
A Revolution in Favor of Government: The Ratification of the United States Constitution

John P. Kaminsky

Office of Academic Affairs
Saint John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota

1987

Saint John's University, in cooperation with the College of Saint Benedict, is celebrating the bicentennial of the United States Constitution, from the Treaty of Paris (1783) through the drafting of the Constitution itself (1787) to the ratification of the Bill of Rights (1791). The project is directed by David Bennetts, Associate Professor of History, and guided by the Bicentennial Committee: Annette Atkins, Assistant Professor of History; Lee Hanley, Director of Information Services and Foundation Relations; Robert L. Spaeth, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Joan Steck, Associate Professor of Communication and Media, and Kay Wolsborn, Assistant Professor of Government.

Preface

In 1983, two hundred years after the United States concluded the Treaty of Paris with its former adversary Great Britain, Saint John's University, in cooperation with the College of Saint Benedict, began an educational celebration of the bicentennial of the development of the U.S. Constitution. Between the formal ending of the Revolutionary War in 1783 and the ratification of the Bill of Rights in 1791, the leaders of the new nation established a constitutional government that became the bedrock of American liberty and justice at home and a model for revolutionary movements around the world. In the 1980's the Constitution's lessons and implications continue to guide, instruct and fascinate Americans of all political and religious persuasions as well as America's foreign friends. Hence the timeliness and timelessness of celebrating the Constitution's two hundredth birthday with eight years of educational events, 1983-1991.

Although the year 1783 brought nationhood and international recognition, the organization of the United States under the Articles of Confederation proved to be unsatisfactory, despite the significant progress made by such legislation as the Territorial Ordinance of 1784 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. The state of Virginia in 1786 adopted An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom. Later that year Shays' Rebellion in Massachusetts threatened the newly won stability and peace. In the following year James Madison wrote an essay critical of the confederate system, "Vices of the Political System of the United States," after the Annapolis Convention had convened to propose a Constitutional Convention.

The summer of 1787 formed the crux of American constitutional development; in a scant four months the document that historian Samuel Eliot Morison has called "the most successful constitution in history" was drafted, debated, adopted and submitted to popularly elected ratifying conventions in the thirteen states by the Constitutional convention sitting at Philadelphia. Immediately James Madison, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay wrote and published the papers now known as *The Federalist*, defending the new Constitution and urging its ratification.

By 1789 the Constitution was in place. George Washington, the heroic military leader of the Revolution, was inaugurated as the nation's first President. Ratification debates had stressed the need for a bill of rights to be added to the Constitution. Madison, the principal author of the Constitution itself, led the first Congress to adopt ten amendments to the Constitution that we still call the Bill of Rights. By 1791 the Bill of Rights had been ratified by the states. The development of the constitutional system was complete.

Saint John's and Saint Benedict's are conducting an eight-year program of events designed to encourage reflection on the U.S. Constitution. Our inaugural program featured a lecture by the distinguished historian, Stanley J. Idzerda, Professor of History at the College of Saint Benedict. In the Fall of 1986 Dr. John P. Kaminsky delivered a lecture entitled "A Revolution in Favor of Government: The Ratification of the United States Constitution" in the Stephen B. Humphrey Theater on the Saint John's campus. We are fortunate to be able to publish the text of Dr. Kaminsky's address as the third in our series of Bicentennial Papers.

-- Dr. David P. Bennetts

A Revolution in Favor of Government: The Ratification of the United States Constitution

In considering the struggle to ratify the Constitution, several basic propositions must be understood:

1. Most of the United States, over 90 percent, was agricultural. To be sure there were towns--Philadelphia and New York City were both a little smaller than St. Cloud. Boston was about two-thirds the size of St. Cloud. Rural communities were tied together by rivers and the seacoast and to a certain extent by roads that were often impassable during inclement weather. Communications among states was conducted largely through a primitive post office and by the one hundred or so newspapers published at the time.

2. Most Americans wanted a revision of the Articles of Confederation that would strengthen the central government.

3. America in 1787 was a loose confederation of thirteen states, and the struggle to ratify the Constitution was conducted in these thirteen states with thirteen different casts of characters.

4. The debate over the Constitution was conducted by an extremely literate public--a public that had for a quarter century intensely debated the nature of government and how best to preserve the liberties of the people and the sovereignty of the individual states. This was not a purely theoretical debate. Americans had fought a war for seven years over these issues.

5. Finally, the debate centered on the new Constitution, that is, the basic form of the Constitution was accepted by most Americans. To be sure everyone objected to some parts of the Constitution--even the most ardent Federalists such as George Washington, James Madison, James Wilson and Alexander Hamilton. But most people agreed that the central government under the Articles needed to be strengthened and that it would be dangerous to

entrust significant additional powers to the single-house Confederation Congress without also creating executive and judicial branches of government. Therefore, in the eyes of Federalists the issue was whether to ratify this Constitution *in toto* or to reject it. In the eyes of Antifederalists, the issue was what amendments to this Constitution were needed and how should these amendments be proposed and adopted so that it would be safe to establish this new form of government.

Before going any further, we should examine how Federalists and Antifederalists viewed the Constitution. The problem was nicely put by James Madison in his *Federalist* No. 51.

In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place, oblige it to control itself.

Antifederalists agreed with Federalists that the new government would be able to control the people, but they didn't believe that the new government would be able to control those in power.

Antifederalists believed that the Constitution would create a national government that would end in either an aristocracy or monarchy. The Constitution was, in their judgment, a counter-revolution that would overthrow the principles of the Declaration of Independence. They maintained that the Constitutional Convention had violated the Articles of Confederation, the instructions to the delegates from the state legislatures, and the resolution of Congress of 21 February 1787 that called the Convention. The President and the Senate were too powerful. The Senate had legislative, executive and judicial powers, thus violating the commonly-accepted theory that there ought to be a complete separation of powers among the different branches of government. There should be a privy council to advise the President on matters of appointments and on treaties. The House of Representatives was too small and thus would not adequately represent all segments of American society. Terms of office were too long and Congress' power to regulate federal elections was dangerous. Congress also had other dangerous powers, some of which were undefined (the necessary and proper clause and the general welfare clause). Patrick Henry warned his fellow Virginians that

There are sufficient guards placed [in the Constitution] against sedition and licentiousness: For when power is given to this Government to suppress these, or, for any other purpose, the language it assumes is clear, express, and unequivocal, but when this Constitution speaks of privileges, there is an ambiguity, a fatal ambiguity;--an ambiguity which is very astonishing.¹

Consequently, Antifederalists wanted the re-establishment of Article II of the Articles of Confederation which provided that each state retained all of the

powers that were not expressly delegated to Congress. Antifederalists feared that federal officeholders would multiply under the Constitution and that taxes would rise. These taxes would be levied by Congress and would be collected by federal officials. Jury trials in civil cases were not guaranteed, and the appellate jurisdiction of the federal judiciary favored the wealthy and endangered jury trials in criminal cases. Antifederalists also charged that various provisions of the Constitution recognized, condoned, protected and even encouraged slavery. Amendments to the Constitution would be difficult to obtain after the new government was established and therefore they should be proposed by the state ratifying conventions and should be considered in a second constitutional convention. Perhaps the most serious Antifederalist charge was that the Constitution lacked a bill of rights. This omission was especially dangerous because the Constitution provided that the Constitution, treaties and laws made in pursuance of the Constitution were supreme no matter what state judges said or what was in state laws or constitutions.

Federalists responded that the Constitution would create a confederated republic with powers divided among legislative, executive and judicial branches that would check each other. They believed that the Constitution was the fruition of the Revolution. After all, didn't the Declaration of Independence condone the right of revolution, and the Constitution was in essence a peaceful revolution in favor of government. Federalists argued that the new government would have only delegated powers, and thus a bill of rights was unnecessary and maybe even dangerous because every right retained by the people could not be listed. The unanimity of the Constitutional Convention demonstrated that the Constitution was an accommodation among thirteen jarring interests. The great men of the country--led by George Washington and Benjamin Franklin--favored the Constitution, while opponents of the Constitution were labeled selfish state officeholders, demagogues, debtors, Shaysites, Tories and worse.

Federalists believed that the Constitution would secure personal and economic liberties. If the Constitution were rejected, they argued, anarchy would result; and, using the circular theory of government, would be followed by the usurpation of power by a tyrant who would in time establish despotism. If, on the other hand, the Constitution were ratified, commerce would revive, the economy would flourish, public creditors would be paid, land values would rise, paper money would be abolished, government expenses would decrease, taxes would be reduced, immigrants would flood into America and the prestige of the United States would rise. Once the new government was functioning, defects in the Constitution could be corrected through the system's own process of amendment. Above all, Federalists opposed a second constitutional convention. They saw what such a convention could do and they didn't want another convention discarding their new-wrought Constitution.

The struggle to ratify the Constitution can be divided into seven stages. Within each of these different stages the attitude of Antifederalists changed.

1. Pre-Constitution (1 January to 17 September 1787)
2. Post Constitutional Convention (17 September 1787-9 January 1788)
 - a. Congress Transmits Constitution to the States (28 September 1787)
 - b. Pennsylvania Ratifies (12 December 1787, 46-23)
 - c. Delaware Ratifies (7 December 1787, 30-0)
 - d. New Jersey Ratifies (18 December 1787, 38-0)
 - e. Georgia Ratifies (31 December 1787, 26-0)
 - f. Connecticut Ratifies (9 January 1788, 128-40)
3. Massachusetts Ratifies (6 February 1788, 187-168)
4. The Antifederalist Assurgence
 - a. Detection of the false reports of North Carolina's ratification
 - b. Adjournment of the New Hampshire Convention (21 February 1788)
 - c. Rhode Island Referendum Rejects Constitution (24 March 1788)
5. The Federalist Resurgence
 - a. Maryland Ratifies (26 April 1788, 63-11)
 - b. South Carolina Ratifies (23 May 1788, 149-73)
 - c. New Hampshire Ratifies (21 June 1788, 57-47)
6. The Two Important Hold-Outs
 - a. Virginia Ratifies (25 June 1788, 89-79)
 - b. New York Ratifies (26 July 1788, 30-27)
7. The Completion of the Union
 - a. Confederation Congress Calls First Federal Elections (13 September 1788)
 - b. First Federal Congress Meets (4 March 1789)
 - c. North Carolina Ratifies (21 November 1789, 194-77)
 - d. Rhode Island Ratifies (29 May 1790, 34-32)

First Stage

The first stage of ratification began before the Constitution was published. Long before the Constitutional Convention assembled, Americans believed that the United States was entering a period of crisis. By mid-1786 some people thought that the country had to be divided into separate confederacies or had to return to a monarchical form of government. George Washington wrote:

What Astonishing changes a few years are capable of producing. I am told that even respectable characters speak of a monarchical form of government without horror. From thinking proceeds speaking, thence to acting is often but a single step.²

For many, the Constitutional Convention offered the last chance to save the Confederation. Thus in the Spring of 1787 Americans were warned:

That many, very many wish to see an emperor at the head of our nation, And unless the states very soon give to Congress the necessary powers to regulate trade and to form a system of finance for the support of national credit, such an event may take place suddenly. It may not be at the distance of one short year.³

Threatened with this impending crisis, Americans were advised to accept whatever the Constitutional Convention would propose. The alternatives were: Under the Articles: "anarchy, poverty, infamy and SLAVERY"; under the new government: "peace, safety, liberty and glory."⁴

The *Pennsylvania Herald*, 20 June 1787, commented on the uniqueness of what was happening in Philadelphia.

Whatever measures may be recommended by the Federal Convention, whether an addition to the old constitution, or the adoption of a new one, it will, in effect, be a revolution in government, accomplished by reasoning and deliberation; an event that has never occurred since the formation of society.

A correspondent in the Boston *Massachusetts Centinel*, 30 June 1787, predicted ominously

that unless an energetick, permanent continental government is speedily established, our liberties will be set afloat in the confusion that will inevitably ensue.--At present we . . . are every day tottering on the brink of civil dissention. . . . It would be better to embrace almost any expedient rather than to remain where we are.

Similar newspaper items barraged the public.

Antifederalists would later decry this propaganda, but Federalists saw the newspaper campaign differently. David Humphreys in New Haven, Conn., wrote George Washington shortly after the Constitutional Convention had adjourned:

Indeed the well affected have not been wanting in efforts to prepare the minds of the citizens for the favorable reception of whatever might be the result of your Proceedings. . . . Judicious & well-timed publications have great efficacy in ripening the judgment of men.⁵

Henry Knox, the Confederation's Secretary at War, wrote the Marquis de Lafayette that "The Minds of the people at large were fully prepared for a change without any particular specification."⁶ The Printers of the *Northern Centinel* in Lansingburgh, New York, even admitted that they "conceived it a duty incumbent on them to prepare the minds of their readers for" whatever

the Constitutional Convention proposed.⁷ Thus even before the Constitution was published, Federalists had won a decisive battle in the war to ratify the new form of government. Previously whenever amendments were suggested to the Articles, the public was suspicious of Congress' attempts to grasp more power. Now, there was a general, widespread predilection to accept whatever came from Convention.

One of the most important subjects decided in the Constitutional Convention was how the new Constitution would be adopted. The experience of the previous six years convinced many delegates that their recommendations, whatever they might be, would not obtain the unanimous approval of the state legislatures required by the Articles of Confederation.

Realizing this problem, the Virginia Resolutions, introduced in the Constitutional Convention on May 29th, provided that the Convention's recommendations ought first to be approved by Congress and then be submitted to specially elected state ratifying conventions for their approval. Some delegates opposed this novel idea and wanted to abide by the ratification procedure provided by the Articles. Others, however, suggested the utility of state conventions. They would be single-house bodies, thus making it easier to obtain their approval as opposed to the state legislatures that were generally bicameral. Also some of the ablest men in the country were not members of the state legislatures. These men--including all members of Congress--could be elected to the ratifying conventions. Furthermore, the recommendations of the Constitutional Convention would probably reduce the powers of the state legislatures thus making their assent less likely.

On the 5th of June, James Wilson of Pennsylvania proposed that a plurality of the states be sufficient to adopt the Convention's recommendations. This was the first mention of the abandonment of the unanimity provision of the Articles, and no opposition was immediately voiced. Twelve weeks later the Convention reconsidered the issue. Different delegates proposed that seven, eight, nine or all thirteen states be required to ratify the Constitution. Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania suggested that a smaller number of states be required for ratification if the states were contiguous and a larger number if the states were dispersed.

At this point John Dickinson asked whether Congress' assent was needed for ratification and whether the non-ratifying states could be deserted. The Convention decided that Congress' approval was not needed to adopt the new Constitution and that once nine state conventions had ratified, the Constitution would take effect among the ratifying states. These were important decisions. Had the Convention decided otherwise, it is uncertain that the Constitution would have been ratified.

Second Stage

On the 17th of September 1787 the delegates to the Constitutional Convention signed the Constitution and the Convention adjourned *sine die*, thus beginning the second stage of ratification. Three days later the Constitution was submitted and read to Congress in New York. Critics of the Constitution wanted it submitted to the states with the acknowledgment that the Constitutional Convention had violated the Articles of Confederation, the instructions of the state legislatures to their delegates, and the congressional resolution of 21 February 1787 calling the Convention. Supporters of the Constitution wanted it sent to the states with Congress' approbation.

On 27 September Virginia delegate Richard Henry Lee moved that a bill of rights be added to the Constitution. Lee's motion was easily defeated thus indicating to Antifederalists that they could not prevent Congress from endorsing the Constitution. Federalists, however, wanted to propagate the illusion that the Constitution was warmly supported by all of Congress. Consequently, a compromise was reached: Congress would *unanimously* vote to transmit the Constitution to the states with neither approbation nor disapprobation and all reference to Lee's bill of rights would be deleted from the journals. In commenting on the congressional resolution, George Washington said that

I am better pleased that the proceedings of the Convention is handed from Congress by a unanimous vote (feeble as it is) than if it had appeared under stronger marks of approbation without it.--This apparent unanimity will have its effect.--Not every one has opportunities to peep behind the curtain; and as the multitude often judge from externals, the appearance of unanimity in that body, on this occasn., will be of great importance.⁸

Except for certain pockets of opposition, the initial public response to the Constitution was warm. Town and county meetings passed resolutions of support, and petitions were circulated calling for the speedy assembling of state conventions. Antifederalists, however, seized the initiative in newspapers in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. Using these newspapers, they were able to disseminate articles opposing the Constitution throughout the country. Federalists realized that they had been bested and they countered with their own massive newspaper campaign. Since the overwhelming majority of newspaper printers supported the Constitution, Federalists were able to inundate the press while limiting their opponents to only about ten newspapers nationwide.

The first state to consider the Constitution was Pennsylvania. Two-thirds of its Convention was Federalist. They allowed their state convention to debate the Constitution by paragraphs but when the *Pennsylvania Herald* began publishing the Antifederalist speeches in detail, Federalists became

alarmed. Pressure was applied to the publisher and the editor of the *Herald* was fired. Federalists then cancelled their subscriptions and the *Herald* was forced to go out of business. The minority of the Pennsylvania convention then was not allowed to enter its objections on the convention journals and a bill of rights was similarly kept off the journals. Finally Federalists called for the vote and the Constitution was ratified 46 to 23. Antifederalists had lost the first major battle in the state conventions, but Federalists came away looking as if they had had to use obnoxious tactics to obtain ratification.

Five days earlier Delaware's convention had ratified the Constitution unanimously. New Jersey and Georgia likewise ratified unanimously before the end of 1787, while Connecticut ratified by a three-to-one majority on the 9th of January 1788. Thus ended the second stage of ratification setting the stage for the most important event in the entire ratification struggle.

Third Stage

On the 3rd of January 1788 ten of Boston's twelve delegates to the Massachusetts convention held a dinner-caucus. Governor John Hancock was ill with the gout and thus did not attend. But Sam Adams did attend and broke his long public silence on the Constitution. Adams declared that he opposed the Constitution and would work against it in the convention. Federalist leaders immediately called a meeting of Boston's tradesmen--Adams' base of political support. About 400 tradesmen assembled and expressed their strong support for the Constitution and warned the Boston delegates that a vote against the Constitution would be "contrary to the best interests, the strongest feelings, and warmest wishes of the Tradesmen of the town of Boston."⁹

When the convention assembled, John Hancock was elected president. As usual, however, during difficult political times, the governor's gout flared up and he was unable to attend. After three weeks of debate, Federalists had made significant inroads into the large Antifederalist majority that had been elected, but Federalists realized that they had lost. If a vote were taken, the Constitution would be defeated albeit by a relatively slim majority.

In an effort to win over a few more votes to tip the balance, Federalists decided to propose some recommendatory amendments to the Constitution. The convention would unconditionally ratify the Constitution, but it recommended that the state's representatives and senators in the first federal Congress support certain amendments to the Constitution. To insure a warm reception for these amendments, Federalists leaders agreed to ask Governor Hancock, their arch-political enemy, to present the amendments to the convention as his own. To compensate the governor, Federalists promised not to run a candidate opposite Hancock in the spring gubernatorial

elections. Furthermore, Hancock was promised support for the Vice-Presidency of the United States. And, if Virginia did not ratify the Constitution, thus making George Washington ineligible, Hancock would be the obvious choice for President.

The bait was strong. Hancock's gout improved; he attended the convention and proposed "his" amendments. Sam Adams, the consummate politician, seeing that ratification was now inevitable, jumped on the bandwagon. The final vote was taken on the 6th of February and the convention ratified the Constitution by a narrow nineteen-vote margin--187 to 168.

The immediate response from Federalists nationwide was relief. James Madison believed that "The amendments are a blemish, but are in the least offensive form."¹⁰ Antifederalists such as Patrick Henry argued that Massachusetts had "put the cart before the horse."¹¹ After seeing Massachusetts' amendments, Thomas Jefferson changed his mind about the best procedure to follow in ratifying the Constitution:

my first wish was that 9 states would adopt it in order to ensure what was good in it, & that the others might, by holding off, produce the necessary amendments. but the plan of Massachusetts is far preferable, and will I hope be followed by those who are yet to decide.¹²

As it turned out, Jefferson's wish came true as six of the remaining seven states used the Massachusetts technique of ratifying the Constitution unconditionally while proposing recommendatory amendments. Without this type of ratification, the Constitution never would have been adopted. This, indeed, was the turning point in the struggle and marked the end of the third stage of ratification.

Fourth Stage

The next stage of ratification saw the assurgence of the Antifederalists. False reports of North Carolina's ratification were exposed throughout the northern states. The New York legislature barely passed a resolution calling for a state convention. Then, on 21 February 1788, the bombshell hit. The seemingly safe New Hampshire convention adjourned without ratifying the Constitution. (A vote in the convention would have meant a rejection of the Constitution.) A month later, on 24 March, a statewide referendum in Rhode Island overwhelmingly defeated the Constitution 2,708 to 237. Thus ended the fourth stage of ratification.

Fifth Stage

The events of February and March had a sobering effect on Federalists. Their

bandwagon had been derailed and they vowed to put forth a strenuous effort to ratify the Constitution in the next scheduled state conventions. Federalist majorities in the Maryland and South Carolina conventions steamrolled the Constitution through by votes of 63 to 11 and 149 to 73, respectively. The fifth stage of ratification ended when the second session of the New Hampshire convention ratified the Constitution with recommendatory amendments on the 21st of June 1788 by a vote of 57 to 47. This was the crucial ninth state. The Constitution had been adopted, and the fifth stage of ratification was completed.

Sixth Stage

Even with nine states assenting to the Constitution, the Union would have difficulty surviving without the large states of Virginia and New York. The refusal of these two states to ratify the Constitution would have divided the new union into three small entities--New England, the Middle States, and the extreme South. The importance of Virginia and New York was realized by everyone and Federalists and Antifederalists exerted total efforts in these states.

In Virginia George Mason and Patrick Henry led the Antifederalists. Henry suggested that if the Constitution was wisely constructed, let us receive it: But, Sir, shall its adoption by eight States induce us to receive it, if it be replete with the most dangerous defects? They [Federalists] urge that subsequent amendments are safer than previous amendments, and that they will answer the same ends. At present we have our liberties and privileges in our own hands. Let us not relinquish them. Let us not adopt this system till we see them secured. There is some small possibility, that should we follow the conduct of Massachusetts, amendments might be obtained. There is small possibility of amending any Government; but, Sir, shall we abandon our most inestimable rights, and rest their security on a mere possibility?¹³

Without substantial amendments, Virginia Antifederalists believed that the Constitution would "destroy the State Governments, and swallow the liberties of the people."¹⁴ In response to these arguments, James Madison and Governor Edmund Randolph maintained that the Confederation was "too defective to deserve correction. Let us take farewell of it, with reverential respect, as an old benefactor. It is gone, whether this House says so, or not."¹⁵ The Constitution alone could save the Union. Madison and Randolph prevailed as a small majority voted 89 to 79 on 25 June 1788 to unconditionally ratify the Constitution with recommendatory amendments.

In New York two-thirds of the convention opposed the Constitution,

but a group of Antifederalists broke away from Governor George Clinton's Antifederalist party and voted on 26 July 1788 for unconditional ratification with recommendatory amendments. New York's support, they believed, was needed in the first federal Congress to get a bill of rights and other amendments proposed. Without New York's support in Congress no amendments would be submitted to the states and New York would be isolated. It was, according to Antifederalists,

our object to improve the plan proposed: to strengthen and secure its democratic features; to add checks and guards to it; to secure equal liberty by proper Stipulations to prevent any undue exercise of power, and to establish beyond the power of faction to alter, a genuine federal republic. To effect this great and desirable object . . . the doors of accommodation [must be] constantly kept open.¹⁶

It was time for

men in all the states who wish to establish a free, equal, and efficient government to the exclusion of anarchy, corruption, faction, and oppression . . . to unite in their exertions in making the best of the Constitution now established.¹⁷

Judge Zephaniah Platt of Dutchess County explained the Antifederalists' dilemma best: I voted for unconditional ratification not from a conviction that the Constitution was a good one or that the liberties of men were well secured. No--I voted for it as a choice of evils in our own present situation.¹⁸

Seventh Stage

Finally, the new Constitution was ratified. On 13 September 1788 the Confederation Congress passed an ordinance providing for the first federal elections, and on 4 March 1789 the first Congress under the Constitution assembled. The two remaining states--North Carolina and Rhode Island--ratified the Constitution in November 1789 and in May 1790, respectively.

It had taken a long, bitter struggle to ratify the Constitution. Amazingly, however, the revolution in favor of government was accomplished peacefully. The opposition was loud enough to convince the new Congress under the Constitution to propose a bill of rights which was soon adopted by the states. This bill of rights, as it turned out, would be of utmost importance in preserving our personal liberties. And thus, the Antifederalists had made a significant contribution. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, there had "been opposition enough to do good, & not enough to do harm."¹⁹

Notes

1. Patrick Henry speech, 5 June 1788, *Debates and Other Proceedings of the Convention of Virginia* (3 vols., Petersburg, Va., 1788-89), I, 58.
2. Washington to John Jay, 1 August 1786, Washington Papers, Library of Congress.
3. Philadelphia *American Museum*, March 1787.
4. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 30 May 1787.
5. 28 September 1787, Washington Papers, Library of Congress.
6. 24 October 1787, Knox Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.
7. Albany *Federal Herald*, 31 March 1788.
8. Washington to James Madison, 10 October 1787, Special Collections, Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Amherst College.
9. *Massachusetts Gazette*, 8 January 1788.
10. Madison to George Washington, 15 February 1788, Washington Papers, Library of Congress.

11. Patrick Henry speech, 9 June 1788, *Virginia Debates*, I, 160.
12. Jefferson to Edward Carrington, 27 May 1788, Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress.
13. Patrick Henry speech, 7 June 1788, *Virginia Debates*, I, 142-43.
14. Patrick Henry speech, 9 June 1788, *Virginia Debates*, I, 159.
15. Edmund Randolph speech, 6 June 1788, *Virginia Debates*, I, 93.
16. Nathan Dane to Melancton Smith, 3 July 1788, John Wingate Thornton Collection, New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, Mass.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Platt to William Smith, 28 July 1788, Museum, Manor of St. George, Mastic Beach, Long Island, N.Y.
19. Jefferson to Charles William Frederick Dumas, 12 February 1788, Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress.