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Reluctant Warriors and the Federalist Resurgence in New York, 1808-1815

by Harvey Strum

I

After the election of Thomas Jefferson as president in 1800, the majority of New Yorkers identified with the principles of the Republican Party — republicanism, equalitarianism, nationalism, and Anglophobia. They accepted the Republican Party image of the Federalists, represented by Stephen Van Rensselaer, as the party of aristocrats, elitists, Anglophiles and Tories.

By 1801 the Federalist Party had lost control of the state Senate, Assembly, governor’s office and the New York congressional delegation. They went into a rapid decline to political insignificance. By 1806 the Federalists held no seats in the state Senate, nineteen of the one hundred-twelve Assembly seats, two of the seventeen congressional seats, and did not challenge Republican gubernatorial candidates in 1804 and 1807.

In 1808, however, the Federalists staged a political resurrection, making major gains in the Assembly and congressional races. Then in 1809, for the first time in ten years, they captured control of the Assembly. It was Republican foreign policy under Jefferson and Madison that provided the catalyst for the Federalist resurgence between 1808-1815.

In June of 1807, the British warship, *Leopard*, had fired upon an American frigate, the *Chesapeake*, when the American captain refused to permit the British to search his vessel for deserters. Firing broadside after broadside into the American ship, the British had killed three and injured eighteen Americans. Outraged at the British attack, New Yorkers stopped the British minister, Sir Augustus Foster, when he entered New York City. Due to the intervention of a “reasonable prudent person,” Foster, his horses, and carriage escaped a baptism in the Hudson River by a mob of enraged citizens.

Harvey Strum completed his Ph.D. in History at Syracuse University in May 1979. This article is based upon his doctoral dissertation, “New York and the War of 1812.” In writing the dissertation he used material from the Asa Eastwood Papers, Green Family Papers, the Lorenzo Collection, Barzalli Pease Journals, Peter Smith Papers, and the Spaulding Family Papers in the George Arents Research Library for Special Collections at Syracuse University, as well as materials from several sources in other libraries.
In retaliation for the British attack upon the *Chesapeake*, President Jefferson asked Congress, when it reconvened in November, to stop all foreign trade. An embargo would prevent the capture of American vessels, stop the impressment of American seamen, and put pressure upon the British to make amends for the *Chesapeake*. The Republican majority in Congress easily passed the embargo law.

While the British attack angered virtually all New Yorkers, many opposed retaliating by means of the embargo. Seven of New York’s Republican Congressman voted for the embargo; but the two Federalists, joined by four Republicans, voted against it. Federalists objected to the embargo because they consistently opposed all forms of commercial warfare against Great Britain and feared the embargo would lead to an Anglo-American war.

Almost three hundred ships lay at anchor in New York City when news arrived on Christmas Day, 1807, confirming the embargo. In a frenzied effort to leave port, ships sailed only partially laden, half-manned, and without government clearance papers. Crowds of spectators gathered on the wharves to cheer the embargo violators. Revenue cutters and gunboats chased after the ships and some of the vessels got almost thirty miles from New York before capture. Describing the public mood, Federalists observed that the embargo “cast a gloom over every countenance.”

With the imposition of the embargo, New Yorkers found a loophole in the law. They traded with the Canadians. To plug the loophole, Congress passed an embargo enforcement bill in early 1808 forbidding trade with adjacent foreign territories. In Congress, Barent Gardenier, representing the Hudson Valley counties of Greene and Ulster, denounced the new law and the embargo for impoverishing the farmers and merchants of the state. Imploring the President “to leave a little to your distressed people,” he warned that farmers and merchants needed foreign markets for the surplus agricultural produce of New York.

Ignoring the law and Republican appeals to honor the embargo, New Yorkers continued to smuggle potash and agricultural produce across the Canadian border. Efforts of local customs officers to stop the illicit trade met with resistance. Customs officers found empty coffins at their front doors. They appealed for military protection, Governor Daniel Tompkins sent the militia, and President Jefferson dispatched regular Army troops. Smuggling was so widespread along New York’s northern border, that the president, on April 19, 1808, declared the Lake Champlain region in a state of insurrection.

---

1*New York Commercial Advertiser*, December 26, 1807.

The embargo served as the major issue upon which Federalists and Republicans fought the 1808 spring elections for Congress, state Senate and Assembly. The embargo even dominated town elections. According to Republican editor Charles Holt, “The embargo is made the criterion by which the most unimportant popular election is decided.” Governor Tompkins kicked off the 1808 election campaign in late January with a pro-embargo speech to the state legislature. Over the objections of the Federalist minority in the legislature, the Republican majority endorsed the Governor’s speech and expressed its approval of the embargo.³

Seeking to use American hostility toward the British to stimulate public enthusiasm for the embargo, the Tammany Society proposed a public commemoration of the Revolutionary War soldiers who died as prisoners of war aboard the British prison ships stationed off the New Jersey coast. Honoring the Revolution’s martyrs would remind New Yorkers of King George’s efforts “to enslave the free sons of America.” The Republicans also utilized the impending interment of the Revolutionary War dead to promote Anglophobia and rekindle the old Revolutionary War memories. Republicans called upon New Yorkers to patiently endure the difficulties produced by the embargo in order to prove to the world that the American people would support their government in times of crisis. They condemned Federalist opposition to the embargo as “indirect treason equal to the crime itself.”⁴

As “soldiers of the constitution,” Federalists felt an obligation to save the nation from the embargo and the continued Republican misrule. The concept of declension dominated their thoughts and rhetoric. A once prosperous nation now stood “reduced to dull subsistence.” New York Federalists saw themselves as Jeremiahs trying to cleanse the nation and the state and return the government to the path of political righteousness. Turning Republican rhetoric on its head, Federalists warned that the odium of embargo “would discredit the republican form of government” and drive the nation to despotism.⁵

The economic consequences of the embargo, Federalists claimed, would ruin farmers, leaving “their hard earned produce a burthen on their hands.” According to the Federalists, the embargo had turned “our smiling fields into deserts...[and] in the complaints...of our

³Hudson Bee, April 13-20, 1808.

⁴Ibid; Cooperstown Otsego Herald, April 1808; Diary of Asa Eastwood, May 26, 1808, Asa Eastwood Papers, Syracuse University Libraries.

⁵A Report (Schenectady, 1808), pp. 3-14; Poughkeepsie Journal, April 20, 1808; Kingston Ulster Gazette, January 5, 1808.
hardy seaman, our labouring poor...we hear the evidence of dismay and alarm.” Bitterly assailing the embargo and President Jefferson, Federalists portrayed themselves as the champions of the farmers, laborers, mechanics, and merchants.6

Economic distress produced by the embargo led to a mass defection of voters to the Federalist Party in 1808. After the election Federalists jumped from 24 seats in the New York Assembly to 47. They won 8 of the 17 congressional seats compared to only 2 in 1806. For the first time in ten years Montgomery and Schoharie Counties went Federalist. Queens, Rensselaer, Madison, Greene, and Kings Counties also voted Federalist. Even in counties where the Republicans retained a majority, the Federalists made impressive gains. In Herkimer County the Republican majority dropped from 624 to 204; and in Otsego County it plummeted from 800 in 1807 to 200 in 1808. Republican Party leaders Martin Van Buren and former Governor Morgan Lewis blamed the embargo for the impressive Federalist gains. Republican editor Solomon Southwick reported that in Montgomery, Rensselaer, and Herkimer Counties the embargo was “as odious...as the stamp act.”7 Hostility to the embargo not only boosted the Federalists in New York, but also produced a party resurgence in Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and New England.

Farmers in the eastern and upper Hudson Valley and the Mohawk Valley showed the greatest disposition to swing over to the Federalists because of their dependence upon foreign markets for their agricultural produce. Yet, farmers in areas most exposed to the dangers of an Anglo-American war, as well as those least dependent upon foreign markets, voted Republican. And, even though mechanics and laborers in New York City were hard hit by the embargo, they remained loyal to the Republican Party.

Throughout the remainder of 1808 and early 1809, New Yorkers continued to violate the law. From New York City and Long Island, ships clandestinely left in the middle of the night “to clear the Gun Boats” which were stationed to prevent illegal departures. In Salina, the export of salt depended upon getting it past the customs officials in Oswego. Inhabitants of Cayuga and Seneca counties shipped their produce up Cayuga Lake, through the Seneca and Oswego Rivers, for transportation via Lake Ontario to Montreal.

---

6New York Evening Post, April 11, 1808; Hudson Balance, April 26, 1808.

7Albany Register, May 1808.
To stop the smuggling, Governor Tompkins sent a detachment of militia to the head of Cayuga Lake. One man died in a gunfight between smugglers and the militia near the Cayuga line. Trying to prevent the widespread smuggling from Oswego and Sackett’s Harbor, Customs Officer Joel Burt requested the aid of the Onondaga County militia. Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin recommended declaring Oswego in a state of insurrection; but, fearing the political consequences, Governor Tompkins advised the president against it.

Opposition to the embargo was so strong in Jefferson and St. Lawrence Counties that citizens in Sackett’s Harbor refused to sell food to militia troops who were sent there to enforce the law. At Oswegatchie, residents formed an association to prevent the stationing of troops. Inhabitants of Jefferson County regularly “liberated” at night what the collector of Customs, Hart Massey, had captured during the day. His confrontations with Jefferson County residents led Massey to observe, “the passions of the inhabitants are raised to a fever pitch.”

Public hostility to the embargo encouraged the Federalists to organize a petition drive to repeal the embargo. Largely Federalist militia companies refused to volunteer to enforce the law. In response to Governor Tompkins’s appeal for troops the Albany Rifle Corps refused to serve lest they “embrace their Bayonets in the blood of their fellow Citizens.” Opposition to the embargo stimulated Federalist organizational activities. During the summer of 1808 Federalists formed the Washington Benevolent Society to capitalize on the magnetism of the late George Washington and counteract the personal appeal of Jefferson. Throughout the state, Federalists formed chapters of the society; and, trying to recapture the Revolutionary tradition, Federalists organized Whig societies in the upper Hudson and Mohawk Valleys. Both the Albany and New York Federalist committees encouraged Federalists to organize district, town, and county committees to further the Federalist cause.

During the 1809 campaign Federalists concentrated their attacks on the embargo and supplementary embargo enforcement bill. They denounced the embargo enforcement act because it “exposed the persons, dwellings and property of our citizens to the most arbitrary and odious visitations.” Federalists warned that the embargo would

---

8Diary of Asa Eastwood, November 11, 1808, March 15, 1809, Asa Eastwood Papers, Syracuse University Libraries; Asa Danforth to Timothy Green, May 9, 1808, Green Family Papers, Syracuse University Libraries; Hart Massey to Albert Gallatin, March 25, 1809, Reel 31, Sackett’s Harbor, Correspondence of the Collector of Customs, Secretary of the Treasury, Record Group 59, National Archives.

lead to the "horrors of military despotism." Implying the need for active resistance, Federalists in Washington County resolved that "the grievances we suffer" under the embargo "may be well expressed by the language of our fathers toward the British government in 1777." 10

To win the votes of ethnic and political minorities, Federalists made special appeals to Irish-Americans, Dutch-Americans, German-Americans, former Tories, and blacks. Speaking before the Wilberforce Philanthropic Association, Joseph Sidney appealed to his fellow blacks to choose between the "slavery polls of democracy" and the Federalist "standard of liberty." In order to capitalize upon the discontent of unemployed sailors, Federalists told jack-tars to "boom off...from such land-lubbers as wish to drive you" from the sea "to the spade and shovel." Federalists reminded ship chandlers, rope makers, sail makers, blacksmiths, riggers, and other mechanics and tradesmen dependent upon the maritime trade, that the Republicans bore the responsibility for the commercial restrictions and the subsequent decline of international commerce. Trying to outflank the Republicans, the Federalists also assailed the legislative caucus as a subversion of republican political principles and an "assumption of power highly derogatory of freemen." The Federalists reminded voters that they had introduced elected district conventions and argued that the people, not party leaders, ought to nominate candidates.11

To justify the embargo, Republicans portrayed it as the only alternative to war. Onondaga County Republicans warned that opposition to the embargo risked driving the nation into "the horrors of a foreign war." In an effort to neutralize the political impact of the depression produced by the embargo, Republicans told voters "the decrees of France and England are the real causes of the interruption of our commerce." Republicans condemned the Federalists as "advocates of Insurrection and Rebellion." Martin Van Buren, speaking to Columbia County Republicans, catalogued the allegedly seditious activities of the Federalist opposition to the embargo. Again trying to use Anglophobia against the Federalists, Republicans asked voters if they were "willing to become the vassals of England?" To blunt the Federalist appeals to the discontented, Republicans wrapped themselves in the Revolutionary tradition, Anglophobia, American exceptionalism, and nationalism.12

10Salem Northern Post, April 1809; Utica Patriot, April 1809; Kingston Ulster Gazette, April 1809.

11Joseph Sidney, An Oration Commemorative of the Abolition of the Slave Trade (New York, 1809); New York Evening Post, April 19-28, 1809; Morris Miller to Peter Smith, April 22, 1809, Reel I, Peter Smith Papers, Syracuse University Libraries.

12New York Aurora, March 30, 1809; Cazenovia Pilot, February 8, 1809; New York Public Advertiser, April 1809.

9
DANIEL D. THOMPKINS
from The Memorial History of the City of New York, James Grant Wilson, ed.
New-York History Company, 1893.
When news reached New York of the Erskine Agreement, repealing the embargo in exchange for British removal of restrictions on American commerce, New Yorkers rejoiced. Both Republicans and Federalists fought for the credit for the embargo’s removal. Even though the embargo was repealed, New York voters went to the polls and demonstrated their discontent with Jeffersonian foreign policy. Hostility to the embargo and the embargo enforcement act led to the Federalists capturing the Assembly seats in Herkimer, Ontario, Otsego, Jefferson, St. Lawrence, Clinton-Franklin, and Richmond Counties. Picking up 18 seats in the Assembly the Federalists won a total of 63 of the 112 seats and captured a majority in the Assembly for the first time in ten years. In the state Senate races the Federalists won 5 of the 8 seats at stake. In the Western State Senate District a Republican majority of 3,200 in 1808 turned into a Federalist majority of 320. As Ontario County Republican leader John Nicholas admitted, the New England immigrants to western New York, incensed by the embargo, abandoned the Republican Party to vote Federalist in 1809.

In 1808, 57,000 voters went to the polls for the state Senate. This jumped by 16,000 (28 percent) in 1809. Voter turnout also rose markedly in many counties in the Assembly races. In the key counties of Ontario and Otsego which switched from Republican to Federalist, voter turnout jumped 20 percent and 44 percent respectively. During the 1809 election Federalists benefited from a significant rise in voter participation and a sharp rise in the Federalist vote. Federalists ran well in the towns and counties of western Long Island, the eastern and upper Hudson Valley, the Southern Tier, the North County, the Mohawk and Upper Susequehana Valleys, and the eastern part of the Genesee country. Republicans managed to retain majorities in the towns and counties of the lower western Hudson Valley, the Catskills, eastern Long Island, New York City, the Delaware Valley, the region between Lake Champlain and the Hudson, the Niagara Frontier, the Finger Lakes, and Onondaga County. But citizen discontent with the embargo brought voters to the polls and made the Federalists a majority party for the first time in ten years.

II

News of the British repudiation of the Erskine Agreement in the summer of 1809 led President James Madison, Jefferson’s successor, to recommend the renewal of commercial restrictions against Britain. When Congress removed the embargo it replaced it with the Non-Intercourse Act forbidding trade only with England and France. The Erskine Agreement had allowed trade with England, but its repudiation led to application of Non-Intercourse against both European belligerents.
Trying to reach an accommodation, the British dispatched Sir James Jackson as the new British minister. Angered by his pompous and insulting attitude, the president demanded Jackson’s recall in November 1809. This break in Anglo-American diplomatic relations alarmed and incensed Federalists, such as John Lincklaen, who feared “an alliance with France, and a War with England is inevitable.” The Federalists denounced the Republicans for their alleged “malicious and inveterate hatred” of England.\(^\text{13}\)

During the 1810 election campaign the Federalists tried to use the dismissal of Jackson and the danger of war as their major issues to retain control of the Assembly and to win the gubernatorial election and a majority of the congressional delegation. Republicans assailed Jackson for his “vile attempts...to evade the just...claims of our government” and attacked the Federalists for their “fulsome adulation” of the British minister. Bitterly divided into warring factions fighting for control of the party and the state’s patronage, the Republicans temporarily united in 1810 in an attempt to recapture control of the Assembly and with it control of state patronage. To oust the Federalists, they used the issues of Jackson’s dismissal, the popularity of their gubernatorial candidate, Anglophobia, and their advocacy of democracy. With the removal of the embargo, voters returned to the Republican Party. The Republicans easily re-elected Governor Tompkins by fifty-four percent of the vote over his Federalist challenger, Jonas Platt. They also won two-thirds of the Assembly seats, twelve of the seventeen congressional seats and all the state Senate seats at stake.\(^\text{14}\)

Even though the Republicans soundly defeated them the Federalists remained stronger in 1810 than they had been prior to the embargo. In 1807 the Federalists held only 24 seats in the Assembly, but in 1810 they retained 41. Immediately after the election the Republicans split apart into warring factions. In 1811 the majority of the Republican leadership backed the candidacy of De Witt Clinton for lieutenant-governor, but Tammany and the Robert Livingston-Morgan Lewis faction of the party endorsed the candidacy of Marinus Willett. The Federalists nominated Nicholas Fish. In a campaign without issues Clinton easily won, demonstrating his hold over the loyalty of the state’s Republicans. Clinton received 50.4 percent of the vote, Fish, 44.6 percent and Willett 5 percent. The Federalists retained 41 seats in the Assembly. Unlike the years 1804 and 1807, when Republican Party factions were the major political forces, in 1811 the Federalists

\(^{13}\)John Lincklaen to Paul Busti, November 15, 1809, John Lincklaen Letterbook, 1805-1812, Lorenzo Papers, Syracuse University Libraries.

\(^{14}\)Hudson Bee, January-February 1810; New York Columbian, January-May 1810.
were the major opposition. Tammany, and the anti-Clinton and Livingston-Lewis factions were a very weak third force. Although the embargo returned the Federalist Party to a major position in New York political life, the 1810 and 1811 elections suggest that, without the discontent arising from Republican foreign policy issues, the Federalists could not have effectively challenged Republican control of New York.

III

Throughout 1810 and 1811 efforts to reach an understanding with the British failed. Congress removed all restrictions on commerce in May, 1810, with the passage of Macon’s Bill No. 2. According to this new law, Congress authorized the president to reimpose sanctions against either of the two belligerents if the other agreed to respect American neutral rights. France issued an ambiguous note, the Duc de Cadore Letter, which President Madison interpreted as French acceptance of American rights; and he imposed an embargo on trade with the British.

Renewal of the commercial restrictions against Britain did not lead to her capitulation. On November 5, 1811, the president recommended the strengthening of military defenses. Following the president’s recommendations, the House Committee on Foreign Relations, chaired by Peter Porter, who represented most of New York west of Seneca Lake, approved increased expenditures for defense. Upon instructions from the White House, Congress passed a ninety-day embargo. Madison signed it into law on April 4, 1812. In anticipation of the embargo a frenzied effort was made to load all the ships in New York City because the owners “feared they will be Stopped by the Embargo.” Many vessels fled the port, as Asa Eastwood observed, “with only two or three Men on board.”

Rumors of war with England circulated in New York for months prior to the actual declaration. As Asa Eastwood noted in late February 1812, “it is Said we Shall Certainly have a war.” The new embargo and the threat of war gave the Federalists the issues they used in the 1812 campaign. Organized petition drives in Troy, Lansingburgh, Waterford, Albany, New York, and other communities demanded that Congress delay or repeal the new embargo law. Federalists warned that if the Republicans won the election it would lead to “TAXATION without limits and a WAR without glory.” Editor Paraclete Potter of the Poughkeepsie Journal told voters to choose

15Asa Eastwood Diary, April 5, 7, 1812, Asa Eastwood Papers, Syracuse University Libraries.
between peace, neutrality, and trade if they voted Federalist, and "enormous loans and large standing armies...land taxes, whiskey taxes...the EMBARGO," and war if they elected the Republicans. War would bring "ruin and disgrace," Albany Federalists predicted, "and its only acquisition the...cold, inhospitable provinces of Canada and Nova Scotia." 16

Local jealousies over the control of nominations almost split the Federalists. Madison and Oneida Counties fought a bitter battle for the right to nominate a congressional candidate. Against the pleadings of Morris S. Miller and Jonas Platt of the Oneida Federalist Committee, Peter Smith, father of abolitionist Gerrit Smith, upheld the claims of Madison County. Eventually Smith and the other Madison County Federalists acquiesced to the Oneida County nomination. In Albany, New England immigrants successfully ended Dutch domination of Federalist nominations by winning the nomination of John Lovett, the Connecticut-born clerk of the Albany Common Council, for Congress. Conflict between towns and counties and sometimes between ethnic groups for control of nominations cursed both the Republicans and Federalists and seriously threatened Federalist and Republican Party unity in 1812. 17

Republicans attacked the British, endorsed war, and denounced the Federalists as traitors. The Republican press warned that the British sought to return the United States "to the abject condition of British colonies." To Republicans the choice was between the Federalists who favored "abject submission to Britain, and those in favor of independence." Only by resorting to war could the United States protect "our republican institutions" and preserve "the last asylum of free governments." 18

Picking up 19 additional seats, the Federalists won a majority in the Assembly, 60 to 52. In the state Senate races they picked up 3 seats while the Republicans won 5. Federalists won control of the Assembly because of victories in Jefferson, Greene, Montgomery, and Otsego Counties. They also captured 2 of the 3 seats in Madison and Westchester Counties, 3 of the 5 in Washington, and split the 2 seats in Schenectady.

The Federalist success in the Assembly races came primarily as a result of citizen discontent with the new embargo and the threat of war. As a Republican editor, Charles Holt, admitted, the decline in wheat prices produced by the new embargo proved "an important consideration with farmers." De Witt Clinton accurately predicted

16 New York Commercial Advertiser, March-April, 1812; Buffalo Gazette, April 22, 1812.
17 Oneida Corresponding Committee to Peter Smith, April 9, 1812, Jonas Platt to Peter Smith, April 14, 1812, Morris S. Miller to Peter Smith, April 17, 1812, Peter Smith to Morris S. Miller, April 15, 1812, Reel 1, Peter Smith Papers, Syracuse University Libraries.
18 Newburgh Political Index, April 4, 1812; Albany Republican, April 18, 1812.
that the embargo would lead to Republican losses. In the state Senate races, Republican division between Tammany, which backed the re-election of President Madison, and the Clintonians, supporting De Witt Clinton's bid for the presidency, enabled the Federalists to win 2 Senate seats from the Southern District for the first time in thirteen years.\footnote{New York \textit{Columbian}, May 1-18, 1812; \textit{Hudson Bee}, May 19, 1812.}

IV

With the Federalist victory many of the party faithful hoped the Republican defeat would dampen the spirits of the war hawks. "Notwithstanding the strong belief in War by many," John Lincklaen could "still cherish the hope of Peace." Federalists bombarded Congress with petitions denouncing war as "the worst of all possible evils." When the president asked Congress for a declaration of war in early June, New York's congressional delegation took the results of the 1812 election into consideration in their vote for or against war. Only three congressmen joined Senator John Smith to vote for war. Four Federalists and seven Republicans in the House and Senator Obadiah German voted against war. Though Congressman Ebenezer Sage of Long Island, one of the three who voted for war, believed that New York Republicans voted against war to further the presidential ambitions of Clinton, probably the results of the 1812 election more directly affected their vote.\footnote{John Lincklaen to Paul Busti, May 18, 1812, John Lincklaen Correspondence, Box 3, Lorenzo Collection, Syracuse University Libraries.}

To John Lincklaen and other Federalists the Republicans opted for a war "without any reasonable prospect of success and contrary to the wishes of a great portion of the Community." Throughout the summer and fall of 1812 the Federalists organized public rallies against the war. Even though Federalists in frontier counties agreed to serve in the militia, their brethren in the Hudson and Mohawk Valleys refused to volunteer. When Governor Tompkins tried to neutralize Federalist opposition to the war by appointing the Federalist leader Stephen Van Rensselaer as commander of the militia, Federalists agonized over the appointment. Reluctantly, they agreed that Van Rensselaer had no alternative, because if he had refused, the Republicans would have branded him a coward.\footnote{Ibid, John Lincklaen to Abraham Backer, October 12, 1812.}

During that same summer and fall of 1812, the militia consistently refused to participate in an invasion of Canada. Under the New York State Constitution of 1777 the militia did not have to serve outside of New York. Repeatedly, the militia refused to cross into Canada; and at the battle of Queenstown in October, twelve hundred militiamen would not cross the Niagara River to relieve American troops trapped...
by the British. A month later, when General Henry Dearborn tried to march on Montreal, the militia declined to invade Canada. When Major General Van Rensselaer called out the Chautauqua County militia in September to take part in the 1812 Niagara campaign, the militia refused because "no valuable end would be answered by the intended draft." During the winter of 1812-1813 the militia deserted en masse.22

In an effort to end the war, the Federalists debated at a secret national convention in September whether to endorse the candidacy of De Witt Clinton for the presidency. After considerable dissent, particularly from leading New York Federalists such as Rufus King, the Federalist convention agreed to quietly back Clinton. Many New York Federalists distrusted Clinton, and private meetings held with him did not end their misgivings that Clinton was a scoundrel and a political opportunist. In exchange for Federalist support, Clinton agreed to work with the Federalists in the 1812 congressional elections. As the result of a reapportionment of Congress after the 1810 census, New York's congressional delegation had jumped from seventeen to twenty-seven.

The Federalists, as "Friends of Peace, Liberty and Commerce," waged the December 1812 congressional election. Attacking the war, its ineffective prosecution, the loss of lives, the waste of money, and the increased taxes, Federalists concluded, "No possible benefit can result from the continuation of the present war." Tammany, the Livingston-Lewis faction, and many Clintonians campaigned for the war. While a few Clintonian editors criticized the war, most endorsed it. Republicans urged voters to support the "just and arduous war." If the voters chose Federalist "partizans of Britain," it would demonstrate "that the members of republics are too fickle...to support any war which bears on their purses."23

Reminiscing forty years afterwards, Republican Levi Beardsley remembered Republican efforts in Otsego County to make the war acceptable to the public, but "our candidates were defeated." New Yorkers elected nineteen anti-war Federalists, one Peace Republican and seven pro-war Republicans. With the exception of New York City, where the Clintonians cooperated with the Federalists, De Witt Clinton's promised alliance did not materialize on the local level. As the Federalist editors of the Albany Gazette accurately concluded, "the result of the late election...is wholly to be attributed to the war." From the outbreak of the war through the congressional elections the majority of New Yorkers were reluctant warriors.24

22Chautauqua County Militia to Major General Stephen Van Rensselaer, September 12, 1812, Ebenezer Foote Notebook, Chautauqua County Historical Society.
23Canandaigua Ontario Repository, November-December 1812; Genesee Ontario Messenger, December 1, 1812; New York National Advocate, December 1812.
JOHN LINCKLAEN
Founder of Cazenovia.

JOHN LINCKLAEN
from History of Madison County, State of New York by Mrs. L.M. Hammond.
Syracuse, Truair, Smith, and Co., 1872.
Immediately after the 1812 congressional elections the campaign began for the 1813 gubernatorial and state legislature elections. When Governor Tompkins and the Republican majority in the New York Senate proposed resolutions endorsing the war and loaning the federal government $500,000 to prosecute it, the Federalist Assembly passed anti-war resolutions and killed the loan. "Are you willing, that a system of conscriptions shall be adopted which tears the son from his aged parents?" Federalists asked voters during the 1813 campaign. Approving the resistance of the governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut to administration requests for a call-out of the militia, Federalists denounced Governor Tompkins’s compliance. Reports of soldiers stealing horses, insulting citizens, impressing men, arresting and beating civilians led Federalists to wonder if "this war has reduced" New Yorkers "to the condition of Turkish slaves."25

During the 1813 campaign De Witt Clinton openly broke with Governor Tompkins and tried to sabotage his re-election. With a group of loyal supporters Clinton attacked the governor's support of the war and his lukewarm attitude toward Clinton’s presidential bid. However, the vast majority of the Republican legislators rallied behind the governor and endorsed the war. Clinton was totally discredited and treated as an apostate. The fate of Clinton demonstrated that any Republican who openly formed an alliance with the Federalists lost his following in the Republican Party.

Martin Van Buren emerged as one of the leaders of the pro-war and pro-Tompkins Republicans. In an appeal to the voters, he reminded them that upon the outcome of the War of 1812 depended "whether man is capable of self-government." Popular support for the war would demonstrate to Europe the viability of the republican form of government in time of war. Republicans asked voters to elect a Republican Assembly because a Federalist Assembly "will...prove injurious to the war." To re-elect Tompkins would prove "support for the war." Trying to discredit the Federalist gubernatorial candidate, Stephen Van Rensselaer, Republicans blamed the Queenstown disaster on the alleged incompetence of Van Rensselaer. As a result of the election Tompkins remained in office, defeating his Federalist rival with fifty-two percent of the vote. The Republicans won all the Senate races, but the Federalists kept control of the Assembly.26

25New York Spectator, March 13, 1813; New York Gazette, April 20, 1813.

26Buffalo Gazette, April 27, 1813; New York Statesman, April 1813; Address of a number of Republicans... (Albany, 1813); Martin Van Buren, Autobiography, pp. 65-66, Reel 1, Martin Van Buren Papers, Library of Congress.
Tompkins's re-election did not indicate a surge of patriotism. When he called out 5,000 men for militia duty in the summer of 1813, only 1,500 appeared! Resistance to the militia call-out was greatest in the Federalist stronghold in the upper Hudson Valley. Of the 600 requested in Columbia County, 60 appeared. When the 1,500 men who turned out were marched north, as part of General Wade Hampton's drive on Montreal, only 25 agreed to cross the Canadian border. Efforts to recruit men for the Army proved disastrous. Men would not volunteer.

Then, in late December and early January, 1814, the British crossed the Niagara River and burned Buffalo and neighboring towns. Twelve thousand refugees fled western New York for the comparative safety of Batavia and Canandaigua. In April the Congress removed the embargo.

Just prior to the election of 1814, a group of pro-war Federalists in New York City split off from the party and ran a separate Assembly slate. Led by Oliver Wolcott, Jr., the former Federalist secretary of the Treasury, the splinter group ran as the American Federalists. The 1814 campaign issues repeated those of 1812 and 1813. As a result of the British destruction of the Niagara Frontier, the removal of the embargo, and the Federalist split, the Republicans won seven of the eight Senate seats, two-thirds of the Assembly seats and elected nineteen pro-war congressmen. Two congressional seats were in dispute and were later awarded to the Republicans leaving the Federalists with only six seats. While the vast majority of New Yorkers did not rush to join the Army, they gave the advocates of the war a definite vote of confidence with the Republican landslide of 1814.

Retaliating for the American burning of York (Toronto) and Newark, the British destroyed Washington in late August. Fear of a British attack on New York forced New Yorkers to unite temporarily. To defend New York City, the Federalist Common Council requested citizens to contribute their labor to construct fortifications at Brooklyn Heights, Harlem Heights, and Hell's Gate. Citizens from all walks of life “including Doctors, Lawyers, and Merchants” labored on the city's defenses. While Federalists reserved the right to criticize the conduct of the war, they agreed to join with the Republicans to defend the state from a British invasion.27

Unity did not last long. A Republican plan to revise the militia law provoked a sharp Federalist reaction. While Republicans considered reform of the militia law necessary to insure that “the wealthy exempt” assisted “the poor soldier,” Federalists “wished the Bill and the MAN who introduced it in Hell.” Organizing petitions against the law and

27 Asa Eastwood Diary, August 9, 20, 1814, Asa Eastwood Papers, Syracuse University Libraries.
mass meetings to protest it, Federalists denounced it because it bore "a great resemblance to the late...conscription system of France." Federalists objected to serving as "soldiers, against their consent [for wars] of foreign conquest." Governor Tompkins did not implement the law because enforcement might have provoked massive civil disobedience by the Federalists.28

VI

News of the end of the war in February, 1815, did not end the partisan debate about the militia law and the war. During the 1815 spring election campaign Republicans defended the war. "We have proved the practicability of a republic, such as ours, for the purposes of war," they told the voters. "We have defeated [European trained armies]," boasted the Republicans, and "have shown to the world, that... freemen are more than a match for veteran mercenary slaves." Federalists considered the war unnecessary and attacked the "odious conscription... taxes...and concluding a peace...without obtaining one object for which the war was commenced." They reminded voters that the Republicans had boasted they would conquer Canada but "at the end we were in possession of no part of Canada."

The war which divided New Yorkers so bitterly in 1812 divided them just as strongly in 1815. As a result of the election the Federalists picked up twenty-two seats in the Assembly and the Republican Assembly majority dropped from thirty-two to two, hardly an overwhelming endorsement of the war. But this proved the last comeback for the Federalists. In 1816 they won only a third of the Assembly seats and gradually disintegrated over the next five years.29

In summary, after 1800 the majority of New Yorkers voted Republican. The Federalist gains in the Assembly elections of 1808-1809, 1812-1813, and 1815, the state Senatorial elections of 1809, and the congressional elections of 1808 and 1812 represented a repudiation of the embargo and the war, not the Republican Party. Between 1808-1815, foreign policy and its impact upon the lives of New Yorkers served as the major campaign issues in state and local elections. Federalist gains represented primarily a protest vote (against specific Jefferson and Madison foreign policies) which only temporarily interrupted the dominance of the Republican Party in New York.

28Hudson *Northern Whig*, November 15, 1814; Poughkeepsie *Journal*, November 9, 1814.