
The Articles Of Confederation Implemented The Principle Of

*The Articles Of
Confederation
Implemented The
Principle Of*

*Downloaded from
www.everybodystreet.com
by Stout & Gaige*

FORGING A NATION: HOW THE FIRST U.S. CONSTITUTION PRIORITIZED STATE POWER

In the aftermath of the American Revolution, the thirteen newly independent colonies faced a monumental challenge: how to form a unified nation without replicating the

oppressive central authority they had just fought to overthrow. The result was the Articles of Confederation, the first written constitution of the United States. Ratified in 1781, this document was not merely a placeholder; it was a deliberate, ideological experiment in governance. At its heart, **the Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** state sovereignty and a decentralized federal structure. This foundational choice, while ultimately

deemed flawed, provided critical lessons that shaped the U.S. Constitution and continue to influence debates about the balance of power between state and federal governments.

THE FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLE: STATE SOVEREIGNTY ABOVE ALL

The central tenet of the Articles was the preservation of the independence and autonomy of each state. The document created a "firm league of friendship" rather than a powerful national government. **The Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** a confederacy, where the central authority derived its power from the states, not from the people directly. This was a direct response to colonial grievances against King George III and

the British Parliament, which had exercised sweeping authority over the colonies without their consent.

Article II of the Confederation explicitly stated that "each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled." This language was unambiguous: the national government was the creation of the states, and its powers were strictly limited to what the states voluntarily surrendered. **The Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** a weak central government as a safeguard against tyranny, reflecting the deep distrust of concentrated power that

characterized the revolutionary era.

THE PRINCIPLE OF A UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE WITH EQUAL STATE REPRESENTATION

The structure of the national government under the Articles was remarkably simple and intentionally weak. There was no executive branch to enforce laws and no national judiciary to interpret them. The entire government consisted of a single-chamber Congress, known as the Confederation Congress.

The Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of equal state representation in this Congress, granting each state one vote regardless of its population size or economic contribution.

This arrangement was a direct concession to smaller states, which feared being dominated by larger, more populous states like Virginia or Massachusetts. While this ensured that Delaware had the same voice as New York, it also created significant imbalances. A state with fewer than 60,000 people had the same voting power as one with over 400,000. This principle of equality among states, rather than proportional representation, was a defining characteristic of the Articles and reflected the belief that the states were the primary political entities, not the national government.

THE PRINCIPLE OF LIMITED CENTRAL AUTHORITY IN

TAXATION AND COMMERCE

Perhaps the most consequential area where **the Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** limited central authority was in fiscal and economic matters. The national Congress had no power to levy taxes directly on the people. Instead, it could only request funds from the states based on the value of land within each state. These requisitions were voluntary; states could and often did refuse to pay or paid only a fraction of what was requested.

This arrangement was disastrous for national finances. During and immediately after the Revolutionary War, the Confederation Congress accumulated massive debts to foreign allies like France and the Netherlands, as

well as to American soldiers who had fought in the war. Without the power to tax, Congress could not pay these debts, leading to a loss of international credibility and domestic unrest, including the infamous Shays' Rebellion in 1786.

Similarly, **the Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** state control over commerce. The national government could not regulate interstate trade or impose tariffs on foreign goods. Instead, each state created its own trade policies, leading to a chaotic patchwork of tariffs, fees, and even currency systems. States imposed taxes on goods from neighboring states, treating them almost as foreign nations. This economic fragmentation hindered economic recovery after the war and

demonstrated the practical weaknesses of a government that could not manage its own economy.

THE PRINCIPLE OF UNANIMOUS CONSENT FOR AMENDMENT

Another critical principle embedded in the Articles was the requirement for unanimous consent from all thirteen states to amend the document. **The Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** extreme caution against change, ensuring that no state could be forced into a new arrangement without its full agreement. While this protected state sovereignty, it also made the government nearly impossible to reform.

When it became clear that the Articles were failing, attempts to amend them

repeatedly failed because of the unanimous consent requirement. For example, a proposal in 1781 to allow Congress to impose a 5% tariff on imports was supported by twelve states but was blocked by Rhode Island. This single state could veto a reform that would have provided much-needed revenue to the national government. The principle of unanimous consent thus became a structural obstacle to governance, preventing the Confederation from adapting to changing circumstances and addressing its most pressing problems.

THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

Despite its weaknesses, **the Articles of**

Confederation implemented the principle of collective action in matters of war and foreign affairs. Congress was given the exclusive power to declare war, make peace, enter into treaties and alliances, and manage relations with Native American tribes. This was essential for presenting a unified front to the world, especially given that the new nation was surrounded by European powers like Britain and Spain that still held territories in North America.

However, even in foreign affairs, the principle of state sovereignty created complications. While Congress could negotiate treaties, it could not compel states to comply with them. For example, the Treaty of Paris of 1783, which ended the Revolutionary War, required American states to restore

property confiscated from Loyalists. Many states simply ignored this provision, violating the treaty and providing Britain with a pretext for maintaining military posts on American soil. This showed that even in areas where the national government had formal authority, it lacked the power to enforce its decisions.

THE PRINCIPLE OF REPUBLICANISM AND STATE- LEVEL GOVERNANCE

The Articles also reflected a commitment to republicanism, the idea that government should be based on the consent of the governed and that citizens should exercise political rights through elected representatives. However, **the Articles of**

Confederation implemented the principle of republicanism primarily at the state level. Each state had its own constitution, its own elected legislature and governor, and its own system of courts. The national government was essentially a coordinating body among these republican states, not a republican government in its own right.

This approach had both strengths and weaknesses. On the positive side, it allowed states to serve as laboratories of democracy, experimenting with different approaches to governance, voting rights, and civil liberties. On the negative side, it meant that the national government lacked the direct connection to the people that would give it legitimacy and authority. Citizens paid taxes to and received services from their state

governments, not the national government, which made it difficult for Congress to assert its authority or inspire patriotic loyalty.

THE PRINCIPLE OF NO EXECUTIVE OR JUDICIAL BRANCHES

One of the most striking features of the Articles was the complete absence of separate executive and judicial branches. **The Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** legislative supremacy, with all national authority concentrated in the Congress. There was no president, no cabinet, and no federal court system. When Congress was not in session, a Committee of the States could manage affairs, but this committee had very limited powers.

This arrangement reflected the revolutionary generation's fear of executive power, which they associated with monarchy and tyranny. However, it also meant that there was no one to enforce laws, administer government programs, or resolve disputes between states. When conflicts arose between states over borders, trade, or other issues, there was no national judicial body to adjudicate them. States were left to negotiate among themselves or, in some cases, threaten military action. The lack of an executive also meant that there was no leadership to coordinate national responses to crises, such as economic downturns or civil unrest.

THE LEGACY: LESSONS FOR THE

CONSTITUTION

The weaknesses of the Articles ultimately led to their replacement by the U.S. Constitution in 1788. The Constitution reversed many of the principles that the Articles had embodied. It created a stronger central government with the power to tax, regulate commerce, and raise an army. It established separate executive, legislative, and judicial branches with checks and balances. It provided for proportional representation in the House of Representatives and equal representation in the Senate—a compromise that preserved some state equality while also giving larger states more influence. And it made the Constitution the supreme law of the

land, directly binding on all citizens, not just states.

However, the legacy of the Articles endures. Efforts to maintain the powers of states have been a recurring theme in American political history. The concept of states' rights featured prominently in the conflicts over tariffs, slavery, and federal power that culminated in the Civil War. And the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which reserves to the states powers not delegated to the federal government, explicitly preserves the principle that the national government has limited, enumerated powers.

CONCLUSION: A PRAGMATIC FOUNDATION FOR A MORE

PERFECT UNION

The Articles of Confederation represented a genuine attempt to create a government based on the principles of liberty, self-governance, and distrust of centralized authority. **The Articles of Confederation implemented the principle of** state sovereignty, limited central government, and collective action among equals. While these principles proved too restrictive for a growing nation facing internal and external challenges, they were not a failure.

The experiment under the Articles provided the founders with invaluable experience and hard-learned lessons about what a national government needed to function effectively. The

Constitution that replaced it did not entirely abandon the principles of the Articles; rather, it refined and balanced them, creating a federal system in which states retained significant powers while a stronger national government could act decisively in matters of common

concern. Understanding this evolution helps us appreciate the deliberate pragmatism behind the founding of the United States—a nation forged in the tension between the need for unity and the desire for local autonomy.