The Constitution has made no provision for our holding foreign territory, still less for incorporating foreign nations into our Union. The executive, in seizing the fugitive occurrence which so much advances the good of their country, have done an act beyond the Constitution. The legislature, …risking themselves like faithful servants, must ratify and pay for it...

While the property and sovereignty of the Mississippi and its waters secure an independent outlet for the produce of the western States, and an uncontrolled navigation through their whole course, free from collision with other powers and the dangers to our peace from that source, the fertility of the country, its climate and extent, promise in due season important aids to our treasury, and ample provision for our posterity, and a widespread field for the blessings of freedom and equal laws.

Thomas Jefferson – Letter to John Breckinridge and Third Annual Message to Congress (1803)

Possession of [New Orleans; and of such other positions on the Mississippi] we must have…to secure to us forever the complete and uniterrupted navigation of that river. This I have ever been in favor of; I think it essential to the peace of the united States, and to the prosperity of our Western country. But as to Louisiana, this new, immense, unbounded world, if it ever be incorporated into this Union, which I have no idea can be done but by altering the Constitition, I believe it will be the greatest curse that could at present befall us...the settlement of this country will be highly injurious and dangerous to the United States...and of making the fertile regions of Louisiana a howling wilderness, never to be trodden by the foot of civilized man, it is impracticable...The inducements will be so strong that it will be impossible to restrain our citizens from crossing the river.

Samuel White – U.S. Senate Speech (1803)

A. Briefly explain ONE significant difference between Thomas Jefferson's view and Samuel White's view of the United States acquisition of the Louisiana Territory.

The American people have declared their constitution, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, to be supreme; but this principle would transfer the supremacy , in fact, to the States… The people of all the States have created the general government, and have conferred upon it the general power of taxation. The people of all the States, and the States themselves, are represented in Congress, and, by their representatives, exercise this power...when a State taxes the operations of the government of the United States, it acts upon institutions created, not by their own constitutents, but by people over whom they claim no control. It acts upon the measures of a government created by others as well as themselves, for the benefit of others in common with themselves... The result is a conviction that the States have no power, by taxation or otherwise, to retard, impede, burden, or in any manner control, the operations of the constitutional laws enacted by Congress to carry into execution the powers vested in the general government.

John Marshall – McCulloch v. Maryland (1819)

[The] Constitution conveyed only a limited grant of powers to the general government, and reserved the residuary powers to the governments of the states and the to the people; and that the Tenth Amendment was merely declaratory of this principle… The limited grant to Congress of certain enumerated powers only carried with it such additional powers as were fairly incidental to them, or, in other words, were necessary and proper for their execution... It is laid down in the report before mentioned that Congress under the terms "necessary and proper" have only all incidental powers necessary and proper, etc., and that the only inquiry is whether the power is properly an incident to an express power and necessary to its execution, and that if it is not, Congress cannot exercise it.

Spencer Roane – Editorial from the Richmond Enquirer (1819)

A. Briefly explain ONE significant difference between John Marshall's view and Spencer Roane's view of the scope of power between the federal government and states.

Despite all the examples of popular vice in the [1780s], the Federalist confidence in the people remained strong. The Federalists had by no means lost faith in the people, at least in the people's ability to discern their true leaders. In fact many of the social elite who comprised the Federalist leadership were confident of popular election if the constituency could be made broad enough…Despite prodding by so-called designing and unprincipled men, the bulk of the people remained deferential to the established social leadership... Even if they had wanted to, the Federalists could not turn their backs on republicanism.

Gordon S. Wood – The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787 (1969)

The competing economic struggles advanced in the 1780s were rooted in conflicting assessments of popular virtue. Madison and other prominent Federalists believed the 1780s offered farmers a grim lesson about the limits of their own capacity for self-rule. According to this viewpoint, the authors of the Revolution-era state constitutions had placed too much faith in ordinary Americans' ability and willingness to act wisely and justly… Although [many Americans] agreed that the state legislatures had mismanaged the economy, they traced this failure to elite, not popular, misrule. Consequently, they disputed the Federalists' assertion that the only way out of the economic bind was to embrace the restraints on popular influence embodied in the Constitution.

Woody Holton – Did Democracy Cause the Recession That Led to the Constitution? (2005)

A. Briefly explain ONE specific historical difference between Wood's and Holton's interpretations.