions attempted to gain control of the Republican party within the state. These included the Burrites, the Clintonians and the Livingstons. The Clintonians and the Livingstons were two influential families in New York politics. The leader of the Clintonians was George Clinton, who had been governor several times, and Robert Livingston led the Livingston clan. Both leaders provided political patronage to members of their families and their supporters. Aaron Burr, whose followers were known as Burrites, had become vice-president of the United States in 1801, but in 1804 Jefferson dropped him from the ticket while still serving as vice-president.¹

¹Jefferson dropped Burr from the national ticket because he believed that Burr had intrigued for the presidency in 1800. At that time there was no provision in the federal constitution for separate ballots for president and vice-president. The person, who received the largest majority vote from the electors would be president, and the one with the second highest total would be vice-president. Jefferson and Burr received seventy-three votes apiece, and Jefferson believed that Burr had created the tie in order to obtain the presidency. The House resolved the conflict when Jefferson was selected on the thirty-fifth ballot. Burr was supported in the House balloting by the Federalists.
Burr returned to New York to discover that the Clintonians and Livingstons had taken control of the Republican party. With the aid of his followers and the Federalists, he decided to reestablish himself as a political power by running for governor. Yet Burr's political career came to an end in the state when Morgan Lewis, chief justice of the state supreme court, defeated him for the governorship. Lewis was a member of the Livingston faction, but had also received support from the Clintonians in the election.  

When Lewis became governor, the factionalism within the Republican party appeared to have terminated. The Republicans controlled the legislature and the influential council of appointments, which consisted of one senator from each of the four senatorial districts, with the assembly or lower house of the legislature selecting the four senators.  

---


Nevertheless, within a short period of time Lewis alienated the Clintonians. The governor made a number of mistakes: he provided more political patronage to the Livingstons than to the Clintonians; he supported the chartering of the Federalist-dominated Merchant's Bank in New York City, which De Witt Clinton opposed; and he made attempts to take control of the council of appointments from the Clintonians.

Lewis made the error of appointing Maturin Livingston, his son-in-law, as recorder of New York City by removing the capable Peter B. Porter, a Burr supporter. Livingston was inefficient and had a limited knowledge of the law. The governor established a precedent of providing jobs for his supporters without giving consideration to a member of the opposition or a Clintonian.  

Throughout 1803-1804 two Republican-dominated legislatures had refused to incorporate the Merchant's Bank of New York City. Besides denying this company a charger in 1804, the legislature passed an act, which declared that

1800's Hammond served in the United States House of Representatives and became a state senator in 1817. Since there are few primary materials available on microfilm for this period of New York history, his contemporary study is useful.

unincorporated companies could no longer perform banking functions. If the Merchant's Bank refused to comply with the law, it would be subject to penalties. The following year the Merchant's Bank made another attempt to acquire a charter, but this time the company used bribery to obtain success. Senator Ebenezer Purdy, who introduced the bill, offered thirty shares of stock to Senator Stephen Thorn and fifty shares at a $1,000 profit to Senator Obadiah German for their votes. Agents of the company offered shares, which would be worth 25 per cent in advance to John Ballard, Gurdon Huntington and Peter Betts, all members of the assembly. The Philadelphia Aurora General Advertiser stated that Peter Betts had sworn before a legislative committee that a man, who gave his name as Vredenburgh, offered to purchase his vote for the incorporation of the bank. Later Purdy resigned his seat from the senate in order to avoid expulsion.


7 Philadelphia Aurora General Advertiser, 25 April 1805. Hereafter cited as the Aurora. The Aurora will be used to describe the politics of New York because New York papers of the period are unavailable.
Two major Clintonians objected to the bill. De Witt Clinton, mayor of New York City, opposed the chartering of the bank because it was Federalist-controlled and would offer competition to the Manhattan Company, a Republican bank in which Clinton was a stockholder. He also believed that with an additional bank there would be a wider circulation of paper money, which could become worthless.\(^8\) Ambrose Spencer, a judge on the state supreme court, declared that the public interest did not require another bank, and he asserted that the passage of the bill had been secured with bribery.\(^9\)

Although Clinton and Spencer had their objections, Governor Lewis believed that the banking powers of this company would not hurt the public interest, and the legislature should charter the company or modify the restrictions placed upon the Merchant's Bank in 1804. Lewis was never charged with corrupt motives for his support of the bill.\(^10\)

The legislature passed the bill by a large majority. This


\(^10\)Ibid.
banking question was the major issue, which divided the Clintonians and Livingstons or Lewisites into rival factions.

During the elections of 1805 the Clintonians and Lewisites continued their alliance for the public's benefit. The Aurora accused the Federalists of corrupting members of the Republican party. It predicted that the corrupt politicians would be removed because of their involvement in the Merchant's Bank controversy. Furthermore, the paper supported the election of De Witt Clinton as state senator from the southern district.\(^\text{11}\) On May 13, 1805, the Aurora announced that the Republicans had achieved a victory. The senate was now all Republican, including Clinton, and only the counties of Columbia and Albany had returned Federalists to the assembly.\(^\text{12}\)

After the elections of 1805, the warfare between the Clintonians and Lewisites began. The New York American Citizen and Albany Register attacked Lewis and his friends. The Poughkeepsie Journal attacked Spencer and Clinton. Later it changed its name to the Poughkeepsie Barometer when the Burrites stopped publishing the Morning Chronicle in New York City and joined with this paper. The Plebian, published

\(^{11}\text{Aurora, 6 May 1805.}\)

\(^{12}\text{Ibid., 13 May 1805.}\)
in Ulster County, gave its support to Governor Lewis.  

By now the public had become aware of dissension within the Republican party. The split became official in 1805 when the Republican majority, led by De Witt Clinton, repudiated Lewis and declared that those who supported Lewis were Quids.

Lewis took the Livingston faction out of the Republican party with him, and it appeared that he would receive Federalist aid. The Clintonians realized that they needed another ally to offset the loss of the Livingstons. Their choice was the Burrites. In December of 1805, Theodorus Bailey, a friend of Clinton, made certain promises to John Swartwout, a leading Burrite: the Burrites would receive loans through the Manhattan Company; they would be accepted into the Republican party; the Burrites would have equal political patronage with the Clintonians; and the American Citizen would stop its attacks upon the Burrites. De Witt Clinton denied the incident, but the Manhattan Company made a loan of $18,000 to a leading Burrite. Also on February 20, 1806, a banquet occurred at the Dyde's Hotel, where the Clintonians and Burrites made toasts to their union. Four days later the Burrites, who would not support Clinton,

---

13 Hammond, Political Parties in New York, 1:224.
formed an alliance with the Lewisites at Martling's Long-
Room in New York City. This protest faction became known
as "Martling's Men."¹⁴

The *Aurora* now joined with the *New York American Citizen*
by saying, "The third party of New York legislature [the
Lewisites], is fairly laid on its back--and that state
promises to be justified from the stain of last year's
corruption." To prove its point this paper claimed that the
Quids had failed to get Andrew McCord of Orange County
elected speaker of the house, while the majority Republicans
elected their candidate.¹⁵ In another issue the *Aurora*
compared Governor McKean with Lewis. Both men had been
chief justices of their respective state supreme courts and
had been placed in the governor's chair by loyal Republicans.
This paper said, "Both of them have abandoned the republican
cause and taken refuge in the arms of men and the party who
were their most bitter enemies [the Federalists]."¹⁶

After electing a speaker and forming an alliance with
the Burrites, the Clintonians further increased their power
in January, 1806, by gaining control of the council of

⁵*Aurora*, 6 February 1806.
⁶Ibid., 6 March 1806.
appointments. Pierre C. Van Wyck replaced Maturin Livingston as recorder, and Thomas Tillotson, the governor's son-in-law, lost his position as comptroller to Elisha Jenkins. Many of Lewis' supporters were removed from minor offices.  

When the Lewisites and Clintonians became divided, the Federalists were indifferent. Then they proclaimed their allegiance to the Quids for the spring elections of 1806 in order to gain political patronage. William Van Ness, the able Federalist leader, urged his party to support their own candidates where Federalism was strong, and in other counties to support the Lewisites when two Republicans competed for the same office. The Lewisites and the Federalists obtained a majority in the assembly, and in New York City they acquired control of the commons council which made appointments. For political reasons many Clintonians lost their positions within the city. In April, 1806, the Quids and Federalists elected a speaker and gained control of the council of appointments. De Witt Clinton lost his job as mayor of New York City to Marinus Willett, and Maturin Livingston and Thomas Tillotson returned to their jobs. Again another system of "federo-republicanism" had been established.

17 Alexander, Political History of New York, 1:151.  
During 1806 the national administration received descriptions of the schism in New York. Pierpoint Edwards, a Clintonian, informed James Madison that the state had divided into four parties: Federalists, Burrites, Lewisites and Clintonians. The last three factions claimed to be loyal Republicans and friends of the president, but local considerations had divided the Republicans. According to Edwards the Federalists had joined the Lewisites; whereby both major factions of the Republican party now looked to the Burrites for assistance. He correctly predicted that the Lewisites would have difficulty in providing the Federalists with offices because of their fear of being called "traitors" by the Clintonians.19

John Nicholas, a Quid, wrote to Albert Gallatin that De Witt Clinton "was determined to organize a power which should place everything at his disposal." In order to achieve success, there were negotiations between the Burrites and Clintonians, with both factions having a big celebration in honor of their coalitions. Nicholas wrote, "I view this as the most alarming sins in public affairs." He believed that the Burrites would make Clinton more powerful, and the

two factions would create a corrupt Republican party. Yet Nicholas had a higher esteem for Clinton than Governor Lewis. Clinton was an excellent politician; he understood character; and his opponents were helpless to oppose him. Lewis was an "honest, open, indiscreet man, and has not the least knowledge in intrigue . . . ."  

In a letter to Joseph Scott of Pennsylvania, Jefferson wrote: "That the rudiments of such a third party were formed in Pennsylvania and New York has been said in the newspapers, but not proved." According to the president, it was the duty of every Republican to prevent the schism from occurring.  

Apparently Jefferson was aware of divisions among Republicans in New York. He told Elbridge Gerry, "New York seems to be in danger of republican division." Later in another letter he wrote, "I see with infinite pain the bloody schism which has taken place among our friends in Pennsylvania and New York, and will probably take place in other states."


\[\text{\textsuperscript{22}}\]Jefferson to Gerry, 3 March 1804, ibid., p. 73.  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\]Jefferson to George Logan, 11 May 1805, ibid., p. 142.
Jefferson continued with a policy of neutrality similar to the one he had used in Pennsylvania. Pierpoint Edwards had told Madison that the president had not supported either the Clintonians or Lewisites. The president expressed his own opinion when he told James Gamble that he regretted seeing the schism emerge between Republicans in New York. "I determined from the first moment to take no part in them and that the government should know nothing of such differences."  

Again Jefferson's policy of impartiality appeared to be a success. The alliance between the Federalists and Quids showed signs of weakening when Lewis failed to award political patronage to his new allies. A few vociferous friends in each county asked him to make removals, causing his appointments to be of a partisan character in every major part of New York. He could not even appoint Federalists as justices of peace because he would be denounced as a "traitor" to the Republican party. Since Lewis would not appoint Federalists or Clintonians, he had a limited choice. Hence, unfit

---


men received appointments. The Federalists were also unhappy with Lewis. They were greedy for office and could not understand why they should support a governor, who would not give them political rewards. Others believed that the governor was timid and incapable of making decisions.26

On February 16, 1807, a Republican caucus in the legislature selected Daniel Tompkins for governor. Thus the two most important Republican leaders, Clinton and Spencer, failed to receive the nomination. De Witt Clinton was too controversial and had made too many enemies in state and local politics. Ambrose Spencer was a close ally of Clinton and for his second marriage had married Clinton's sister. Tompkins had no family connections with the Clintons and had been a successful circuit judge on the state supreme court. On the same day the rest of the Republicans in the legislature renominated Lewis.27

The election proved to be a bitter contest. The Quids began the attack when John Lansing, a Livingston follower, explained why he did not run for governor in 1804. That year Lansing had received the nomination from a Republican congressional caucus before Lewis. Lansing accepted the

26 Hammond, Political Parties in New York, p. 244.
27 Ibid., pp. 238-40.
nomination, but wrote a letter of resignation to Ebenezer Purdy, chairman of the caucus, saying that he would be unable to promote "Republican interests" in New York. In 1807 he explained what he meant by "Republican interests." Lansing claimed that George Clinton, De Witt's uncle, had asked him to follow a particular course in government, but he had refused. Then he learned from Thomas Tillotson that De Witt Clinton had made some false charges against him in the 1804 campaign by saying that he was a Burrite. Lansing believed that if he became governor, he would be controlled by the Clintonians. The two Clintons denied Lansing's accusations. Naturally Lansing claimed his account was correct. After the election of 1807, nothing came of the controversy between Lansing and the Clintonians.28

In retaliation the Republicans attacked the Federalists and the Quids in the newspapers. Rufus King headed the Federalist assembly ticket in New York City, which became known as the American ticket. It consisted of Federalists, Quids and Burrites.29 Thomas Addis Emmett of the New York American Citizen began a strong attack upon King's conduct as minister to Great Britain during the 1790's. He stated

28Ibid., pp. 241-43.
29Aurora, 5 May 1807.
that in the summer of 1798 the Irish attempted to raise an insurrection against the British, but it ended in failure. The political prisoners reached an agreement with the British government, which permitted them to select a country in which to live in exile. Their choice was the United States, and Emmett was one of the prisoners. King refused to permit them to come to the United States, because according to Emmett, "Mr. King does not desire to have Republicans in America!" With this denial Emmett and his family had to stay in prison four years. He claimed that the British government used King's refusal to keep them in prison.\(^{30}\) With this verbal assault upon the American ticket as being anti-Irish, many Irish-Americans voted Republican in the New York City elections.

In the spring elections of 1807 the Federalists and Quids suffered a resounding defeat. King was the top American ticket vote getter, but placed fourth behind three Republicans, who acquired seats in the assembly.\(^{31}\) The Republicans gained large majorities in both houses of the legislature, and Tompkins defeated Lewis by 4,085 votes.\(^{32}\) With the defeat

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 16 April 1807.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., 6 May 1807.

\(^{32}\) Ibid., 9 May, 11 June 1807.
of Lewis, several of his followers returned to the Republican fold, but Martling's Men continued to oppose De Witt Clinton throughout the remainder of his political career. Since Jefferson did not show favoritism toward either faction, the victorious Clintonians continued their loyalty to the national administration without qualms.

New York and Pennsylvania had the best organized Quid factions, but the term Quid appeared from time to time in other states to refer to third party movements. In Delaware there was conflict over patronage during Jefferson's administration. In Rhode Island there was discord among the supporters of Governor Arthur Fenner and the majority of the Republican party. Jefferson expressed his doubts about these two states by saying that Rhode Island was Republican on "anomalous grounds" and Delaware "will be always uncertain, from the divided character of his citizens." The president added, "In Delaware it seems we have a preliminary operation to reconcile republicans. For how can federalists coalesce with those who will not coalesce with each other."


Another state that experienced Quidism was New Jersey. The Quids appeared in the counties of Sussex and Hundterdon. In 1804 Silas Dickerson of Sussex started to run against William McCollough for the council (the upper house of the legislature), but his friends dissuaded him because McCollough was an incumbent. Then in 1805 his brother Mahlon supported McKean in Philadelphia against Snyder for the governorship. These two incidents caused the voters to believe Dickerson was a Quid, causing him not to be reelected as an assemblyman in 1805. The next year Sussex Republicans began to search for Quids and urged the party to create a truly Republican ticket. While they hunted for Quids, a Federalist was elected to the legislature. The Quid scare came to an end in Sussex with the death of Silas Dickerson in 1809.\footnote{Carl E. Prince, New Jersey's Jeffersonian Republicans; The Genesis of An Early Party Machine, 1789-1817 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1967), pp. 82, 135.}

The dissident Republicans of Hundterdon County accused James J. Wilson, editor of the Trenton True Republican, of being a Quid. The accusation failed to achieve success, and he continued to be a powerful Republican leader.\footnote{Ibid., p. 91.}
In 1805-1806 the *Aurora* described third party movements within other states. It stated that there were few Quids, but they existed throughout the United States. In Rhode Island the Federalists and the Quids had a candidate for lieutenant governor in 1805; however, Paul Mumford, the Republican candidate, defeated him by a large majority.\(^{38}\) After many struggles the Republicans were the predominant party in Rhode Island, but during the spring elections of 1806 the Republicans had factionalism, which would bring about a Federalist victory. In Vermont the Federalists were united, while the Republicans, as a divided party, could not choose a governor. Since the Republicans offered ineffective opposition to the Federalists in Connecticut, the Federalists ruled with "unbridled tyranny."\(^{39}\) The *Aurora* was correct with its predictions. The Federalists elected governors in Rhode Island and Connecticut and achieved a majority in the Vermont legislature.\(^{40}\)

Albert Gallatin received communications from some leading Republicans in Rhode Island. One wrote to Gallatin in 1805, "We now hear vibrating in our ears, the name of a

\(^{38}\) *Aurora*, 7 May 1805.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 15 April 1806.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 24 May 1806.
third party, emerging from obscurity and the dregs of faction . . . . This faction, which has acquired the name of Tertium Quids is now rapidly dilating itself in this State." 41 In 1807 Christopher Ellery stated that there were three parties in Rhode Island, the Federalists, the supporters of the late Governor Arthur Fenner and the real Republicans. The supporters of Fenner claimed to be Republicans, but, according to Ellery, the real Republicans "were the sincere friends of the Union." In order to keep out the Federalists and the supporters of Fenner, the real Republicans had to support unfit people for office, including state positions and congressional seats. Ellery predicted that James Fenner, son of Arthur Fenner and a United States Senator, would be elected governor with the support of the Federalists and the friends of his father. Yet the real Republicans would acquire a majority in the general assembly or lower house of the legislature. 42

Except for New York and Pennsylvania, Jefferson had little concern about schisms among Republicans in other states. In such states as Rhode Island, New Jersey and

41 Oliver Whipple to Gallatin, 8 September 1805, Gallatin, Papers of Gallatin, reel 11.

42 Christopher Ellery to Gallatin, 27 April 1807, ibid., reel 14.
Delaware, there were no organized factions of Quids, making it easy for the president to continue his successful policy of neutrality by allowing the Republicans within those states to achieve reconciliation among themselves. There was no national organization of Quids within the states. Only New York and Pennsylvania had organized Quid factions, and those factions had no contact with each other. The Republican divisions within the other states were the result of local controversies over political patronage, state policies and personalities.  

Jefferson followed a wise course by ignoring the Quid revolt in the states. These Quids did not attack the president's policy but opposed certain Republicans within their states. When they returned to the Republican party, they had no ill feelings toward Jefferson because he had not attacked them. When the president learned of the dissension among Pennsylvania Republicans, he said, "The same will take place in Congress whenever a proper head for the latter shall start up . . . ." The Jefferson administration soon experienced a Quid revolt in the United States Congress,

---

43 Noble E. Cunningham, Jr., "Who Were the Quids?" Mississippi Valley Historical Review 50 (1963):255.

but the president then followed a quite different plan of action.
CHAPTER IV

JEFFERSON AND THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

In 1801 John Randolph entered the national House of Representatives at the age of twenty-eight as a delegate from Virginia. In this session Speaker Nathaniel Macon appointed Randolph, a kinsman of Jefferson, to the chairmanship of the important Ways and Means Committee. With an erratic but brilliant mind, Randolph acquired dominance over his colleagues in the House. During his first years in Congress he was on good terms with Jefferson and was influential in passing bills favored by the administration. By 1806 he publicly broke with Jefferson, declaring that he was no longer a Republican and was ready to embrace "quiddism." 

According to William C. Bruce, Randolph's most definitive biographer, there were several factors leading to the schism between Jefferson and Randolph. Randolph was too restive under Jefferson's leadership, and he desired a degree of

---


2 Ibid., 9th Cong., 1st sess., 13 March 1806, p. 775.
independence. He was unhappy with the current standards of the Republicans, believing that the party had deviated from its "pure principles." During the trial of Samuel Chase, associate justice of the Supreme Court, he believed that the Jefferson administration did not give him complete support. Furthermore Randolph disagreed with the administration's involvement in the Yazoo controversy and Jefferson's conduct of foreign affairs with the Spanish and British.\(^3\)

One of the first conflicts between Randolph and Jefferson was the impeachment of Chase. On January 5, 1805, Randolph's introduced a resolution in the House, requesting that a committee of inquiry be created to examine the official conduct of Chase.\(^4\) After three days of debate the resolution carried by a vote of eighty-one to forty, with Randolph selected as chairman of the committee.\(^5\) In March of 1804 the committee recommended impeachment for Chase; whereby the House complied by voting seventy-three to thirty-two for impeachment.\(^6\)

\(^3\)The Randolph Papers will not be used in this thesis. They are at the University of Virginia and are unavailable on microfilm. For a detailed study of Randolph's break with Thomas Jefferson see William C. Bruce, John Randolph of Roanoke, 2 vols. (New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1922), 1:267-74.


\(^5\)Ibid., 8 January 1804, pp. 875-76.

\(^6\)Ibid., 12 March 1804, pp. 1171, 1180.
On December 3, 1804, Randolph's special committee brought forth eight charges against Chase. Some of the major ones were: (1) Chase had shown misconduct in the John Fries case by delivering an opinion in writing on a point of law before the jury had heard the defense and prohibited Fries' counsel from addressing the jury; (2) in the James Callender case, a libel case against President John Adams in 1800, Chase refused to permit John Basset, a biased member of the jury, to be excused and to allow John Taylor to be a witness for Callender; (3) he refused to allow a grand jury to be dismissed after it had found no reason for an indictment; (4) and Chase had delivered "an intemperate and inflammatory political harangue" (anti-Republican) to a grand jury in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1803. The House accepted all eight articles of impeachment. Joseph Nicholson of Maryland, a close ally of Randolph, proposed that the House appoint managers to conduct the impeachment. The House selected Randolph, Nicholson, George W. Campbell of Tennessee, John Boyle of Kentucky, Peter Early of Georgia and Caesar Rodney of Delaware. The Senate received the

---

7Ibid., 8th Cong., 2nd sess., 3 December 1804, pp. 728-31.

8Ibid., pp. 748-60.
articles from the managers and issued a summons for Chase to appear on January 2, 1805.  

Chase pleaded "not guilty" on all counts at the summons, and the trial began on February 8, 1805, in the Senate chamber. At the trial Randolph, the chief counsel for the prosecution, declared that he was unprepared, but he would attempt to perform the task to the best of his abilities. Chase had two of the best Federalist lawyers, Robert Harper and Luther Martin, as his attorneys. Randolph was no lawyer and his boisterous oratory, which had proved so effective in the House, was no match for the legal abilities of his adversaries. On March 1, 1805, the Senate found Chase guilty on three of the eight articles, but he failed to receive the two-thirds majority vote necessary for conviction. Randolph was upset by the results. Jefferson had been neutral during the trial, and his correspondence did not show that he had been disappointed by the acquittal. Randolph's opposition to the administration probably

---

9 Ibid., December 1804, pp. 762-63, 776, 791.
10 Senate, ibid., 8 February 1805, p. 153.
originated from the Chase trial because of Jefferson's indifference. 13

The Yazoo land fraud scandal was to be another divisive factor among Republicans. On January 7, 1795, the Georgia legislature provided thirty-five million acres to four land companies, Georgia Company, Georgia Mississippi Company, Tennessee Company and the Upper Mississippi Company, at the price of $500,000 or one and one-half cents an acre. 14 Georgia had a valid need for the money. This frontier state consisted of 50,000 people, who had a bankrupt state treasury, an unpaid state militia, a worthless state currency and Indian tribes that had not been removed. Yet every member of the Georgia legislature except future Republican Senator James Jackson had received a bribe or had an interest in the land companies. When the citizens of Georgia discovered the fraud, they elected a new legislature for 1796. 15


15 Bruce, Randolph of Roanoke, 1:181-82.
The new legislature declared the act of 1795 to be "null and void" and asserted that proof of the sale would be removed from all records, documents and deeds by a public burning.16

On the day that the Georgia legislature declared the Yazoo act void, the Georgia Company sold 11,000,000 acres. Three of the land companies opened offices in Boston and sold large amounts of land to purchasers in New England and the Middle states. When the purchasers discovered that the act of 1795 was invalid, they went into an uproar and demanded that the national government protect their interests. The New England purchasers established the New England Mississippi Company in order to place pressure upon the federal government, and they enlisted the support of Postmaster General Gideon Granger.17 On February 14, 1803, three federal commissioners, James Madison, Albert Gallatin and Attorney General Levi Lincoln, submitted their report on the Yazoo claims to Congress. They recommended that Georgia surrender its title rights for $1,250,000; whereby the United States would remove all Indian titles to the territory, settle all

---

16 Public Lands, 1:158.
17 Bruce, Randolph of Roanoke, 1:183-85.
British and Spanish claims, and set aside 5,000,000 acres for the claimants. 18

Early in 1804 Randolph began his opposition to the commissioners' report by introducing several resolutions. In these he upheld state's rights, declaring that the people of a state had the right to annul a previous act passed by a corrupt legislature, and the constitutions of Georgia and the United States did not prohibit the rescinding act of 1796. Randolph attacked the purchasers of the Yazoo land, saying that their claims under the act of 1795 could not be recognized by an agreement between Georgia and the United States nor by any measures emanating from the federal government. 19 In the last statement Randolph attacked the compromise reached between Georgia and the federal commissioners as invalid, thus alienating his northern colleagues, who supported the Yazoo claimants from their own states. After extensive debate, all of Randolph's resolutions received a general postponement until the next session of the legislature; however, they failed to be accepted at that time. 20

18 Public Lands, 1:132-35.
The Yazoo claimants retaliated against Randolph by sending a large number of petitions to the House. Petitioners from the Georgia Mississippi Company declared that they were ready to enter into negotiations with any federal commissioners and were protected by law if no compromise occurred. Under such pressure, Samuel Dana of Connecticut on January 29, 1805, introduced a resolution authorizing three commissioners to settle the Yazoo claims. Then Christopher Clark of Virginia, a Randolph supporter, proposed an amendment to the resolution, which stated that no part of the 5,000,000 acres could be used to compensate the claimants. Randolph delivered a violent attack against the Dana resolution. He declared that the innocent buyers were hypocrites because on February 17, 1795, President George Washington had informed Congress that he had received two acts from the Georgia legislature, including the Yazoo act. The president proposed that the ceded lands of Georgia be acquired by the United States; whereby the House complied by passing Washington's proposal. Although the Senate did not pass the House bill, according to Randolph, the buyers of the Yazoo land had fair warning that the Yazoo act might

21 Ibid., 8th Cong., 2nd sess., 30 November 1804, p. 725.
be invalid. Randolph attacked certain members of Congress, saying if they accepted the claims of the New England Mississippi Company they had identified themselves with the "swindles of 1795." He accused Gideon Granger of using his patronage as postmaster general in order to obtain votes in favor of the Yazoo claimants. Randolph concluded that Dana's resolution should be rejected.  

Granger replied to Randolph's charges when he sent a letter to the House on February 1, 1805. The postmaster general stated that all insinuations made against him were false. He had made no attempts to bribe members of Congress, and Granger offered to permit Congress to investigate his official conduct in the post office department. Then the members of the House passed a resolution to create a committee to examine the conduct of Granger, but the resolution failed to become a bill.  

Clark dropped his amendment, and Dana's resolution went to the Committee of Claims to become a bill.  

After a continuing postponement in the House of Representatives about the Yazoo claims, in March, 1806, the Senate

---

22 Ibid., 29 January 1805, pp. 1022-32.
23 Ibid., 1 February 1805, pp. 1110-18.
24 Ibid., 3 February 1805, pp. 1167, 1174.
passed a bill accepting the commissioners' report of 1803. Randolph repeated his previous arguments against the Yazoo claims but added that Jefferson had used his influence as president to obtain the passage of the bill. After a brief debate, Randolph won a major victory when the House rejected the Senate's bill, sixty-two to fifty-four.25 It was not until when Randolph was temporarily out of Congress that in 1814 the issue was settled, generally along the commissioners' original proposal. The claimants did not receive 5,000,000 acres of land, but acquired $5,000,000 worth of United States stocks certificates, resulting from the sale of the Yazoo land reserved for the claimants in the agreement reached between the federal commissioners and Georgia in 1802. The claimants who desired land could exchange their stock certificates for land in the Mississippi Territory.26 In 1805 and 1806 Jefferson supported the report of the commissioners because they were members of his cabinet. Yet the president continued with his policy of neutrality among Republicans. If Jefferson had intervened in such a confused issue by placing his


presidential leadership to the test, he might have done more harm than good.27

In foreign affairs Jefferson was not indifferent towards Randolph's protests. During the early 1800's Great Britain and Napoleonic France had become deeply involved in a world conflict. Great Britain was the mistress of the seas, and Napoleon was the ruler of continental Europe. Thus the commercial and expansionist policies of these countries affected all nations, especially the neutral United States. By 1805 Spain, one of the allies of France, still continued to violate the territorial sovereignty of the United States. Spain controlled Florida, from which she sent troops into land claimed by the United States. The Jefferson administration protested the Spanish actions but with no results.

On December 3, 1805, Jefferson delivered his annual message to both houses of Congress, and part of it was devoted to the Spanish problem. The president claimed that American citizens had been seized and property taken by Spaniards within American territory. As commander-in-chief he ordered troops to the frontier in order to protect American citizens and repel future Spanish aggressions.

Jefferson concluded this subject when he said he would give further information at another meeting of Congress.  

On December 6, 1805, in a secret message to Congress Jefferson told Congress that war was not necessary with Spain, but there should be some action by the United States to protect its citizens. The president said, "But the course to be pursued will require the command of means which it belongs to Congress exclusively to yield or to deny .... To their wisdom then I look for the course I am to take ...."  

Speaker Macon referred the president's secret message to a special committee led by John Randolph. The chairman asked to have an interview with Jefferson in order to discuss the president's intentions. When Jefferson learned of Randolph's request, he wrote to Gallatin, "Randolph has just called to ask a conversation with me .... everything therefore had better be suspended till that is over."  

In 1806 Randolph,  

---


[29] Confidential Message on Spain, 6 December 1805, ibid., pp. 204-05.  

using the pseudonym "Decius," described his interview with Jefferson and the subsequent events that proceeded it in the Richmond Enquirer. He learned from the interview that the president wanted $2,000,000 for the purchase of Florida. Randolph informed Jefferson that he could not support the measure because the president had not publicly asked for the money, and he had placed the entire responsibility upon Congress. Even if Jefferson had made a direct request, Randolph would oppose it, because after the failure of Spanish negotiations, the payment of the money would disgrace the country forever.  

According to "Decius" his committee met on December 7, 1805, which came to no definite decision about the president's message. Barnabas Bidwell of Massachusetts proposed that money be granted for foreign intercourse; however, the committee rejected his proposal. Before Randolph left for Baltimore on December 14, he met with the secretary of state. Madison told him that France would not permit the United States to settle its differences with Spain, unless the Jefferson administration gave money to France as a bribe to prevent a French and Spanish war against the United

States. Randolph said, "his confidence in the secretary of state had never been very high, but that now, it was gone forever." 32

"Decius" claimed that after his arrival from Baltimore on December 31, Gallatin met him at the door of the committee room. He placed in Randolph's hands a piece of paper entitled, "Provision for the Purchase of Florida." Randolph declared that he would not "vote a shilling" for the measure. The secretary of treasury explained that he was not here to recommend the measure, but it would be advisable for the committee to make such a recommendation. Randolph continued with his avowed opposition to the scheme. Except for Bidwell, all of the committee continued to oppose the purchase of Florida. 33

On January 3, 1806, Randolph's committee reported a resolution that required the president to provide a sufficient number of troops to repel Spanish aggression on the southern frontiers of the United States. On the same day Bidwell introduced his resolution, requesting "that $_____ be appropriated by law for the purpose of defraying any extraordinary expenses which may be incurred in the intercourse
between the United States and foreign nations.”^34 After several days of stormy debate, the House rejected Randolph's resolution, seventy-two to fifty-eight. ^35 On January 14, 1806, the House passed the Bidwell resolution with some modifications. It specifically stated that the money would be used "in the purchase of the Spanish territories lying on the Atlantic ocean and Gulf of Mexico, and eastward of the Mississippi [Florida]."^36 Later in February the Senate passed the House bill. When Randolph's resolution went down to defeat, Jefferson won a victory over his major critic. In this controversy the president used the power of his office when he asked Congress to solve the problem, and he supported the Bidwell resolution after Randolph refused to aid the administration.

In April, 1806, Randolph made one last effort to resurrect the Spanish problem. He introduced a resolution, which required the president's secret message of December 6 be placed in the Journal of the Secret Proceedings of the House and proposed that a new journal should be provided


for the use of its members. After several days of debate, administration forces won another victory by rejecting Randolph's resolution with forty-four yeas and seventy-four nays.

In September, 1806, Jefferson decided to answer the accusations made by Randolph as "Decius" and as a congressman concerning his policy with Spain. In a letter to W.A. Burwell, the president declared that many of "Decius'" facts were incorrect. Randolph claimed Jefferson did not make his secret message about Spain public. Jefferson stated that he had told Congress about the Spanish wrongs and had asked Congress for a means to reach an agreement. Both his public and private messages were official and were published in the congressional journals. In one sense Randolph was correct, because the president's secret message never appeared in the journals. When Randolph wrote as "Decius," he claimed that the purchase of Florida was not in Jefferson's official message to Congress. In a vague fashion the president answered this charge by saying that the public message did not recommend war, but he had asked Congress to be prepared for it. According to Jefferson he

37 Ibid., 5 April 1806, p. 949.
38 Ibid., 7 April 1806, p. 992.
advised negotiations with Spain in the secret message, an action which means the probable purchase of Florida. The president declared that Randolph's special committee had recommended offensive measures when it urged that troops be raised for the southern borders, while his measures were peaceful. Jefferson told Burwell to make use of this information. 39

Another area of concern in Jefferson's foreign policy was the commercial restrictions placed upon American ships by the British and French governments. In 1806 the British proclaimed all ports under French control to be in a state of blockade. In retaliation Napoleon replied with his Berlin Decree, which closed European ports to English goods. Through this system of blockades, any American ships that traded with Great Britain or permitted itself to be examined by British cruisers could be captured by French privateers. And any American vessel that tried to trade with ports under French control, without first receiving British permission, could be captured by British frigates. With these restrictions placed upon neutrals, the British and French seized hundreds of American ships.

Of the various British attacks upon American sovereignty, which far exceeded Napoleon's insults, impressment was the major cause for animosity between Great Britain and the United States. The British forced sailors on American ships into serving in the English navy. In economic terms, the loss of seamen was less a disaster than the loss of ships and cargoes. Usually American ships would recruit British seamen, an action which balanced the United States' losses from impressment. Yet impressment infringed upon a country's national honor. Since the United States had lost many of its ships and seamen, the Jefferson administration decided to retaliate against Great Britain and France with a policy of peaceful coercion.

The United States representatives accepted Jefferson's policy when they introduced several resolutions. In January, 1806, Andrew Gregg of Pennsylvania proposed that the United States stop importing all goods from Great Britain and its colonies. Joseph Nicholson of Maryland recommended that the United States no longer import specific articles from Great Britain. These items were the following:


All articles of which leather is the material of chief value; all articles of which tin or brass is the material of chief value; tin in sheets excepted; all articles of which hemp or flax is the material of chief value; woolen cloths, whose invoice prices shall exceed ___; woolen hosiery of all kinds; window glass, and all other manufactures of glass; silver and plated wares; paper of every description; nails and spikes; hats; clothing ready made; millinery of all kinds; playing cards; beer, ale and porter; and pictures and prints. 42

Joseph Clay of Pennsylvania proposed a more drastic measure, an embargo. The United States should not import or export goods from any European power or its colonies that placed restrictions upon American trade. 43 James Sloan of New Jersey introduced a resolution proposing that Great Britain should return all American ships and impressed seamen within a specific number of months, or the United States would stop all trade with Great Britain. 44

On March 5, 1806, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole in order to consider the Gregg resolution. Gregg began the debate, arguing that the non-importation act would have a strong affect upon the British empire. The commercial and agricultural classes of Great Britain would be hurt by the act; whereby they would become supporters of the United States. When American merchants

42 Ibid., 5 February 1806, p. 451.
43 Ibid., p. 452.
44 Ibid., 12 February 1806, p. 460.
stopped trading with Great Britain, they would find markets from other countries and would resort to domestic manufactures to remove the deficiency. He predicted that the United States would lose only 20 per cent of its import duties from Great Britain, while additional trade from other countries would compensate for the loss of revenue. According to Gregg, American merchants would not suffer immensely because they could still export. In conclusion he stated that this was not a war measure—it was a recourse for peace rather than an appeal for war. The only way that this measure could be warlike was that the British were looking for an excuse to begin a conflict. 45

John Randolph led opposition against the Gregg resolution. He believed that it would lead to war with Great Britain. Instead of the British removing trade restrictions, these would be increased against the United States. Also Randolph believed that the United States would aid France by such a measure, when he said, "Take away the British navy, and France to-morrow is the tyrant of the ocean." If the United States entered a foreign war for commercial reasons, this country would lose its Constitution. He proclaimed that the president would "filch the last shilling from our pockets . . .

drain the last drop of blood from our veins." Then he recommended an embargo rather than a non-importation act because Great Britain and France should suffer equally.  

Besides attacking the Gregg resolution, Randolph had some comments about the Jefferson administration. He claimed that members of the cabinet were examples of "back-stairs influence" seeking to bring about the passage of this resolution. He had seen men bring messages from the president that never appeared in the congressional records but determined decisions of the House. Randolph attacked Jefferson for failing to give explicit directions to Congress or provide proper leadership to the country at a time when foreign relations were crucial. Yet Randolph made a surprising statement in his long speech. He admitted being the chief of a dominant faction within the Republican party, but he failed to give a name to this faction.  

Several of Randolph's supporters joined him in his attack against the Gregg resolution. Joseph Clay declared that "it places greater means of injuring us in the hands of our enemy [Great Britain] than she already possesses; and the second, that we shall not be able to maintain the course

---

46 Ibid., pp. 559-60, 571.

47 Ibid., pp. 561, 572, 574.
it points out for any length of time."\textsuperscript{48} Joseph Nicholson argued that the wording of the resolution and the actions of its supporters would lead to war; the United States would lose one-half of its revenue; and the value of American products would be reduced, a blow which would fall upon the agricultural part of the economy. He provided an impressive list of statistics to prove his arguments. Nicholson claimed that of thirty-six million dollars worth of imported goods which entered the United States each year, thirty million dollars worth came from Great Britain. Thus the United States could rely upon receiving six million dollars worth of imports from other countries. If the non-importation act should be passed, the United States would lose five million dollars on import duties.\textsuperscript{49} Nathaniel Macon declared that the measure could lead to war and suggested that commerce should not be suppressed but increased, in order for both the East and West to grow. He agreed with Nicholson that the agricultural South would suffer from such a measure.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 549.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 7 March 1806, pp. 682, 678.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., pp. 686-87.
On March 13, 1806, the Committee of the Whole rejected the Gregg resolution by a vote of one-hundred one to twenty-four and on the same day rejected the Sloan resolution by ninety-eight to twenty-six. Then the representatives considered the Nicholson and Clay resolutions. If Jefferson had supported the Gregg resolution, it would have passed. But this would have meant the loss of five million dollars to the treasury. In addition Jefferson feared this measure would lead to war, for the trade of one country had been stopped by another. Of the two remaining measures, the Jefferson administration placed its full support behind the Nicholson resolution.

Although Nicholson and Randolph were close friends, Randolph repeated his previous arguments on the Gregg resolution against the Nicholson measure. In this speech he made his official break with the Republican party. He admitted that he belonged to a third party known as the Quids, who did not accept Federalism, Burrism or Yazooism. Now Jefferson had an official Quid revolt, led by John Randolph in Congress.

---

51 Ibid., 13 March 1806, pp. 767-69.
52 Bruce, Randolph of Roanoke, 1:251.
Clay withdrew his measure, and the Committee of the Whole accepted Nicholson's resolution by eighty-seven to thirty-five. Then the bill went to the Committee of Ways and Means to become a bill. When Jefferson learned of the vote, he was pleased with the results. Of the thirty-five who voted against the resolution, only nine were Republicans. The president wrote to James Monroe, minister plenipotentiary to Great Britain, "I have never seen a H. of Representatives more solidly united in doing what they believed to be the best for the public interest. There can be no better proof . . . that so eniment a leader [Randolph] should at once and almost unanimously be abandoned." On March 26, the Jefferson administration won another victory against the Quids when the House passed the bill sent to the committee by ninety-three to thirty-two vote.

After Randolph announced his break with the administration, Jefferson was still confident that the Republicans were strong in Congress. In writing to William Duane, the president explained that Randolph had "openly attacked the

---

54 Ibid., 17 March 1806, p. 823.


administration," and he asked Duane to come to Washington to "see republicanism as solidly embodied on all essential points, as you ever saw it on any occasion." To another correspondent Jefferson stated that the House went into confusion with the defection of Randolph, but he had taken only five or six followers with him. His followers believed that the opposition would be brief and not for a prolonged period of time. According to Jefferson, Randolph's schism caused Republicans in the House to unite behind the administration. The president expressed his confidence in the Republican party to Caesar Rodney, when he wrote, "As long as we pursue without deviation the principles we have always professed, I have no fear of deviation from them in the main body of republicans." He proclaimed to John Tyler that the Republicans had lost a few "anomalous members," but the majority of Republicans rallied to form a "solid phalanx" against the dissident Republicans in Congress.

58 Jefferson to Nicholas, 13 April 1806, Lipscomb and Bergh, eds., Writings of Jefferson, 11:99-100.
60 Jefferson to Tyler, 26 April 1806, ibid., p. 252.
Since Jefferson had an overwhelming majority of Republicans supporting him, he decided to remove the few Quids left in Congress. He gave Nicholson a federal judgeship, and on March 22, 1806, he sent a letter asking for an interview with Macon. In this letter Jefferson wrote, "Some enemy, whom we know not, is sowing tares among us." The president expressed his complete confidence in the Speaker and believed that their differences could be reconciled. William E. Dodd, Macon's definitive biographer, claimed that at this meeting Jefferson offered the Speaker the job of postmaster general, which he declined. With this refusal by Macon, Jefferson had him removed from the speakership in October, 1807. Joseph B. Varnum of Massachusetts became the new Speaker, who removed John Randolph from his chairmanship of the Committee of Ways and Means. During the first month of the Tenth Congress, Macon remained at his plantation at Buck Springs, North Carolina, in order to avoid humiliation. At this session of Congress he broke with the Quids and rejoined the Republican party.

61 Jefferson to Macon, 26 March 1806, ibid., pp. 248-49.
64 Dodd, Life of Macon, pp. 216, 219.
Although Jefferson's policy of action had brought victory for him in Congress, there was the danger that Randolph's followers would unite with the Quids on the state level. When Randolph broke with the administration in 1806, it would have been logical for him to have created a national third party. Yet the Virginian made no effort to consolidate the discontented Republicans, and he did not request the aid of the powerful Quids in New York or Pennsylvania. The two Quid governors, McKean of Pennsylvania and Lewis of New York, both denounced Randolph.65

In Pennsylvania Randolph received support from those who were not Quids in state politics. One of his strongest supporters in Congress was Joseph Clay, who belonged to the Duane-Leib faction of the Republican party. During 1806 the Philadelphia Aurora General Advertiser supported Randolph in a number of its issues. In January, 1806, it described Randolph as a "virtuous man" who brought forth measures "honorable to the government of a free people."66 While Congress was in secret session discussing the Spanish controversy, the Aurora declared that Randolph had proposed

65 Noble E. Cunningham, Jr., "Who Were the Quids?" Mississippi Valley Historical Review 50 (1963):255-56.

66 Philadelphia Aurora General Advertiser, 20 January 1806. Hereafter cited as the Aurora.
measures supporting Jefferson's measures; however, northern Republicans did not want to see his plans adopted. Later, in another issue, this newspaper mentioned that a faction, including Barnabas Bidwell and Joseph Varnum, had attempted to remove Randolph from power. The Aurora stated that this faction were supporters of Yazoo, Burr, and had embarrassed the president. Soon Duane received warnings from his political friends in Washington to end his support of Randolph. Gradually he stopped favoring the Virginian in his newspaper.

In New York the Lewisites did not support Randolph, but it appeared for a time that the Clintonians might join the Randolph revolt. In February, 1806, De Witt Clinton made a toast praising the abilities of Randolph. That summer Connecticut Republican Pierpoint Edwards informed Madison that the Clintonians supported Randolph and his party because they believed that Randolph's influence would be useful in aiding De Witt Clinton's political

---

67 Ibid., 28 January 1806.
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career. When the Clintonians discovered that Randolph was anti-commerce and was losing favor with Jefferson, they continued with their allegiance toward the national administration.

On June 22, 1807, the Jefferson administration experienced another foreign crisis with the attack of the British ship of war Leopard upon the United States frigate Chesapeake. The Chesapeake, on its way to the Mediterranean, had been hailed by the Leopard near Norfolk, Virginia and ordered to surrender four deserters. Commodore James Barron, the commander, refused to permit the search; whereby the Leopard fired a number of broadsides into the frigate, killing three and wounding eighteen. The British removed the four alleged deserters and the Chesapeake returned to its port with twenty-two shots in its hull and heavily damaged masts and rigging.  

On July 2, 1807, Jefferson issued a proclamation ordering all British warships out of American waters. He prohibited

---


any commercial intercourse with British vessels of war, and any American could be penalized for giving or selling supplies to the British. 73 He summoned a special session of Congress to meet in October, calling for 100,000 men from the state militias, and ordered repairs for seacoast fortifications. The United States built an additional fifty gunboats, and Jefferson sent a ship to carry dispatches to the American ministers in London. 74

With the threat of war and negotiations uncertain, Congress met on October 26. On December 18, Jefferson recommended establishment of an embargo. The Senate went into secret session and drew up the bill in a few minutes. The Senators dispensed with debate and the rule of three separate readings on three separate days. Within four hours the embargo bill had been passed by the Senate. 75 During the discussion of the embargo in the Senate, Randolph introduced the following resolution in the House: "That an embargo be laid on all shipping, the property of citizens of the United States, now in port, or which shall hereafter

73Aurora, 6 July 1807.

74Ibid., 10 July 1807.

arrive." Randolph wanted a temporary embargo, which would keep American shipping out of British hands, if Great Britain should declare war against the United States. Yet when the Senate passed its bill, Randolph and his Quids changed their approach and went into opposition against the bill. The Quids opposed the Senate bill because it placed no limits in time or scope upon the embargo. Within three days the House passed the act by eighty-two to forty-four with Randolph, the Quids and the Federalists voting against it. The president signed the measure on December 22, 1807. Again the power of the administration was too much for the Quids.

In the states Jefferson conducted a policy of neutrality against the Quid revolt, but in Congress he had to use strong measures to crush the opposition. Since his authority had been challenged, he retaliated by removing Randolph's followers and by forcing the passage of legislation opposed by Randolph. Nevertheless Randolph continued to oppose

---

the president's power by advocating Monroe for president in 1808 rather than Madison, Jefferson's chosen successor.
CHAPTER V

THE ELECTION OF 1808

In 1803 when Monroe left the United States on a special mission for the purchase of Louisiana, he was an intimate friend of Jefferson and Madison. Yet when he returned to the United States in December, 1807, this friendship had vanished. Monroe believed that Jefferson and Madison desired to keep him in a subsidiary role within the Republican party in order to prevent his advancement to higher rewards such as the presidency. Since Monroe distrusted the national administration, Randolph and his Quids found in the Virginian a politician of national prominence to be their candidate for president in 1808.

The schism between Monroe and his friends had its beginnings in Monroe's displeasure at having William Pinckney appointed as a co-commissioner in 1806 to help with treaty negotiations, which he (Monroe) had begun as minister to Great Britain. In a letter to Jefferson, Monroe explained

---

that the appointment of Pinckney had delayed negotiations, and his own standing had been weakened in London "by the reports that a special mission would be resorted to."

Monroe claimed that upon Pinckney's arrival he would do everything in his power to promote the success of the negotiations, and he would not leave for the United States until the negotiations had been concluded. To Madison, Monroe expressed similar sentiments when he wrote, "It is certainly my desire to get home as I can with propriety, but no object of a private nature is so urgent, and very few could be, to induce me to leave this country at such a crisis . . . ." 

In March, 1806, when Randolph announced his break with the administration, Monroe began to receive a large amount of correspondence from Randolph and his followers. Randolph declared that there was current intrigue in Congress to offer the presidency to Madison, but he would not join Madison's supporters. The Virginian said that there was division among the Madison followers and the "Old Republicans;"

---


3 Monroe to Madison, 29 April 1806, ibid., p. 432.
however Randolph wrote, "I tell you that they [Old Republicans] are united in your support."4 John Taylor of Caroline urged Monroe to join the new third party which consisted of the Clintonians of New York and a majority of the lower house in the Virginia legislature.5 James Garnett desired to see Monroe return to the United States to save the Republican party from ruin. The new Republicans had destroyed the principles of the old Republican party with which Monroe was familiar.6

Nicholson increased Monroe's animosity toward Pinckney when he stated that the "real friends" of the Jefferson administration became dissatisfied with Pinckney's appointment, and they believed that Monroe could have settled the differences with Great Britain by himself. Nicholson claimed that Jefferson told him that he did not intend to accept any treaty made by Pinckney and Monroe; whereby Monroe's political career could be ruined with Pinckney's appointment. The congressman from Maryland explained the rumors in the newspapers, saying that people who supported the administration

---


5 Taylor to Monroe, 27 February 1806, ibid.

6 Garnett to Monroe, 17 March 1806, ibid.
were dropped by the Republican party because they would not support Madison for president, and Randolph did not have a coalition with the Federalists.\(^7\)

Jefferson retaliated against the Quid correspondence when on March 16, 1806, he warned Monroe to be cautious about "what and to whom you write, that you may not be allied to operations of which you are uninformed." The president also wrote, "Some of your new friends are attacking your old ones out of friendship to you, but in a way to render you great injury."\(^8\) In another letter of May 4, 1806, Jefferson described the Quid revolt in Congress in detail, saying that the Republicans in the House united against Randolph's attack, and the Republican minority consisted of only four to eight representatives. The president said the public favored the administration and urged Monroe not to commit himself to Randolph. In an attempt to heal any ill feelings that Monroe had toward the national administration, he offered the governorships of the Orleans and Louisiana Territories to him.\(^9\)

\(^7\) Nicholson to Monroe, 5 May 1806, ibid.

\(^8\) Jefferson to Monroe, 16 March 1806, ibid.

Monroe replied to both Randolph's and Jefferson's letters. He told Randolph that he anticipated negotiations with Great Britain would be concluded by autumn, when he could return to the United States. Monroe declared he was still friends with Randolph and appreciated the confidence that Randolph and his followers had in him. But he told Randolph that he wished to see his name withdrawn from the presidential contest of 1808, because a division within the Republican party would bring about a Federalist victory.  

In reply to Jefferson's letter of May 4, Monroe declined the governorships of the Orleans and Louisiana Territories when he wrote, "I owe to my family to improve my establishment in Virginia," and "I have also much to attend to of a private nature." In another letter to Randolph, Monroe expressed his true feelings about the administration when he wrote, "that circumstances have occurred during my service abroad which were calculated to hurt my feelings and actually did hurt them, which may produce a change in the future relations between some of them [Jefferson and Madison] and myself."

11 Monroe to Jefferson, 8 July 1806, ibid., pp. 477-78.  
12 Monroe to Randolph, 12 November 1806, ibid., p. 488.
In late 1806 Monroe and Pinckney concluded their treaty with Great Britain. Again Monroe expressed indignation when he learned that Jefferson did not consider the treaty as satisfactory, and the president even refused to submit it to the Senate. Jefferson attempted to explain to Monroe why he rejected the treaty, declaring that it did not include a renunciation of impressment; it only allowed the United States an indirect colonial trade "during the present hostilities;" the United States could not pass non-importation or non-intercourse laws; and "the British commisrs. [sic.] appear to have screwed every article as far as it would bear, to have taken everything, and yielded nothing." The president suggested that Monroe return home and allow Pinckney to conclude the negotiations. Again Jefferson offered Monroe the governorship of the Orleans Territory at $5,000 a year.¹³

Several years after rejection of the treaty Monroe expressed his feelings about the affair to John Taylor of Caroline. He stated that the Republican majority had condemned the treaty and its makers without seeing it, and they had praised the administration for its firmness in

rejecting it. Monroe wrote, "It cast a cloud over my character which did me great injury." According to Monroe many Republicans believed that he belonged with the Federalists, who denounced the treaty, or with the minority Republicans, who "complained of the mode of proceeding." Monroe bitterly wrote, "This was surely a generous reward for my services and for the support which I had given to the administration in every country where I had represented it, especially in England after the special mission where I hazarded much and could gain nothing by remaining there."\(^{14}\)

With distrust and bitterness toward the national administration, Monroe returned home on December 13, 1807. Randolph and his Quid supporters were anxious to see him, but the majority Republicans feared a split within the Republican party if he should join opponents of the administration. Monroe received a warm welcome in Richmond, where members of the Virginia lower house gave him a welcoming address. Only in the governor's council was there friction when Governor William C. Cabell refused to sign a complimentary address, believing it would aid Monroe's candidacy. Monroe remained in Virginia for ten days and went on to Washington,

\(^{14}\)Monroe to Taylor, 10 September 1810, Hamilton, ed., Writings of Monroe, 5:132.
where he received a disappointing reception. Jefferson and Madison did not ask his advice about Great Britain, and they refused to talk to him about political matters. Monroe believed that he had been excluded from national leadership in order for Jefferson to obtain the election of Madison. When he returned to Virginia, he did not prohibit his supporters from campaigning for him.15

During January, 1808, Monroe formulated the policy which he would use throughout the campaign. Monroe informed Doctor Walter Jones that he had not announced his candidacy, nor had he joined any faction or group. He believed that the nation should make its choice for president without any influence by those who desired office. Then Monroe made a statement typical of a politician: "At the same time it has been far from my intention to withhold my services from my country in case they should be called for by it."16 Later in 1808 Monroe stated that he disapproved of the conduct of the administration and preferred not to be identified with it. Yet he did not connect himself with the minority because


it could destroy the administration or him, for "the public mind would take its side with one or other party and adhere to it afterwards." Thus Monroe publicly conducted a policy of neutrality by not supporting either faction within the Republican party.

The Madison forces achieved a victory on January 23, 1808, at a congressional caucus in Washington. Senator Stephen Bradley of Vermont issued a summons for a caucus to every Republican member in both houses, except for five senators and twenty-two representatives, who had failed to act with the majority of Republicans in Congress. Bradley claimed that he had the right to issue the call because he had been responsible for summoning a congressional caucus for Jefferson's nomination in 1804. At the caucus the congressmen agreed to vote by ballot without nominations. For president Madison received eighty-three votes; Monroe had three; and Vice-President George Clinton acquired three. For vice-president Clinton received the largest number of votes, having seventy-nine. The caucus established a committee of correspondence for each state except Delaware and Connecticut, which had no Republican congressmen. The Republicans passed a resolution which announced the nominations

17 Monroe to ______, 13 July 1808, ibid., p. 55.
of Madison and Clinton and explained why the meeting took place. But there were several important groups absent from the caucus. None of the New York delegation, who were supporters of Clinton, appeared--except for one member. Randolph's supporters were not present, including six Virginians. Of the twenty-eight Federalists in Congress, only John Quincy Adams, senator from Massachusetts, received an invitation to attend the meeting.

In the states the Madison organizers obtained another victory for their candidate. The Republican regulars of the Virginia legislature circulated private petitions, requesting a meeting to be held at the Bell Tavern in Richmond on January 21, 1808. One hundred twenty-three Republicans unanimously nominated Madison for president at the meeting. On the same day the Monroe supporters held a caucus at the state capitol, where Monroe received the nomination by a vote of fifty-seven to ten. Of the fifty-seven votes that Monroe received, seventeen were from Federalists. Thus Monroe received only forty votes from the


19 Richmond Enquirer, 28 January 1808, Hereafter cited as the Enquirer.
Republicans in the Virginia legislature. The Richmond Enquirer attacked the Monroe caucus, declaring that Republicans should not consort with Federalists, and both parties should be kept separate.\(^9\)  

In February those congressmen, who objected to Madison's nomination, issued a protest against the congressional caucus of January 23. It declared that the meeting was in "direct hostility to the principle of the constitution." The citizens of the United States had the right to select their candidates, not a few men at a private meeting, who claimed they represented the interests of their constituents. The protestors proclaimed that the caucus was "not justified or extenuated by an actual necessity." In previous years when the Republicans were a minority, it was necessary to have party unity, but now the Federalists were weak and few in numbers. They declared the caucus was "an attempt to produce an undue bias in the ensuing election of President and Vice-President," because the public would believe that members of Congress were the only men, who had the ability to select candidates for the two highest offices. In conclusion the protestors stated that Madison was unfit for the office of president because he was partial to one of

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 2 February 1808.
the belligerents in Europe (France); he had recommended a bargain with the speculators of Yazoo; and he had aided Alexander Hamilton and John Jay in writing the Federalist, papers in which he had advocated Federalist principles.21 The seventeen protestors represented three states, Virginia, Pennsylvania and New York. The New York protestors were supporters of George Clinton rather than followers of Randolph. The Pennsylvanians were Joseph Clay, Samuel Smith, Daniel Montgomery and Samuel Maclay, who supported either Clinton or Monroe but did not belong to the Quid party within their own state.

The Madison followers answered the charges of the protestors. William Wirt, an influential Republican leader in Virginia, wrote several articles in the Enquirer under the pseudonym of "One of the People." Wirt claimed that the protestors attacked Madison because they had failed to get appointments from the administration, and Madison had stood in the way of their secret designs. He attacked their argument against the caucus as being valid when he pointed out that they had attended the congressional caucuses of 1800 and 1804 and had accepted the choice of those caucuses

for candidates. Wirt claimed that the protestors created bias among the people when they placed their names on the protest, and the congressmen at the caucus did represent their constituents, who had expressed their sentiments to them. Wirt made his strongest charge when he declared that the protestors had tried to destroy the Republican party and were against the present administration.22

The *Enquirer* urged the citizens of Virginia to vote for Madison and declared that the animosity between Madison and Monroe would produce division within the Republican party.23 On August 2, 1808, a group of New York Young Republicans adopted a resolution supporting Madison for president. They declared that the legislative caucus was the best method for nominations because other methods produced added expense and delay. Opponents against the congressional caucus claimed it was corrupt, but the Young Republicans stated that eighty-three members of Congress could not be purchased by an individual or any treasury.24


23*Enquirer*, 2 February 1808.

Monroe received correspondence after the congressional caucus, urging him not to run for president. Matthew Clay believed that Monroe's candidacy could divide the Republican party, and Monroe had "little probability of success." Wirt informed Monroe that he (Wirt) had declared himself for Madison, and if Monroe continued in the race, it might have an ill effect upon his political standing. Since public opinion believed that Monroe had the support of the Republican minority or the Federalists, this hindered his chances of successfully returning to the Republican party. Jefferson wrote: "I see with infinite grief a contest arising between yourself and another, who have been very dear to each other and equally so to me." The president claimed that he would be neutral in the race and told Monroe to beware of the designs of his friends. In another letter aiming at reconciliation, Jefferson explained his actions toward Monroe as minister to Great Britain. He claimed that committees from both houses of Congress had urged him to send a special mission to Great Britain to

26 Wirt to Monroe, 8 February 1808, ibid.
achieve redress upon "the subjects of impressment and spoilation by Great Britain." Thus, according to Jefferson, he had to send Pinckney, "not from any want of confidence in you, but from a belief in the effect which an extraordinary mission would have on the British mind . . . ."
The president told Monroe that his major reason for rejecting the treaty of 1806 was because it did not include a renunciation of impressment. But Jefferson wrote, "I never, one instant, lost sight of your reputation and favorable standing with your country . . . ." 28

Although Monroe's name had been placed in the presidential campaign, he was under no illusion that he could defeat Madison. If Monroe seriously believed that he could defeat Madison, he would have conducted a more vigorous campaign and would have attempted to reach an understanding with the Clintonians and the Federalists. He made no such efforts, even when his close friend, Littleton Tazewell, suggested that Monroe open communications with New York and agree to run with Clinton as a vice-presidential candidate. 29


29 Tazewell to Monroe, 8 October 1808, Monroe, Monroe Papers, 1st ser., reel 4.
objective in 1808 was to vindicate himself in the eyes of the public by proving that a substantial number of citizens were loyal and had confidence in him. In order to increase his popularity with the public, two weeks before the election Monroe asked Jefferson's permission to publish their correspondence, saying he would delete any passages that the president desired to have removed.²⁰ Jefferson complied with Monroe's request.²¹ With the publication of this correspondence Monroe appeared in the popular mind still to be on good terms with the Jefferson administration. Nevertheless the schism between Monroe and Madison did not heal until 1811, when Madison offered Monroe the position of secretary of state.

In New York many Clintonians supported George Clinton (De Witt's uncle) for president. When Madison received his nomination from the congressional caucus, the Albany Register, a Clintonian newspaper, declared that it supported Madison but remarked that Clinton deserved the nomination since he was vice-president. On March 8, 1808, George Clinton expressed his feelings about the choice of Madison

²¹ Jefferson to Monroe, 28 October 1808, Monroe, Monroe Papers, 1st ser., reel 4.
when he said that he had not been asked about the nomination of Madison or his own nomination as vice-president. The Albany Register attacked Virginia, declaring that a northerner was entitled to the presidency as much as a Virginian. De Witt Clinton conducted a vigorous presidential campaign in New York for his uncle because he believed that the vice-president deserved the position, and he was tired of the Virginia dynasty. He attacked the caucus as being unfair, since only 89 of the 139 Republican congressmen had attended. In New York the legislature selected the presidential electors rather than the voters. Thus in November, 1808, De Witt Clinton urged the legislature to give all its electoral votes to his uncle. Governor Daniel Tompkins opposed Clinton's tactics, saying this would divide the Republican party; it would weaken the influence that New York Republicans had with the national administration; and it would make New Yorkers appear ridiculous to members of the party in other states. Finally the legislature agreed


to permit each elector to vote in the way he desired. Hence, Madison received thirteen electoral votes, and George Clinton acquired his only six electoral votes for the presidency.

The election of 1808 appeared to offer a fine opportunity for the return of the Federalists to power. Jefferson had furnished them an excellent electioneering device—the embargo which hit the United States harder than it did Great Britain. The commercial classes suffered financial ruin in the seaports and elsewhere. There was open defiance of the embargo with smuggling along the Canadian border, and traders abusing the privilege of coastal shipping. The Republican party had its divisions, and the Clintonians seemed to desire Federalist aid. Instead of facing certain defeat with their own candidates, they believed that a coalition with discontented Republicans could return them to political prominence. But they decided to postpone consideration of the subject until after the spring elections in New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania.

---

34 Ibid., pp. 166-67.
35 Jefferson to Thomas Mann Randolph, 13 December 1808, Lipscomb and Bergh, eds., Writings of Jefferson, 12:256.
In Massachusetts the Federalists failed to capture the governorship but obtained a majority in the legislature, which selected the electors. In the New York assembly they increased their total from twenty-one to forty-five out of one-hundred five. With a Clinton-Federalist alliance, New York could go Federalist in the presidential election. However, disaster occurred for the Federalists in Pennsylvania. Early in 1808 the alliance between the Quids and Federalists had been broken with the return of the Quids to the Republican party. The Quids and regular Republicans supported Madison, while only a few Republicans, including Samuel Maclay and William Montgomery, were Clintonians.\(^{37}\) In the spring elections in Pennsylvania the Federalists suffered an overwhelming defeat against a united Republican party, causing Madison to receive all of the electoral votes from the Keystone State.

In August, 1808, the Federalists held a secret conference in New York. The party decided that George Clinton had no strength outside New York. The Federalists realized that they could carry New York with Clinton's help, but they were not willing to sacrifice principle in order to obtain nineteen electoral votes. They went to men of their own party and

\(^{37}\) Ibid., pp. 747, 756-57.
selected Charles Cotesworth Pinckney of South Carolina for president and Rufus King of New York for vice-president. 38

Randolph and his Quids did not support the same candidates as the Quids in the states. In New York the Quids or Lewisites favored Madison rather than join the Clintonians in support of George Clinton, whom they despised. 39 The Quids in Pennsylvania gave their complete support to Madison, while some of the regular Republicans supported Clinton or Monroe. As previously mentioned a few Republicans had joined Randolph in the protest against the caucus of January 23. Duane also said that he had reluctantly supported Madison in the Aurora, but he expected that Clinton and Monroe would be elected. 40

By the end of November, 1808, the Madison and Clinton ticket won a resounding victory against the Federalists. Madison received one-hundred twenty-two electoral votes to Pinckney's forty-seven and Clinton's six. Jefferson's policy of previous years against the Quid revolt aided Madison's victory. When the Quids returned to the Republican party in their states, they continued their loyalty to the national


39 Hammond, Political Parties in New York, 1:266.

40 Nevins, ed., Diary of John Quincy Adams, p. 54.
administration by supporting the Madison ticket because they had no ill feelings towards Jefferson's policy of neutrality in state politics. Since the president had successfully crushed the Quid revolt in Congress, those who opposed his administration on the national level became associated with Randolph and his followers. Thus Monroe could never attack the administration publicly because the Republicans and the public would associate him with "traitors" to Jefferson and the Republican party.

After Madison's victory, the Quid movement had been crushed. At the next session of Congress Randolph found himself completely ostracized with a small group of followers. Nevertheless the Quicks in Congress continued to oppose the policies of the Madison administration. This tiny group of dissidents were decimated in the elections of 1812-1813 because of their opposition to the War. Randolph lost his seat in Congress, for the first and only time, to his ancient rival (and Jefferson's son-in-law) John Wayles Eppes. Edwin Gray, Archibald McBryde and Matthew Clay were other Virginia Quicks that suffered defeats. Randolph ultimately obtained reconciliation with the national administration in 1820, when Monroe became president. 41

---
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