



CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

csac.history.wisc.edu > Document Collections > Constitutional Debates: Federalist and Antifederalist Essays > The Debate Over the Nature of Union and Republican Government > Union is Perpetual under the Articles

Samuel

Boston *Independent Chronicle*, 10 January 1788 (excerpt)

Again, I find, in the last acts of the Constitution, that it is an open professed resolution, to break a solemn covenant, made by the several States in the confederation of *the United States of America*. Which having named the States, in the 3d. article, says “the said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship, with each other, for their common defence, &c.”—Then going on to describe this *firm league*, till it comes to the last Art. it concludes, “And the articles of this Confederation, shall be inviolably observed by every State; and the Union shall be perpetual; nor shall any alteration at any time hereafter be made in any of them; unless such alteration be agreed to, in Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the Legislatures of every State.” But this new Constitution, does not appear to be agreed to by Congress, neither is it a Confederation of the States; but professedly of the people, as in the very first words of it; and concludes, that [“]the ratification of the conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution, between the States so ratifying the same.” This is expressly repugnant to the Confederation, the sacred national covenant we are under; and to set up a schism in the nation. This is not proposed to be done by the same contracting parties. For that was a covenant of union between the States. This is to be by the people of the States, to throw off all their allegiance to the federal Constitution of the nation, and the covenant Constitutions of the several States. And if the conventions in nine States will adopt it, then to separate, and set up this in violation of all covenant obligations, of the most solemn important kind and consequence.

But almost every one is possessed with a persuasion, that some farther powers are necessary to be vested in the National Head, the Congress; perhaps I am as strongly possessed of that apprehension as any one; therefore, at first, I felt passive, or rather inclined that this Constitution should be adopted, not considering the nature of it. But why should we break such a solemn covenant, as this Constitution resolves to do? And plunge ourselves into such a labyrinth of innovation, which it is impossible for any one to fore-see, or perhaps to guess where it will land us, or what we shall meet by the way? This Constitution does not wear the complexion of uniting the nation—but of dividing it. Had we not much better keep on our old ground? The national covenant we are under, solemnly ratified to be perpetual, and amend that: It is, no doubt, as easy to amend that, as it will be to amend the new one. And this I understand, was the *sole purpose* the federal Convention was appointed for, viz. To revise the articles of confederation, not to destroy the covenant. Why should we be fond of another revolution so soon? Why should we be

fond of such an innovation? Let us hear what a sage old politician, once said on a similar occasion, after having described to the people, the nature and consequence of the innovation, they were urging for, says, *Ye shall cry out in that day, because of your King, which ye have chosen you: and the LORD will not hear you* [1 Samuel 8:18].

CITE AS: John P. Kaminski et al., eds., *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution*, Vol. V: Massachusetts [2] (Madison, Wis.: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 1998), 678–84.