p. 169, ¶ 1, line 5 – “A few, like the irrepressible Gouverneur Morris, were already making plans to flee political life for what they considered a much-deserved vacation. Most of the delegates... were steeling themselves for the next phase of the constitutional struggle; ratification of ‘the plan’ by their home states. ”

p. 169, ¶ 1, line 10 – “Unless nine states approved the Constitution, the long months of debate, argument, negotiation, and compromise would prove futile, and the crisis brought on by an incompetent government would continue. Could they rally the support they needed? No one knew.”

p. 170, ¶ 1, line 6 – “Their plans for the future were as different as their personalities: Washington hoped to retire from public life; Robert Morris hoped to save his precarious fortune; and the peg legged Gouverneur Morris hoped to travel abroad in search of cultural stimulation, and, with luck, new amorous encounters.”

p. 170, ¶ 2, line 3 – “(George) Mason remained firm in his resolve to oppose the Constitution, although he knew he would pay a high price for his apostasy. His ‘Objections to the Constitution,’ first scribbled on the back of his copy of the plan, was already circulating Philadelphia.”

p. 171, ¶ 1, line 1 – “The story (of Mason being viewed as a traitor in Virginia) was untrue, but it suggested the bitter divisions between the supporters of the new plan of government and its opponents in the key state of Virginia.”

p. 171, ¶ 2, line 5 – “A copy of the Constitution and Gouverneur Morris’s brilliantly politic letter were already on their way to the Confederation Congress. Once Congress accepted this report from the Constitutional Convention, state legislatures were expected to call for the election of delegates to special ratifying conventions. At these conventions the Constitution would be approve– or rejected.”

p. 171, ¶ 3, line 1 – “‘The Constitution,’ George Washington wrote somberly to his old friend Henry Knox, ‘is now before the Judgement Seat.’ For him, and for all the Federalists the question was: would nine states ratify?”

p. 172, ¶ 1, line 3 – “Madison felt confident that Delaware, New Jersey, and Connecticut would ratify. As for Rhode Island– few veterans of American postwar politics were surprised when the legislature of Rogue’s Island voted not to hold a ratifying convention at all.”
p. 172, ¶ 2, line 1 – “Ironically, the greatest danger lay in the home states of the two men most intimately associated with the new plan of government. In Madison’s Virginia, a fierce contest was brewing, as powerful and influential men began to publicly denounce the Constitution. And in Alexander Hamilton’s New York, the nation’s only genuine party machine, the Clintonites, were already mounting an organized campaign of opposition.”

p. 172, ¶ 3, line 6 – “Antagonism between the elite and the poorer classes was as old as America itself, and in almost every state, long-standing divisions between the privileged class that the convention delegates represented and the struggling people of the backcountry reappeared in the battle over ratification.”

p. 173, ¶ 1, line 7 – “In western counties of Virginia, Pennsylvania, or Massachusetts, voters were certain to elect delegates who shared their deep-seated distrust of merchants, tidewater planters, and lawyers, the ‘very influential men’ Hamilton described.”

p. 173, ¶ 2, line 1 – “The Constitution would find its supporters among the farmers and workingmen of the nation, of course. Urban artisans and small shopkeepers saw the advantages of a government powerful enough to increase commerce and trade.”

p. 173, ¶ 3, line 1 – “At the same time, not all the wealthy merchants or planters could be counted on to support the new plan of government. The opposition would boast a roster of notable political and economic leaders as well as Revolutionary heroes. Regional icons like Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry, activists like the Revolutionary propagandist Mercy Otis Warren, and powerful office holders like Governor George Clinton would quickly emerge as articulate champions of the antiratification movement.”

p. 174, ¶ 1, line 5 – “The backcountry men and women would depend in great measure upon champions who were from the same social class as the nationalist leadership. In many cases this proved their undoing.”

p. 174, ¶ 2, line 1, Through the whole ¶– “From the beginning the supporters of the Constitution did have one advantage: a political savvy born of experience.”

p. 175, ¶ 2, line 1 – “Perhaps the nationalists’ most brilliant tactic in the battle of ideas ahead of them... was their decision to call themselves ‘Federalists’ and their cause, ‘Federalism.’ The men behind the Constitution were not.. federalists at all. They were advocates of a strong national government whose authority diminished the independence of the states. Their opponents were the true federalists...”
p. 175, ¶ 2, line 13 – “By co-opting the name ‘Federalists,’ the pro-Constitution forces deprived their opponents of the ability to signal clearly and immediately what they stood for.”

p. 175, ¶ 3, line 1 – “The Anti-Federalist suffered from more than the damaging misnomer. In most states they found themselves on the defense, urging voters to be loyal to a government they conceded was in need of repair. Indeed, many confessed they wanted a new government; they just didn’t want the government the convention was proposing.”

p. 176, ¶ 2, line 2 – “Unlike the Federalists– who had honed their arguments over four months of grueling debate, made their compromises, and reached a measure of consensus– the Anti-Federalists had no collective critique, no agreed-upon set of objections.”

p. 176, ¶ 3, line 1 – “What Anti-Federalists did share was a pervasive suspicion, a belief that the Constitution was the end product of a carefully laid conspiracy by a cabal of ambitious men.”

p. 177, ¶ 1, line 5 – “The convention had not been called in 1787 to create an oligarchy or a monarchy, they argued, but to protect Americans from the ‘turbulence and follies of democracy’ and to help it achieve an honorable place in the family of nations.”

p. 177, ¶ 1, line 15 – “At their worst, both sides resorted to name-calling and labeling; ‘consider the source’ was the central message of many of the central message of many of the pro and anti diatribes.”

p. 177, ¶ 2, line 1 – “Substantive criticisms of the Constitution did emerge, of course, many of them echoing the concerns of the convention delegates themselves.”

p. 178, ¶ 1, line 2 – “Anxiety over excessive Senate power had been a key factor in their acceptance of what would become know as the electoral college.”

p. 178, ¶ 2, line 1 – “Over the ten months of argument and discussion that followed the completion of the Constitution, Anti-Federalists voiced few concerns about the presidency.”

p. 178, ¶ 2, line 11 – “In the ratifying conventions, the presidency was virtually ignored; none of the many amendments proposed in the New York, Virginia, or New Hampshire conventions, for example, focused on the office of the president.”

p. 178, ¶ 3, line 1 – “The explanation for this lack of controversy is simple: George Washington. Like the Federalists, the Anti-Federalists were confident Washington would be the nation’s first president if the Constitution was ratified. And like their opponents, the revered him.”

p. 179, ¶ 1, line 1 – “In the end, familiar suspicion that aristocracy was on the rise, the pervasive fear of
conspiracy, and the certainty, burned into the American consciousness, that power give would be power abused came together over a single issue: the absence of a bill of rights. To many Anti-Federalists, the failure – or refusal – of the convention to include guarantees of fundamental right such as freedom of speech or assembly was proof that the Constitution was not a solution to an existing American crisis but a source of a future one.”

p. 181, ¶ 1, line 9 – “The usually stoic Washington made no effort to disguise his hopes for ratification.”

p. 181, ¶ 2, line 1 – “Jefferson was not ‘so keen’ for the Constitution as the Federalists might have hoped. He was one of the few who singled out the presidency as a source of concern. John Adam, Jefferson’s diplomatic counterpart in London, defended the executive’s powers, especially in checking the Senate.”

p. 181, ¶ 2, last line – “As Christmas 1787 neared, Jefferson confided to a friend: “As to the new Constitution I find myself nearly a Neutral....””

p. 182, ¶ 2, line 2 – “Although Pennsylvania had rushed to convene its convention in November, it was Delaware who won the honor of ratifying the Constitution first.”

p. 182, ¶ 2, line 4 – “(In Pennsylvania) The two preexisting state parties – one representing urban and commercial interests, the other western, rural interests – had quickly chosen sides on the issue of the new government. The urban, and now Federalist, forces controlled the Pennsylvania legislature, and they naturally hoped to take advantage of their position while they still held a majority. When opposition members refused to attend the legislative session, a mob dragged two of them back into the chamber so that a quorum was assured to issue a call for the convention. Federalist filled the newspapers with pro-Constitution essays, and it is doubtful if many voters realized there was any opposition to ratification at all.”

p. 183, ¶ 2, line 11– “Thus, as the Massachusetts convention got underway, five of the nine necessary states were in the “yes” column.”

p. 183, ¶ 3, line 1 – “Madison was keenly aware of the importance of the Massachusetts vote. Anti-Federalists forces were strong in North Carolina, New York, and Virginia, and were gaining surprising strength in New Hampshire. These states would be deeply influenced by the decision of the Massachusetts convention. When the delegates met on January 9, the spirit of Shays’s rebels was evident. Western hostility to Boston merchants translated into western opposition to the Constitution.”

p. 184, ¶ 2, line 2– “Massachusetts Federalists fought fiercely but unsuccessfully to gain control of the
convention. Class-based attacks on the supporters of the Constitution had proved highly effective in the elections.”

**p. 184, ¶ 2, line 11**– “When Massachusetts Federalists realized that the Anti-Federalists held a small majority, they worked hard to woo some of these delegates to their cause. The ethics of their tactics were often questionable. They warned the poorer delegates, for example, that they would not be reimbursed for their expenses unless the Constitution was ratified.”

**p. 184, ¶ 3, line 1**– “But the Massachusetts Federalists succeeded, in the long run, because they were superior debaters, more prestigious citizens, and had greater skill in political settings.”

**p. 185, ¶ 2, line 6**– “With six states in his ‘win’ column, Madison now awaited news of the New Hampshire convention.”

**p. 185, ¶ 3, line 1**– “New Hampshire proved him (Madison) terribly wrong. Many delegates arrived at the convention bound by instructions from their communities – and those instructions were to vote ‘no.’”

**p. 186, ¶ 2, line 6**– “In Virginia George Washington had greeted the news of the New Hampshire postponement with dismay. It lent encouragement to the Virginia Antis and to the New York opposition as well. The only bright spot seemed to be the public response to the series of essays by ‘Publius,’ now circulating throughout the states. These essays carefully and effectively addressed every aspect of the Constitution, anticipating objections and provided cogent rebuttals to them. Although the authorship was anonymous, most of Madison’s correspondents knew that the essays were the work of John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and Madison himself.”

**p. 186, ¶ 2, line 23**– “The question was could Publius win the hearts and minds of the Virginia and New York convention delegates.”

**p. 187, ¶ 1, line 1**– “By the time the Virginia convention met, both Maryland and South Carolina had – as hoped – ratified the Constitution.”

**p. 187, ¶ 1, line 18**– “The city of Charleston, where the convention met, was unabashedly, even noisily pro-Constitution, and this may have dampened the opposition further. When the vote came, it was 149-73 in favor of ratification.”

**p. 187, ¶ 2, line 1**– “Eight states had accepted the new government. Although Virginia Federalists hoped that their state would be the ninth pillar of the federal temple, that honor went to New Hampshire. Reconvening in June, the New Hampshire convention voted 57-47 to support the
Constitution.”

p. 188, ¶ 1, line 3—“The only many he placed in the ‘undecided’ column was the young James Monroe, labeled an Anti-Federalist by many, but suspected by Madison of being a reluctant supporter.”

p. 188, ¶ 1, line 16—“On June 2, Madison could at last breathe a sign of relief, for by a vote of 89 to 79, his home state endorsed his handiwork.”

p. 188, ¶ 2, line 1—“All eyes turned to New York. Although the new government was technically a reality, few people believed it could succeed without both Virginia and New York within its fold.”

p. 188, ¶ 2, line 5—“The unchallenged leader of the Federalist campaign in New York was Alexander Hamilton. The chief author the ‘Publius’ essays and the mastermind of the Federalist strategy at the state convention, Hamilton worked tirelessly to devise tactics that would snatch victory from the jaws of the Clintonites. Clinton, whose network of patronage and near monopoly of public offices outside New York City amounted to America’s first party machine, took ful advantage of his position.”

p. 189, ¶ 2, line 1—“Throughout June Hamilton’s strategy was to stall proceedings in the convention until work came from Virginia.”

p. 190, ¶ 1, line 1—“Hamilton read this call for adjournment as the first clear sign of weakness in the Anti-Federalist camp. They do not want the Union, he said, yet they do not want to reject the Constitution either. If Virginia ratifies, would New York relish the thought of its isolation?”

p. 190, ¶ 2, line 1—“Faced with the news of Virginia’s decision and fearing that Hamilton and his urban Federalists might make good their secession threat, the Anti-Federalist majority bent to the will of the minority. By a vote of 30-27, New York joined the Union.”