

# **Anarchist Odyssey of the Federalist Papers, Part 1**

By: Matt K. (End The Terror War)

June 9, 2015

Hello everyone, this is Matt from the Liberty Under Attack-End The Terror War partnership. [1] I will be examining the Federalist Papers [2], sharing my anarchist views, and letting you decide for yourselves just how much of a "necessary evil" any government supposedly is. To assist in this article, I will be naming which Federalist Paper, the author, and their associated quotes. Below the quotations, I will share my perspective. Sources will be at the bottom. Since there are 85 Federalist Papers in all, I will be covering 10 Papers at a time.

## **Federalist No. 1, Hamilton:**

1. "After an unequivocal experience of the inefficacy of the subsisting federal government, you are called upon to deliberate on a new Constitution for the United States of America."

The statement is coercive in nature, it implies that people are OBLIGATED to formulate "new" governments and "new" social contracts (Constitution's). This is immoral and an infringement upon individual freedom of choice to live without government or a social contract. Hamilton is proposing, to the populace of New York, that government is a MANDATORY institution that every person must subservient themselves to. As a start-off to the Federalist position, Hamilton makes a very unconvincing speech.

2. "Among the most formidable of the obstacles which the new Constitution will have to encounter may readily be distinguished the obvious interest of a certain class of men in every State to resist all changes which may hazard a diminution of the power, emolument, and consequence of the offices they hold under the State establishments; and the perverted ambition of another class of men, who will either hope to aggrandize themselves by the confusions of their country, or will flatter themselves with fairer prospects of elevation from the subdivision of the empire into several partial confederacies than from its union under one government."

Hamilton seems to be pleading for the State, and the Constitution, to defend the aristocratic class of early America and to use this newfound power as a means of class warfare to discourage or violently silence dissident voices. In that respect, the country hasn't changed much at all. Things remain precisely as the "Founders" designed it to be. Hamilton being amongst them himself. [3] Notice that he makes no case for the abolishment of America's imperial adventurism, to permit the freedom of secession (confederacies), and that unification with the Federal government, even if undesired on a local level, is considered an altruistic achievement - regardless of the cost in infrastructure and lives. In short, we have a case of appealing to the people of New York that the Federal government exercising state terrorism [4] upon other Americans is a justifiable act, so

long as a "Union" is forcibly secured. This monopoly on force seems to follow his same previous thoughts above, as examined in #1. The amorality of Hamilton's call to arms in support of the Federal government stinks like a rotting corpse.

3. "For in politics, as in religion, it is equally absurd to aim at making proselytes by fire and sword. Heresies in either can rarely be cured by persecution."

Hamilton laments this statement AFTER making a case for proselytizing the people of New York to join his cause "by fire and sword" in the FORCED institution of governance, a Constitution, and forcibly securing a "Union." This is doublespeak and hypocrisy. A little sweet talk does nothing to disguise the underlying, oppressive, objectives of Hamilton's idealized (or is that, idolized?) governance over the American people. The Statist cause is raw within the first Federalist paper, that's for certain.

4. "An enlightened zeal for the energy and efficiency of government will be stigmatized as the offspring of a temper fond of despotic power and hostile to the principles of liberty."

Hamilton is addressing the issue of party politics here, but he seems to be walking a maze of self-contradictions at this point. While accusing others of seeking to acquire despotism and hostility to libertarian principles (a baseless assertion within the Federalist Paper itself without greater context), he has himself, as examined previously - argued for his own anti-liberty rallying cry around a Federally-enforced "Union", a new government, and a Constitution. He's also gone out of his way to secure the aristocratic elite of his era from criticisms, affording the State's subservience to their interests as some sort of reward worth applause. I guess when you're among the "Founders", even when you enforce the extortion racket and violent monopoly of the State, you can "do no wrong." If anything, you are historically deified as the ideal leader(s) for all matters of governance in America. People just adore their slave-masters of the distant pass, I guess.

5. "...the vigor of government is essential to the security of liberty."

Liberty can be secured just fine without governance, much less its vigor. This is yet another contradiction on Hamilton's part, liberty isn't "secured" when your "security" (government) goes out of its way to stifle liberty at every turn possible. Hamilton himself had already previously invoked actions against liberty (a violently forced "Union", a mandated government, an obligatory Constitution, and calls for terrorizing anyone who "steps out of line" in resisting the aristocratic order's warfare upon the 'lower classes'). That doesn't "secure liberty", it's an affront to it.

6. "You will, no doubt, at the same time, have collected from the general scope of them, that they proceed from a source not unfriendly to the new Constitution. Yes, my countrymen, I own to you that, after having given it an attentive consideration, I am clearly of opinion it is your interest to adopt it. I am convinced that this is the safest course for your liberty, your dignity, and your happiness."

Herein lies the problem of government: Someone else proclaiming to know what's in your best self-interest and liberty. [5] Hamilton has made several statements against the cause of liberty, and then turns around and calls upon government as the "security" for those liberties. He's only dug himself into an inconsistent hole on the issue of governance and liberty, I sincerely doubt by the end of this Federalist Paper that he will have found himself out of it. As someone whose already called for the "new government" to be the violent hand of the aristocracy, clearly he doesn't give a damn about other American's liberties, dignity, or happiness. Hamilton is a liar.

7. "I propose, in a series of papers, to discuss the following interesting particulars: The utility of the union to your political prosperity; The insufficiency of the present confederation to preserve that union; The necessity of a government at least equally energetic with the one proposed, to the attainment of this object; The conformity of the proposed constitution to the true principles of republican government; Its analogy to your own state constitution; and lastly, The additional security which its adoption will afford to the preservation of that species of government, to liberty, and to property."

Wow, Hamilton. After arguing for violent coercive means to "secure the Union", he speaks of political prosperity. There is no "necessary government", so even with the objective fulfilled, people still aren't found in "political prosperity." Conformity is precisely the problem here, the Federalist call to use its monopoly on violence to force subservience from others. You can take your "republican government" LIE and shove it, pal. Government doesn't afford preservations to liberties or property, such a narrative is a ridiculous contradiction. Take your proposals, and shove off. The country would've been a much better place with NOBODY claiming rulership over others, but then your gang of thugs ("Founders"/Federalists) just had to come along and lie, cheat, and kill your way to mocking the American public. No wonder politicians throughout America's history deify your sort, you are deceptive liars and hypocritically use means of governance literally "hostile to liberty" to your own selfish ends.

8. "It may perhaps be thought superfluous to offer arguments to prove the utility of the union, a point, no doubt, deeply engraved on the hearts of the great body of the people in every State, and one, which it may be imagined, has no adversaries."

When you've already called for violence to impose your "Union", you've already lost any attempts at gaining a supporter from an anarchist like myself. I'm quite adversarial against ALL States, all governments, and Hamilton's hypocrisy is a great testimony of self-contradictions to my skeptical reasoning, and anger.

9. "For nothing can be more evident, to those who are able to take an enlarged view of the subject, than the alternative of an adoption of the new Constitution or a dismemberment of the Union."

Dismemberment would imply that something is left over [6], I wouldn't be so kind. Such a violent monopoly and extortion racket deserves to be entirely dismantled entirely. You want to see liberty, Mr. Hamilton? Let people live freely WITHOUT the confines of your violently-enforced "Union." Even something reduced down to size can reformulate and gather itself again, in this way, complete and permanent abolishment is preferable to the survival of ANY State (Federal or otherwise).

### **Federalist No. 2, Jay:**

1. "Nothing is more certain than the indispensable necessity of government, and it is equally undeniable, that whenever and however it is instituted, the people must cede to it some of their natural rights in order to vest it with requisite powers."

Well, at least Mr. Jay isn't as deceptively attempting to guile the public as Hamilton was attempting in the 1st Federalist Paper. He's quite straight-forward in his nonsensical call for "necessary government" and "ceding rights to vest government with powers." From the opening, Jay [7] doesn't make any appeals to liberty, so he can't automatically be accused of outright hypocrisy...yet. However, the amorality is blatantly shared with Hamilton from the start. People should really come to terms with the reality that the "Founders" weren't an entirely virtuous bunch. Whether you choose to judge them individually or collectively, something was definitely amiss in their conspiracy to forcibly implement governance in The States. [8]

2. "It is well worthy of consideration therefore, whether it would conduce more to the interest of the people of America that they should, to all general purposes, be one nation, under one federal government, or that they should divide themselves into separate confederacies, and give to the head of each the same kind of powers which they are advised to place in one national government."

Jay is promoting a false dichotomy [9] wherein the only supposed "choices" are the Federal government or confederacies. This is absurd, those are NOT the only options "to the interest of the people of America." The notion that absence of ANY rulers whatsoever (anarchism) [10] is neither considered or even dismissed at this point by Jay, says quite a lot. His agenda is to enforce the Federal government upon America, whether Americans desire it (without coercion) or not. He's an original authoritarian.

3. "Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people - a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs, and who, by their joint counsels, arms, and efforts, fighting side by side throughout a long and bloody war, have nobly established general liberty and independence."

Independence, sure. Liberty? Not with jokers like the Federalists running amuck, seeking to impose their governance on others. What nonsense.

4. "...should never be split into a number of unsocial, jealous, and alien sovereignties."

Well, Mr. Jay, while I agree that antisocial and jealous manners won't be doing anybody any huge favors. It's NOT upon the arbitration of the Federalists, or anybody else, to forcibly implement governance that will not permit the "alien sovereignties" their voluntary place in being split from the violent monopoly supported by John or Alexander. The will of the "aliens", and the Americans will determine those sovereignties, NOT those of the Federalist ilk.

5. "...the formation of a wise and well-balanced government for a free people."

No government provides wisdom or well-balance for the freedom of people. That is laughably ridiculous.

6. "Admit, for so is the fact, that this plan is only recommended, not imposed, yet let it be remembered that it is neither recommended to blind approbation, nor to blind reprobation; but to that sedate and candid consideration which the magnitude and importance of the subject demand, and which it certainly ought to receive."

Jay is being very obtuse in this case. After endorsing Hamilton's case for the use of a violent monopoly (the federal government), he turns around and says that nothing is being imposed. This is inconsistent babble.

7. "It is not yet forgotten that well-grounded apprehensions of imminent danger induced the people of America to form the memorable Congress of 1774."

Let me see if I understand this correctly, after affirming his support to Hamilton's position, he proclaims that the Congressional formation of 74' was done by "the people of America." Am I to believe that the aristocratic class of early America cites themselves as "the American people"? For all the wrong-doing of the British government enacting the Intolerable/Coercive Acts [11], Jay and Hamilton believe that the formation of their own coercive government is the appropriate response. This is astoundingly hypocritical of Jay.

8. "That they were individually interested in the public liberty and prosperity, and therefore that it was not less their inclination than their duty to recommend only such measures as, after the most mature deliberation, they really thought prudent and advisable."

Jay's 'they' here is the previously mentioned Congress of 74'. It's an error in judgement that because a Congressional body is formulated under the pretext of preventing "imminent danger", that this body or its successors will retain the causes of liberty and prosperity for the public. Such is the problem with governance, initial good intentions can turn into very merciless and deadly results of Statist ideologues like Hamilton and Jay.

9. "it is well known that some of the most distinguished members of that Congress, who have been since tried and justly approved for patriotism and abilities, and who have grown old in acquiring political information, were also members of this convention, and carried into it their accumulated knowledge and experience."

Experience may be a wise teacher, but nationalist "patriotism" fervor is hardly cause for celebration regarding the trustworthiness of Congress - much less any other part of government.

10. "...every succeeding Congress, as well as the late convention, have invariably joined with the people in thinking that the prosperity of America depended on its Union."

This is hardly a positive statement on Jay's part. Prosperity for who, exactly? Since the Federal government conspired with local government's against the abolitionist movement, slave revolts, and the Underground Railroad [12] - clearly it shows that the Congressional body DOESN'T provide empathy for the slave, and doesn't perceive that people deemed as its' property as worth individually achieving their own prosperity. The "Union" is full of power-driven hypocrites who don't give a damn about liberty. The notion that white Americans, WITHOUT the permission of government, saw the wrongdoing to African and Indian people, sought to assist them in gaining some steps towards freedom - shows that the "Union" was no less despicable than its southern counterparts in keeping the institution of slavery intact.

11. "They who promote the idea of substituting a number of distinct confederacies in the room of the plan of the convention, seem clearly to foresee that the rejection of it would put the continuance of the Union in the utmost jeopardy."

Seeing as how BOTH the confederacies and the Union are a form of governance/rulership over others [13], I'm against both of them equally as an anarchist. Neither are particularly appealing, because even the secessionist Confederacy still assumes rulership over those who didn't desire it. Again, there's a false dichotomy presented wherein the only supposed choices are Confederate or Union.

12. "I sincerely wish that it may be as clearly foreseen by every good citizen, that whenever the dissolution of the Union arrives, America will have reason to exclaim, in the words of the poet: 'Farewell! A long farewell to all my greatness.'"

What 'greatness'? The Union wasn't founded upon any higher moral foundation than its Confederate counterpart of the south. This is lamenting a nonexistent "America" wherein the Federalist's were altruistic, when they appear to be anything but if the standard is observing the hypocritical wording of the Federalist Papers.

### **Federalist No. 3, Jay:**

1. "great respect for the high opinion which the people of America have so long and uniformly entertained of the importance of their continuing firmly united under one federal government, vested with sufficient powers for all general and national purposes."

Jay starts off with the false assumption that any government, much less a federal one, is requires in order for "purposes" to be addressed.

2. "At present I mean only to consider it as it respects security for the preservation of peace and tranquility, as well as against dangers from foreign arms and influence, as from dangers of the like kind arising from domestic causes."

Do those domestic causes include the Federal government forfeiting 'peace and tranquility' in the criminalization of the American people for dissident voices or actions? Security is hardly established, when the Federal government is the culprit making people feel insecure. The question then becomes, who protects us from the self-proclaimed 'protector' who could turn on us a dime (the Federal government)?

3. "it will result that the administration, the political counsels, and the judicial decisions of the national government will be more wise, systematical, and judicious than those of individual States, and consequently more satisfactory with respect to other nations, as well as more safe with respect to us."

Safe for who, exactly, Jay? I don't see how the Federal government is a bastion of good any more than individual State governments are.

4. "So far, therefore, as either designed or accidental violations of treaties and the laws of nations afford just causes of war, they are less to be apprehended under one general government than under several lesser ones, and in that respect the former most favors the safety of the people."

If by 'the people' you mean the aristocratic class that you share status with Alexander Hamilton, then sure, the "safeties" of the ruling class are certainly secured by the Federal government.

5. "Not a single Indian war has yet been occasioned by aggressions of the present federal government, feeble as it is; but there are several instances of Indian hostilities having been provoked by the improper conduct of individual States, who, either unable or unwilling to restrain or punish offenses, have given occasion to the slaughter of many innocent inhabitants."

I'm sure those Indian hostilities have nothing to do with the forced annexation of territory by the Federal government, much less its individual State subsidiaries. As I recall it, the Federal government had broken treaties with the Indians, repetitively. That would never sow distrust and retaliation, if I read Jay's apologetics on government correctly. They must submit, and enjoy their submission, because government loves you!! The "sin" of historical omission is quite strong by Jay here.

6. "In the year 1685, the state of Genoa having offended Louis XIV., endeavored to appease him. He demanded that they should send their Doge, or chief magistrate, accompanied by four of their senators, to France, to ask his pardon and receive his terms. They were obliged to submit to it for the sake of peace. Would he on any occasion either have demanded or have received the like humiliation from Spain, or Britain, or any other powerful nation?"

I hardly understand this question, in the context of a supposed requiring for a Federal government in America. Is he using Louis XIV [14] to justify the existence of governance? That's disturbing. I guess I'm just reading an apologia for the Federal government's hostilities under the historic love affair towards the French Kingdom in its Italian wars of conquest. [15] Morally speaking, this does nothing to make me feel that the Federal government of the United States carries any genuine affection for the safety and security of the American people - that is - anyone outside the ruling class. The implication appears to be, moreover, that Genoa must submit unless France or another government intervenes to push back the French hostilities, but nothing signifying the Federal government of America would fight on Genoa's side, rather than the French Kingdom's.

#### **Federalist No. 4, Jay:**

1. "As the safety of the whole is the interest of the whole, and cannot be provided for without government, either one or more or many, let us inquire whether one good government is not, relative to the object in question, more competent than any other given number whatever."

The "safety of the whole" isn't secured by governance, but by liberty. The two cannot simultaneously coexist.

2. "It can place the militia under one plan of discipline, and, by putting their officers in a proper line of subordination to the Chief Magistrate, will, as it were, consolidate them into one corps,



and thereby render them more efficient than if divided into thirteen or into three or four distinct independent companies."

This erroneously assumes that the Federal government, by means of coercion, must establish a military by subjugation of individual militia's. Violent coercion, rather than voluntary interaction, is upheld as virtuous by Jay.

3. "Leave America divided into thirteen or, if you please, into three or four independent governments - what armies could they raise and pay - what fleets could they ever hope to have? If one was attacked, would the others fly to its succor, and spend their blood and money in its defense?"

The questions, again, assume that 'government' is always the correct answer to everything. A mutual contract could exist between these independent governments, but then, my position isn't for ANY governance whatsoever. Armies and fleets could be gathered together for mutual defense, even without a centralized monopoly on force (the Federal government).

4. "One government, watching over the general and common interests, and combining and directing the powers and resources of the whole, would be free from all these embarrassments, and conduce far more to the safety of the people."

The problem with this fantasy is it assumes government cares for "common interests", and the military adventurism of American history, even at its earliest stages - showed no cares for "safety of the people." In short, government isn't a guarantor of common safety.

5. "If they see that our national government is efficient and well administered, our trade prudently regulated, our militia properly organized and disciplined, our resources and finances discreetly managed, our credit re-established, our people free, contented, and united, they will be much more disposed to cultivate our friendship than provoke our resentment."

An "efficient and well administered" government is contrary to having free people, because the "efficiency" of government turns against the people themselves when it sees fit to no longer declare an external "threat."

### **Federalist No. 5, Jay:**

1. "It was remarked in the preceding paper, that weakness and divisions at home would invite dangers from abroad; and that nothing would tend more to secure us from them than union, strength, and good government within ourselves."

Ah, lovely. The "good government" oxymoron has returned.

2. "Should the people of America divide themselves into three or four nations, would not the same thing happen? Would not similar jealousies arise, and be in like manner cherished?"

The question assumes that people desire to live in nations in the first place, whereas an anarchist sees no point in such trivial concerns between nations, whether divided or united, in separate or singular governance. The worry for jealousy is easily resolved when no such nations exist, whether to impose on others domestically or externally.

3. "...union of wills of arms and of resources, which would be necessary to put and keep them in a formidable state of defense against foreign enemies."

A unification stratagem for mutual defense can still be done, a government isn't necessary for that to happen.

4. "Let candid men judge, then, whether the division of America into any given number of independent sovereignties would tend to secure us against the hostilities and improper interference of foreign nations."

I wonder what these same foreign nations think of America, whether divided or unified under a singular government, have thought of our hostilities and improper interferences.

### **Federalist No. 6, Hamilton:**

1. "The causes of hostility among nations are innumerable. There are some which have a general and almost constant operation upon the collective bodies of society. Of this description are the love of power or the desire of pre-eminence and dominion - the jealousy of power, or the desire of equality and safety."

Hamilton seems to be among these described "lovers of power" with "desire of dominion" as a Federalist seeking to violently impose governance throughout America. Please read my commentary on Federalist no. 1 [16] above, emphasizing that Hamilton and his Federalist cohorts weren't quite the altruistic "Founders" they may have been perceived to be.

2. "If Shay's had not been a desperate debtor, it is much to be doubted whether Massachusetts would have been plunged into a civil war."

True enough, however this doesn't indicate the necessity of local government in Mass., or the federal government either. Using Hamilton's own vernacular, wouldn't it fall on the creditor (Mass. government) that led Shay into such desperation in the first place? Therefore, government that throws people into anger, "sedition" [17], or defiance to statutory laws of any State. And

when the "uppity" folks are beaten, shot, and imprisoned into submission, government again portrays itself as the problem-solver, the convenient "savior" of another struggling generation.

3. "Have republics in practice been less addicted to war than monarchies?"

This makes little difference, as the initial problem of governance itself isn't equally questioned.

4. "Are not popular assemblies frequently subject to the impulses of rage, resentment, jealousy, avarice, and of other irregular and violent propensities?"

In knowing this, Hamilton wouldn't been smart to honestly find both the proposed Union and the Confederacy to be suspect governments. Rather than promoting one over the other. The anger and jealousies have hardly subsided in any great social milestones, if anything they've only grown in number and through different forms.

5. "What reason can we have to confide in those reveries which would seduce us into an expectation of peace and cordiality between the members of the present confederacy, in a state of separation? Is it not time to awake from the deceitful dream of a golden age, and to adopt as a practical maxim for the direction of our political conduct that we, as well as the other inhabitants of the globe, are yet remote from the happy empire of perfect wisdom and perfect virtue?"

The same deceitfulness, and dream of a golden age, from the Federalist's Union-love affair could equally be put to question. As an anarchist, neither the Union or the Confederacy, as governments provide an air of trustworthiness to span across time.

6. "So far is the general sense of mankind from corresponding with the tenets of those who endeavor to lull asleep our apprehensions of discord and hostility between the States, in the event of disunion, that it has from long observation of the progress of society become a sort of axiom in politics, that vicinity or nearness of situation, constitutes nations natural enemies."

You don't require a government to formulate a unified society. Without any States whatsoever, the issue of hostility can be locally brought to fruition and resolved, the survival of the State depends upon one form of hostility or another to continue its pathetic existence in the first place.  
[18]

7. "An intelligent writer expresses himself on this subject to this effect: 'Neighboring nations (says he) are naturally enemies of each other unless their common weakness forces them to league in a confederate republic, and their constitution prevents the differences that neighborhood occasions, extinguishing that secret jealousy which disposes all states to

aggrandize themselves at the expense of their neighbors.' This passage, at the same time, points out the evil and suggests the remedy."

Intelligent indeed. However, where Mr. Hamilton and the cited writer (Gabriel Bonnot de Mably) logically fall short is that in seeing the failures of jealous States, they don't see the problematic nature of all forms of Statism. The Union, therefore, being no better than its Confederate counterpart.

### **Federalist No. 7, Hamilton:**

1. "We have a vast tract of unsettled territory within the boundaries of the United States. There still are discordant and undecided claims between several of them, and the dissolution of the Union would lay a foundation for similar claims between them all. It is well known that they have heretofore had serious and animated discussion concerning the rights to the lands which were ungranted at the time of the Revolution, and which usually went under the name of crown lands."

No such territorial issues require a government to resolve.

2. "The probability of incompatible alliances between the different States or confederacies and different foreign nations, and the effects of this situation upon the peace of the whole, have been sufficiently unfolded in some preceding papers."

Despite an absence of confederacies, the Union has done nothing to provide peace and resolve any problematic issues of foreign alliances in subsequent years. [19]

3. "America, if not connected at all, or only by the feeble tie of a simple league, offensive and defensive, would, by the operation of such jarring alliances, be gradually entangled in all the pernicious labyrinths of European politics and wars; and by the destructive contentions of the parts into which she was divided, would be likely to become a prey to the artifices and machinations of powers equally the enemies of them all."

Ironically, the forced unification by the Federalists has nothing to minimize the self-declared enemies of America. If anything, both State and federal governments are guilty parties in arousing the hatred of people within the hemisphere and across the world. The Union didn't preserve America from having less enemies, and if anything, it's fabricated enemies in later decades. [20]

### **Federalist No. 8, Hamilton:**

1. "In this country the scene would be altogether reversed. The jealousy of military establishments would postpone them as long as possible. The want of fortifications, leaving the

frontiers of one state open to another, would facilitate inroads. The populous States would, with little difficulty, overrun their less populous neighbors. Conquests would be as easy to be made as difficult to be retained. War, therefore, would be desultory and predatory. Plunder and devastation ever march in the train of irregulars. The calamities of individuals would make the principal figure in the events which would characterize our military exploits."

Hamilton is comparing the issues of war in continental Europe [21] with America's geographic problems in the issues of singular or multiple governance. With anarchism, such contrivances would be a non-issue. There would be nothing, short of emotional or mental turmoil, to motivate one populous in a Stateless society to seek violence upon another. Even then, a collective effort can be made to neutralize such an anomalous endangerment to the general well-being of the public body. No government is required to tackle such scenarios. Neither a localized or Federalist government obligation is a prerequisite to conflict resolution.

2. "The violent destruction of life and property incident to war, the continual effort and alarm attendant on a state of continual danger, will compel nations the most attached to liberty to resort for repose and security to institutions which have a tendency to destroy their civil and political rights. To be more safe, they at length become willing to run the risk of being less free."

No less has substantially already occurred in post-Reconstruction America, with the "Union" solidified. Neither the previous world wars (I & II), the Cold War, or the War on Terror [22] carried with active participation of the U.S. federal government, has done anything to provide "more freedom" or untouched civil and political rights of the American people. No war the U.S. government has entered can be said with certainty in preserving liberty, especially when the U.S. government has been a culprit in permitting "enemy states" to grow in military prowess in previous decades. [23]

3. "Standing armies, it is said, are not provided against in the new Constitution; and it is therefore inferred that they may exist under it.\* [\*] This objection will be fully examined in its proper place, and it will be shown that the only natural precaution which could have been taken on this subject has been taken; and a much better one than is to be found in any constitution that has been heretofore framed in America, most of which contain no guard at all on this subject."

Mutual defensive measures can be taken in a stateless society, without Constitutional mandates.

4. "These are not vague inferences drawn from supposed or speculative defects in a Constitution, the whole power of which is lodged in the hands of a people, or their representatives and delegates, but they are solid conclusions, drawn from the natural and necessary progress of human affairs."

Hamilton admitted, in black and white, previously that he served the interests of the aristocratic elite in formulating the Federal government. [24] The power of the people, anyone outside the

aristocratic elite, is criminalized. In this way, there are NO "representatives" or "delegates" of the American people whatsoever, only the wealthy few and their descendants. In this way, the government functions as an extension of an oligarchic-plutocracy, and NOT the "power of the American people." Hamilton deceitfully betrays and contradicts himself in this instance with his statements in the 1st Federalist Papers, it's his own illogical undoing. Like modern elections, the so-called "representatives" are pre-selected and the whole theatrical scenario is rigged from start to finish to serve the elite interests. Both local and federal voting franchises have been compromised by this same problem. [25]

5. "If we are wise enough to preserve the Union we may for ages enjoy an advantage similar to that of an insulated situation."

The problem herein is that the "preservation of the Union" is dependent upon the aggressive nature of government itself.

6. "But if we should be disunited, and the integral parts should either remain separated, or, which is most probable, should be thrown together into two or three confederacies, we should be, in a short course of time, in the predicament of the continental powers of Europe - our liberties would be a prey to the means of defending ourselves against the ambition and jealousy of each other."

And yet, after a solidified Union has been secured, the liberties are singularly encroached upon by your benevolent Federal government, Hamilton. The number of governments doesn't really matter, what's at issue is that any of them exist at all. That's what makes liberty preyed on, all forms of governance itself.

7. "...if they will contemplate it in all its attitudes, and trace it to all its consequences, they will not hesitate to part with trivial objections to a Constitution, the rejection of which would in all probability put a final period to the Union."

A final period on the Union would be an improvement. The objections noted herein are anything but trivial, they are certain.

### **Federalist No. 9, Hamilton:**

1. "A firm Union will be of the utmost moment to the peace and liberty of the States, as a barrier against domestic faction and insurrection."

Two contradictory narratives are presented here: The success of liberty, and the existence of government. A "firm Union" doesn't, and hasn't, done anything positive for the cause of liberty.

2. "If it had been found impracticable to have devised models of a more perfect structure, the enlightened friends to liberty would have been obliged to abandon the cause of that species of government as indefensible."

Hamilton is making it half-way and then keeping firm his position. Neither government and liberty can coexist, even a "republican" form of government has been formulated around the aristocratic classes.

3. "The regular distribution of power into distinct departments; the introduction of legislative balances and checks; the institution of courts composed of judges holding their offices during good behavior; the representation of the people in the legislature by deputies of their own election: these are wholly new discoveries, or have made their principal progress towards perfection in modern times. They are means, and powerful means, by which the excellences of republican government may be retained and its imperfections lessened or avoided."

It seems to me that republican government hasn't retained any "excellence" and imperfections are rampant and exploited upon continuously. As I see it, no form of government can pay the price in providing "perfect" liberty for anybody, as the very nature of government itself is against freedom, individually and collectively.

4. "When Montesquieu recommends a small extent for republics, the standards he had in view were of dimensions far short of the limits of almost every one of these States. Neither Virginia, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, North Carolina, nor Georgia can by any means be compared with the models from which he reasoned and to which the terms of his description apply. (..) Such an infatuated policy, such a desperate expedient, might, by the multiplication of petty offices, answer the views of men who possess not qualifications to extend their influence beyond the narrow circles of personal intrigue, but it could never promote the greatness or happiness of the people of America."

Hamilton is implying that only a Union can provide happiness to Americans. Perhaps to his niche of Federalists, and the people that have romanticized them as ideal leadership, but not all of America has found happiness within the Union. [26] What happiness can be gained from accusations of sedition (implying a negative connotation towards peaceful or armed resistance to the Union, even if it's much deserved), or enforcing taxation and using false flags (Boston massacre of 1770)? This shows that government isn't only born violently, but that it wishes to stand unopposed for all time, where liberty would call for its abolishment for endangering the lives of the governed.

5. "It is very probable," (says he\*) "that mankind would have been obliged at length to live constantly under the government of a single person, had they not contrived a kind of constitution that has all the internal advantages of a republican, together with the external force of a

monarchical government. I mean a confederate republic. This form of government is a convention by which several smaller states agree to become members of a larger one, which they intend to form. It is a kind of assemblage of societies that constitute a new one, capable of increasing, by means of new associations, till they arrive to such a degree of power as to be able to provide for the security of the united body. A republic of this kind, able to withstand an external force, may support itself without any internal corruptions. The form of this society prevents all manner of inconveniences. If a single member should attempt to usurp the supreme authority, he could not be supposed to have an equal authority and credit in all the confederate states. Were he to have too great influence over one, this would alarm the rest. Were he to subdue a part, that which would still remain free might oppose him with forces independent of those which he had usurped and overpower him before he could be settled in his usurpation. Should a popular insurrection happen in one of the confederate states the others are able to quell it. Should abuses creep into one part, they are reformed by those that remain sound. The state may be destroyed on one side, and not on the other; the confederacy may be dissolved, and the confederates preserve their sovereignty. As this government is composed of small republics, it enjoys the internal happiness of each; and with respect to its external situation, it is possessed, by means of the association, of all the advantages of large monarchies. \*Montesquieu, Spirit of Law, vol. i., book ix., chap. i.' [27] "I have thought it proper to quote at length these interesting passages, because they contain a luminous abridgment of the principal arguments in favor of the Union, and must effectually remove the false impressions which a misapplication of other parts of the work was calculated to make."

Unfortunately for Hamilton, Montesquieu falls short of seeing all form of governance as problematic. It doesn't matter whether it's a monarchy, a confederacy, or a Union. He makes the erroneous claims that because local (smaller States) form a government around their collective membership, that it will withstand internal corruption. History has proven this wrong, especially in America's case. [28] The issue of removing a "supreme authority" could easily be resolved by disbanding government altogether, rather than seeking to replace one authoritarian with another. The case of handling "insurrection" is so vague that the best determination one can make regarding the response of the confederate states is that of the violent monopoly of governance seeking to dismantle or destroy the 'insurrectionists.'

6. "The proposed Constitution, so far from implying an abolition of the State governments, makes them constituent parts of the national sovereignty, by allowing them a direct representation in the Senate, and leaves in their possession certain exclusive and very important portions of sovereign power. This fully corresponds, in every rational import of the terms, with the idea of a federal government."

An abolition of all government would be a prefer alternative to the bickering between State and Federal, or the false dichotomy of Confederacy and Union.



7. "In the Lycian confederacy, which consisted of twenty-three cities or republics, the largest were entitled to three votes in the common council, those of the middle class to two, and the smallest to one. The common council had the appointment of all the judges and magistrates of the respective cities. This was certainly the most, delicate species of interference in their internal administration; for if there be any thing that seems exclusively appropriated to the local jurisdictions, it is the appointment of their own officers. Yet Montesquieu, speaking of this association, says: 'Were I to give a model of an excellent Confederate Republic, it would be that of Lycia.' Thus we perceive that the distinctions insisted upon were not within the contemplation of this enlightened civilian; and we shall be led to conclude, that they are the novel refinements of an erroneous theory."

The representative nature of the Lycian confederacy (cities, common council, judges and magistrates of cities) is ineffective. The "enlightenment" claimed by Hamilton is absurd. There is nothing enlightening in praising the violent nature of governance, even in its "republican" form, even in the case of a violently-enforced "Union".

#### **Federalist No. 10, Madison [29]:**

1. "Among the numerous advantages promised by a well-constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction."

Seeing as how a Union is the violent formation of factions into singular government authority, Madison contradicts himself here.

2. "Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith, and of public and personal liberty, that our governments are too unstable, that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority."

Madison calls these citizens virtuous, yet as a Federalist, disregards them and continues supporting government as an institution. Again, the contradiction lies that liberty (personal and collective) and government cannot peacefully coexist because of the extortionist & monopoly of violence nature of government.

3. "The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are: first, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens, and greater sphere of country, over which the latter may be extended."

Madison assumes that only different formulas of government (democracy, republic) will resolve social issues. A stateless society can achieve resolution without governance.

4. "it clearly appears, that the same advantage which a republic has over a democracy, in controlling the effects of faction, is enjoyed by a large over a small republic, is enjoyed by the Union over the States composing it."

A society founded upon the cause of liberty would be contradictory to impose a government (republic, democracy, or otherwise..) to "control factions." Natural progression would allow the factions to compete and seek resolution with each other, without any form of government to take a biased side to one faction against others or vice versa (many against one). In this Federalist Paper, Madison makes a clear distinction wherein the way in which government responds to factions is praised; without addressing the problematic nature of government itself.

5. "A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source. A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union than a particular member of it; in the same proportion as such a malady is more likely to taint a particular county or district, than an entire State."

If we remove the Confederacy (and Union) from the equation, the religious sect and the "rage" with paper currency can flourish without the State (Federal or local) to be the savior to address the grievances of the communities.

6. "In the extent and proper structure of the Union, therefore, we behold a republican remedy for the diseases most incident to republican government. And according to the degree of pleasure and pride we feel in being republicans, ought to be our zeal in cherishing the spirit and supporting the character of Federalists."

I've read nothing so far from Hamilton, Jay, or Madison that agrees in "cherishing the spirit" or "supporting the character" of the Federalist movement. Much less, the bountiful "liberties" promised by the Union, without acknowledging the problematic nature of government stands in the way of liberty. [30] No authority, religious or secular, earthly or 'divine', can be your 'representative' in any genuine sense of the word.

### **Summary:**

- Reading the first 10 Federalist Paper's hasn't convinced me to be persuaded outside of my anarchist positions.

- Neither Hamilton, Jay or Madison have shown how liberty can exist with government being it's coercive, violent, self. It's government that makes null and void the "social contract" of the governed [31] and thus stands as an enemy to liberty. It's government that abuses the "social

contract" to mockingly intimidate, extort, and/or physically endanger the well-being of the governed. A contract based on coercion and fear, instead of honesty and trust, is worthless.

- Nor has a logical display been afforded regarding how the Union was better than it's Confederate counterpart, when similarities have been noted between them in the problematic nature of government altogether.

Sources:

[1] The Liberty Under Attack - End The Terror War partnership was first announced in Shane and I's first broadcast on FPRN, dated February 8, 2015. Feel free to check it out, [here](#).

[2] [Federalist Papers, Penn State publication](#). (PDF)

[3] [Wikipedia: Alexander Hamilton](#).

[4] [The Free Dictionary](#): "terrorism practiced by a government against its own people or in support of international terrorism."

[5] [Dictionary](#): "freedom from arbitrary or despotic government or control."

[6] [Dictionary](#): "to divide into parts; cut to pieces; mutilate."

[7] [Wikipedia: John Jay](#).

[8] Among the actions of this conspiracy are the [Alien and Sedition Acts](#), [the excise tax of 1791](#), [the Boston massacre](#). To name a few unsettling examples of the Federalists' methods in forcing a government on others.

[9] [Wiktionary](#): "A situation in which two alternative points of views are presented as the only options, whereas others are available."

[10] [Merriam-Webster](#): "absence or denial of any authority or established order."

[11] [Wikipedia: Intolerable Acts](#)

[12] Robert E. Lee (Confederate Army, north Virginia) and Israel Greene (USMC, originated from the Continental Marines who would embody or be subsidiaries of the U.S. federal government), for example, showed an alliance between both local and federal officials in suppressing John Brown's abolitionist resistance.

[13] [Dictionary](#): "The Confederate States of America; the GOVERNMENT formed in 1861 by southern states that proclaimed their secession from the United States. Jefferson Davis was its president. The Confederacy was dissolved after the Civil War."

[Dictionary](#): "The United States; especially the northern states during the Civil War, which remained with the original United States GOVERNMENT."

[14] [Wikipedia: Louis XIV](#).

[15] [Wikipedia: Italian wars](#).

[16] See, Federalist no. 1, Hamilton.

[17] In a free society, the vague accusation of "sedition" implies that only obedience to authority is morality which is neither practically or realistically true. In such a way, Hamilton and the Federalists present themselves as anti-liberty "Founders" of America - wherein their defiance to the British crown is praiseworthy, but anyone who questions or defies the authority of the U.S. government is criminalized - a double standard between the governing elite and the governed.

[18] [Randolph Bourne, War is the Health of the State](#): "War is the health of the State. It automatically sets in motion throughout society those irresistible forces for uniformity, for passionate cooperation with the Government in coercing into obedience the minority groups and individuals which lack the larger herd sense. The machinery of government sets and enforces the drastic penalties; the minorities are either intimidated into silence, or brought slowly around by a subtle process of persuasion which may seem to them really to be converting them. Of course, the ideal of perfect loyalty, perfect uniformity is never really attained. The classes upon whom the amateur work of coercion falls are unwearied in their zeal, but often their agitation instead of converting, merely serves to stiffen their resistance. Minorities are rendered sullen, and some intellectual opinion bitter and satirical. But in general, the nation in wartime attains a uniformity of feeling, a hierarchy of values culminating at the undisputed apex of the State ideal, which could not possibly be produced through any other agency than war. Loyalty - or mystic devotion to the State - becomes the major imagined human value. Other values, such as artistic creation, knowledge, reason, beauty, the enhancement of life, are instantly and almost unanimously sacrificed, and the significant classes who have constituted themselves the amateur agents of the State are engaged not only in sacrificing these values for themselves but in coercing all other persons into sacrificing them."

[19] One thing [Washington was right in, was forewarning Americans](#) of being entangled in foreign alliances. It may have been his only redeeming value. The Avalon Project: Washington's farewell address.

[20] A modern day example of creating enemies from the ground up can be found in the War on Terror, I recommend everyone read my [Q&A series here](#), titled 'The terror industrial complex & you'.

[21] [Wikipedia: Continental Europe](#).

[22] Just to name a few that people will recognize.

[23] Please read Anthony Sutton's Wall Street series for an in-depth explanation of the U.S. government empowering so-called "enemies" while doing backroom deals with the nation-state elites of the respective countries. Nazi Germany ([Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler](#)) & the Soviet Union ([Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution](#)) being the key points here. Last but not least, we shouldn't forget [Operation Cyclone](#). The birth place of Al Qaeda and its terrorist affiliates, courtesy of the U.S. government.

[24] See, Federalist No. 1, Hamilton.

[25] [Princeton University](#): "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens" (PDF)

[26] See, Federalist No. 2, Jay.

[27] [Wikipedia: Montesquieu](#).

[28] [YouTube: Corporate Personhood: How Did We Get Here?](#)

[29] [Wikipedia: James Madison](#).

[30] [Dictionary](#): "freedom from arbitrary or despotic government or control."

[31] [Strike-the-root](#): The social contract is null and void by Anthony Gregory.