

The Question of Modern Antifederalism: A Search for Core Antifederalist Beliefs Amongst the
Candidates for the Presidency in 2008

By David J. Howell B.A.
University of California Irvine
June 2008

A thesis submitted for completion of the Political Science Honors Program at UC Irvine

University of California Irvine

June 2008

Acknowledgement and Dedications

Thanks to Dr. Petracca for first encouraging me to write this thesis and for guiding me as I found my eventual topic. Gratitude must also go to my mom who kept me going and continued reminding me that not finishing was not an option, my dad who arranged for his business trip to run long so that he could give me a ride up to San Jose, and Sergio Bermudez for accompanying me on the trip up to San Francisco, as well as dozens of my other friends who had to listen to me talk about little but Antifederalists for a year.

The Question of Modern Antifederalism: A Search for Core Antifederalist Beliefs Amongst the
Candidates for the Presidency in 2008

By David J. Howell B.A.
University of California Irvine
June 2008

Chair: Mark Petracca

In the 2008 Presidential election there is a possibility of a renewal in the presence of thought and core constitutional beliefs of the Antifederalist party as they would exist in the modern era, but there needs to be some study done in order to determine which candidates, if any, would closer match the ideal set by the model modern Antifederalist. In this study, the author performed a survey of core constitutional beliefs on political actives from both of the major political parties at their respective California State Conventions. Based on the findings of those surveys, the republicans and the democrats were shown to have a remarkable similarity between their core constitutional beliefs, and the Republican hopeful Ron Paul was found to be the one candidate whose supporters most closely matched the modern Antifederalist. As a corollary to this study, the author also found that many political actives had a difficult time envisioning a government that was shaped by their opinions of what government should be. Many of those polled even seemed to lack an opinion of their own and would simply answer

with whatever the established state of things was. These findings suggest that while there may be some who share the Antifederalist mindset, the idea of personal control of government may be beyond the thoughts of modern political actives.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements and Dedications.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
 Sections	
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	4
Methods.....	
28 Findings.....	34
Conclusion and Discussion.....	42
References.....	47

Introduction

There has never been time of greater revolution or freedom of political thought in the United States than in the period that directly followed the end of the revolutionary war. As time slowly moved on past the day when first there was freedom given to the citizens of the former English colonies, there was a great opening where citizens began what Tocqueville called “the great experiment...the attempt to construct society upon a new basis” (25). This experiment first, as many experiments do, led to a primary failure as the development of the Articles of confederation created a government without the power to levy taxes, without a standardized currency or even a means for self-defense. This was not the way for this new country, so the Constitution was drafted and the experiment began again. This time, however, a desire to create a government that had the power and authority that would be necessary for its own self maintenance led to what some feared to be a government of too much power, of too much authority. When the question of ratification of this new document came up, two distinct groups were formed, whose writings are considered some of the most radical political documents of their century. The Federalist papers were renowned for their explanation and justification for the establishment of a strong central force that would be able to unite all of the colonies under one law. They desired to make a strong union, one that would last for years to come and that would be able to handle the new responsibilities of nationhood that had proved too much for the nation founded under the Articles of Confederation. Their victory, though undeniable in its weight, has been recently critiqued by some historians as being due to a remarkable Audacity on their part and a refusal to back down. (Lienesch 86). To some their desire for a strong central government was eerie in its apparent capability for disaster. This can be well exemplified in the writings of

Hamilton whose description of the strength of a country that could “Under a vigorous national government” (Fed 11) that could rival the European nations in strength and authority. The development of this system was met with caution from the Antifederalists, the subject of this study; the group whose caution led not only to a more careful examination of the Constitutional document before its acceptance, but also led to the development of the conditions that led to its acceptance, namely our Bill of Rights. All of this is established fact, but the question that I would seek to answer with my study is one that pertains quite directly to the views and mindsets of these ancient figures in our history.

I would pose the question of where this mindset has gone in the last few centuries. Not two hundred and fifty years ago, the idea of a strong central government sounded far too much like an aristocracy to some citizens who opposed it fervently in pen and sought legal action in order to preserve what can only be considered their very basic rights to freedom from government. Where has this attitude gone? Are there still Antifederalists present in modern political areas? If these views are still present, where would they be and how would they have developed to live in the modern world? In short, the question must be asked: Where are the modern Antifederalists?

This is the explicit goal of this study, to determine where the ideals and the core constitutional beliefs that are commonly associated with the Antifederalists can be found in modern politics, if at all. Is this an important thing to consider in modern politics? After all, with the establishment of a strong central government, there has been no real outcry; people have not been stripped of their rights by a dictatorial central authority, so what would the purpose be of finding similarities between modern political actives, and the first dissenting party of the United

States? The validity of this concern is well summed in a quote from Antifederalist expert Herbert Storing, who in 1968 said “when so much of constitutional law is connected with the Bill of Rights, it is reasonable to conclude that the Antifederalists, the apparent losers in the debate over the Constitution, were ultimately the winners.” Today, as it was then, the bulk of debate hinges over the part of the constitution that exists solely to assuage the fears of the Antifederalists.

Were it not for their vocal resistance to the Constitution in its original form, there would have been no provision for these rights at the outset and perhaps generations would have gone by before their very necessary inclusion in American law. It is due to such a massive and unforgettable effect that this study would strive to answer the following questions.

Question 1: What does the modern Antifederalist look like? What would their beliefs be with regard to military affairs, foreign policy, civil liberties, government duties and economics?

Question 2: Based on the views of political actives from each of two parties, which party most closely resembles the modern Antifederalist?

Question 3: Which candidates, if any, most closely resemble the viewpoints of the modern Antifederalist?

Literary Review

In order to determine the exact location of such an elusive group as modern Antifederalists, one must first be able to gain an accurate depiction of just what such a creature might be. For this, there can be only one true method; one must study what they have written about themselves and what others have discovered in the last 200 years since their mysterious disappearance. In his work on the subject, there have been great advances made by Herbert J. Storing. In his analysis of the texts that first enumerated the concerns of the Antifederalists, he became very aware of their way of thinking and was able to sum the thoughts into *What the Antifederalists Were For*. In this text he states one universal truth that should be regarded as necessary fact for any other adventurer looking to determine the current location of this radical thought. He states "It is not possible to read far among the Anti-federalist writings without being struck by an extraordinary heterogeneity." (Storing 5). So how can there be one set of views that will be present that would determine the existence of Antifederalism in the modern political setting. If there truly were a set of modern Anti-federalists, wouldn't they be just as splintered as any other collection of political actives? This line of thought represents one of the core issues germane to this study: the discovery of overall trends and core constitutional beliefs of the Antifederalist party that would run too deep to be altered with time. After all, all things change with age when it comes to specifics, and the most clear definition of a group would come not

from the small areas where each of the Anti-federalists were splintered but rather where their views would more than frequently overlap. In order to aid in the ease of study, I have divided this into five major categories where a definition of modern Anti-federalism must be found.

1. The Assignment of Military Responsibilities.
2. The Obligations of a Government to Economic Action
3. International Relations
4. Role of the Federal Government in Interstate Relations
5. The Rights of the Individual

These areas of concern will define for us the existence of the Anti-federalist in the form of modern political terminology as well as that of the founding and thus allow this study to extrapolate the views of Anti-federalist actives of the late 18th century to a model that can be sought in modern politics. After all, if the Antifederalists truly were the originators of many beliefs that have come to be recognized as the essence of American value (Duncan 1995), then their location would be a boon to anyone searching to learn more about the possible political futures of the United States. Once this study is complete and a model has been constructed, the real challenge begins as we endeavor to discover the location of this current form of political belief in the predominant political parties of the modern day, but first, the digging must begin as we endeavor to define the views of the modern Antifederalist.

Military Beliefs

With the refining of the constitutional documents, the development of some form of stronger military was an issue of import. After the veritable disaster of Shays' rebellion, the event often credited with inspiration for the constitution; there was a redoubled effort on the part

of such renowned Federalists as George Washington to create a stronger central government that would have the authority to raise a national army that could put down such revolts in the future. (Richards 2003). This type of new authority is explicated in the first Article of the Constitution that federal government would be empowered “to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining” of militias. While this might be taken for granted to the modern reader, the Anti-federalists found this to be an issue of great controversy as well as concern. Until this point, each state had its own militia that was its sole and singular responsibility. How could the new government claim authority to control all of the states defenses? Would this take away their own authority even within their own borders?

The beliefs of the Anti-federalists with regard to the military were quite heavily documented in older texts as being in favor of the development of strong local military and deeply opposed to the idea of a centralized interference in that tradition. In the Anti-federalist papers, this is one of the key elements of regard within several documents. One of the more prominent documents for analysis would be The Anti-federalist no. 28, titled at the time *The Use of Coercion by the New Government*. Published in 1788, this essay begins by questioning the power that would be given to the central government by the new constitution, asking why they would need such a power at the center of the state “was it to strengthen the power which is now lodged in your hands?” (Borden 74) The most logical answer to this question is no, there was no real intent to give more power to the local governments or the local citizens. This must be understood to be a deep concern of the Anti-federalists, that the people would, at large, be removed from the loop of military power, that there would be a loss of authority of the individual over the military actions of the nation. However, there was an understanding of the necessity of

a military body's existence. In the mind of the Anti-federalist there must be a military in order to preserve freedom, but that military ought to be composed of those who directly benefit from its existence. The document continues to further explicate this message "It is asserted by the most respectable writers upon government, that a well regulated militia, composed of the yeomanry of the country, have even been considered as the bulwark of a free people" (Borden 74) that to provide for a type of defense that is otherwise from the common population would be to invite tyranny into a nation that had just fought it back. The role of the militia had been defined by this time to be a body that was responsible for the defense of the people and of their homes, a staked and vested interest of any free man who would take up arms in order to defend home and family against any that would take them away.

In the other works of the Anti-federalists, this viewpoint was at least seconded by the writings of "Deliberator" in Anti-federalist no. 44 titled *What Congress Can Do; What a State Can Not*. The author enumerates many of the authorities that were given to the federal government by a deeper analysis of the articles of the proposed constitution and begins to truly explain a great deal of fearful authorities that the new central government would possess. First on his list of grievances, as is often the case, was the issue of the military. In previous writings in the Federalist papers, there had been asserted that "congress cannot train the militia" (Federalist 110), however by further analyzing the first article of the Constitution the author found that there had been enumerated to the federal government the authority to arm and discipline the soldiery of the militia. The problems that arise from this are well explained "they shall have the power to declare what description of persons shall compose the militia; to appoint the stated times and places for exercising them; to compel personal attendance, whether when called for into actual

service, or on other occasions under what penalties they shall think proper, without regard to scruples of conscience or any other consideration”(Borden 122). The deliberator further explains concerns of the granting of control of this branch to an executive who could send them quite literally anywhere he felt proper. While federal control over the militia was a very controversial issue for the Antifederalists, it paled in comparison to their aggressive dislike of the idea of a national standing army. In Antifederalist 24, we hear from Brutus who explains quite clearly “standing armies are dangerous to the liberties of a people” (Borden 64). He explains that the history of other nations does well to demonstrate that the presence of a national army does very little to inspire confidence of the people in their government, but rather leads to a state that is ruled by fear and the threat of violent reprisal. Brutus continues with his assessment of the situation, asking “If the principles and habits of the people of this country are opposed to standing armies in time of peace, if they do not contribute to the public good, but would endanger the public liberty and happiness, why should the government be vested with this power?” (Borden 62). While this fear may seem ill established considering the people with whom the author was conversing, the historical significance of a standing army is nothing short of enormity. The maintenance of a standing army had almost always lead to the establishment of a police state, as Brutus said in his next letter, “Had the general who commanded [the US Army] possessed of the spirit of a Julius Caesar or a Cromwell, the liberties of this country [might have] in all probability terminated with the war” (Borden 66). The development of a national army as we know it now would have no doubt been distasteful to the mind of any Antifederalist who would shudder to consider a free people living near a military base. While this concern may have been partially assuaged with the addition of the second Amendment to the Constitution, the

concern for a strong local defense is easily observed in the writings of all who have been called Antifederalist.

When considering the military views of the founding Antifederalists, there can be numerous conclusions drawn about the thoughts of their relative progeny. If the founding texts enumerate the necessity for a local military defense, then the 21st century counterpart must no doubt have several views with regard to the modern military situation. First of all, they would no doubt support the necessity for a local defense force to exist. Since there are few examples that can be directly extrapolated from the 18th century militia, the closest figure must be each state's national guard. As such, the modern Anti-federalist would have to support the authority of the Guard's activities within the borders of its own state. If the founders saw the militia as being the protective wall of a free people (Borden 75) then the modern Anti-federalist must see their own local equivalent as a body whose authority and necessity is beyond question. The local military defense must be a predominant part of the modern Anti-federalist mindset, and one that must be maintained as a local asset, with the delivery of payment through county courts and local government offices (Henry 1786). It is by the maintenance of the military as a local body that the militia would better serve to fulfill the will of the people and to maintain their better interests.

As such, in any case where the local defense could be reasonably employed, the modern Anti-federalist would deem it to be necessity, as long as it is considered the collaborative will of the people of their own territory. This means that while the modern Antifederalist would greatly favor any action that is handed to the National Guard by their Governor, by their state legislature, or by local governing bodies; they would have a great amount of apprehension when their own defenders are called to do the will of the central government. The will of the central government

is something of little import when considering the military from the Anti-federalist point of view. While there is a necessity for the federal government to enforce its laws, the local bodies, in the view of the Anti-federalist must exist to serve the will of the local people first and foremost. It is for this reason that the modern Antifederalist could be said to not only favor the existence of the National Guard in principal but also said to favor their action in all civil affairs, abiding by the maxim that the local governments will take care of their own affairs and that the national army would only be called in when the circumstances were beyond the control of local bodies, that the local services should always be employed first in order to grant the state and the territories as much sovereignty as possible. While the previous generations of Antifederalists may have considered the local militia to be the bulwark of a free society, it must be asserted that the Antifederalist of the modern day would consider them to be at least the primary force for the defense of their own liberties.

Economic Beliefs

The beliefs of the Anti-federalists on the topic of a government's economic responsibilities and privileges were a defining factor indeed that make the viewpoints of this established political group echo as unique through the ages. While there was a great concern after the failure of the *Articles of Confederation* that the new government had to have the ability to establish a unified and universal currency for each of the states, the further responsibilities of the United States government were very much in question. In the early writings of the Anti-federalist papers, this is easily recognized as a deep concern as Antifederalist 12, titled *How Will the New Government Raise Money?* Expresses the concern of the new government's ability to levy taxes. The author, calling himself Cincinnatus, expresses deep concern:

On the subject of taxation, in which powers are to be given so largely by the new constitution, you [James Wilson of Pennsylvania] lull our fears of abuse by venturing to predict "that the great revenue of the United States must, and always will, be raised by impost (Borden 31)

The author goes on to express grave doubts that the established system will be able to provide for the growing (even at the time of the founding) national debt and that new taxations would inevitably be necessary in order for the new government to clear its debts. The author points to the statements made in James Wilson's previous arguments, that such a thing would not be necessary, that the fear of this sort of impending threat need not exist, but that does not easily quell the minds of the Antifederalists who were uneasy of a government that might continue to raise money in any way they could make legal under the new constitution if adopted. If anything, the texts present a general fear of impending taxation on the part of newly empowered government. Later in his letter, Cincinnatus continues, asking, "the complaints of intolerable taxes has produced one rebellion and will be mainly operative in the adoption of your constitution. How you will get this sum is inconceivable and yet get it you must or lose all credit" (Borden 30) the concern is present that since the issue of taxation proved to be the issue that killed the Articles of Confederation they will inevitably be a weak point for the new government. Essentially, the author makes it clear that all who read that the future government under the constitution will be responsible for further taxation, and such a thing presents an intolerable option. This fear was quite legitimate when considering the history that has taken place between then and now. In fact, with the establishment of the Sixteenth Amendment to the constitution, the Congress is given a new power, one to "lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration" and one that would soon be upheld in the Supreme court saying in

short that “the due process provision is not a limit on the power to tax” (Richman 2) and that “Congress always had the constitutional power to tax incomes, which were regarded as indirect taxes not requiring apportionment” (Richards 2) as economist writer Sheldon Richman observed in his paper for *Freedom Daily*. This sort of a legal development would have been quite distasteful to the ears of the Antifederalist who called himself Cato Uticensis in Antifederalist papers 30 and 31. He asks of his readers “did it ever enter the mind of any one of you that you could live to see the day, that any other government but the General Assembly of Virginia should have to power of direct taxation in this state?” (Borden 79), this sort of a concept had no precedent in the times of this nation’s founding, and the Antifederalists were nothing short of shocked at the development of such a possibility. In their minds, the people of each state owed only to their own state, with no provision to be made for some central authority figure. The idea of taxation in the mind an Antifederalist is one of local government performing a local service, this is expressed in George Mason’s Antifederalist 35, where he explains that leaving the job of taxation to “those who, in the nature of things, cannot be acquainted with the situation of those on whom they are to impose [taxes]...” (Borden 93) would lead to not only a distrust of the central government, but the establishment at a later point of a government body too large to control and faceless to the people that it was meant to serve.

The right of the new government to tax was not the only concern of the Anti-federalists with regard to the adoption of the constitution. There was also no doubt a great amount of concern among all founding citizens of the new United States that a new government body might seek a greater amount of control over the economy of the new nation. After all, they had just risen out of a governmental system that had complete control over the actions of not only all of

its citizens, but a virtual stranglehold on the businesses that people would establish. Still, however, one must consider just who the Anti-federalists were. For the most part, they were not a rich people, they were considered by many historical accounts to be peopled by “the second class of society” (Main 216). In Jackson Turner Main’s assessment of the history of the Anti-federalists, he dives into an identity of the most early American voices of dissent not only by examining their writings but also attempting to gain a better understanding of who they were as a people. He writes that the Antifederalists’ “constituents were principally small farmers” (Main 219) who would have a deep concern that they would be beset by a new government that would localize power to the North and more importantly, to the rich. This is also documented by Herbert Storing who states that it is only reasonable to consider that the middle class would be the group most in favor of Antifederalist republican ideals, he writes that “in pursuing their own interests, the middling classes tend to pursue the interests of the public at large” (Storing 18).

This set of observations of the populous of the Anti-federalist group is remarkably consistent with many modern beliefs on the part of economists as to the Antifederalist view on government business regulation. While one may commonly make the mistake of associating the Antifederalists with the anti-government view of minimal business regulation, the real fear of the Antifederalists at the time was that of an uncontrolled market with regard to business. Several authors have asserted this but the one with the greatest ease of presenting his views is Daniel Crane in his piece *Antitrust Antifederalism*. In this article, he expresses the concerns that many Antifederalists had with regard to the development of large federal corporations. He explains that “the Antifederalist prediction that powerful federal corporations would arise despite the rejection of Madison’s federal incorporation proposal” (Crane 9) was one that led to the

association of Antifederalism with an opposition to trusts and large corporate entities. It is this sort of thinking that leads one to assume that the common Antifederalist would not be opposed to government regulation and elimination of developments that injure the capacity of a free market. It is this type of a sentiment that led many during the progressive era to compare the actives of that time to the Antifederalists (Cornell). After all, if the Antifederalists were middle and lower class political actives, then question quickly develops as to whether they would permit government regulation of monopolistic tendencies in business. Because of their generic fear of a large entity that inhibits their own rights and capabilities toward self-determination, it is only reasonable to consider that the views of any modern Antifederalist would favor government regulation of large corporate entities for the purpose of allowing for the development of a versatile and varied market.

Now, there may be some doubt in the mind of the reader that the Antifederalists would have ever supported an amount of government action that would regulate the development of industry. However, when considering the core constitutional beliefs on Antifederalists, one sees another developing trend that Herbert Storing once again points out, “A republican citizenry must be free and independent minded, but it must also be homogenous” (Storing 19) he explains that the Antifederalists believed that a true republican society must all be of the same mindset in order to be considered truly of the people. It stands to reason, then, that the Antifederalists would champion a society where “not only likeness, but likeness of a certain kind [exists] in which there are no extremes of wealth” (Storing 20). This might make the Antifederalists of yore seem to be a bit on the side of socialism, but in their mind such a thing did not necessitate a large

central government. Their mindset was that if all were to share the views of the middle class, then all would be able to prosper without the necessary aid of a large government body.

The definition of the views of a modern Antifederalist with respect to the economy can be clearly extrapolated to include two main points of consequence. First, the government must be understood not to oblige itself in the collection of taxes except when absolutely necessary. It is for this reason that the modern Antifederalist would oppose the idea of a government duty toward taxation of income, that they would favor the development of alternate systems or would simply refuse to pay such a sum that they feel is an unjustified collection on the part of an unnecessarily strong central body. Secondly, the established federal government should act as an agent in the best interests of the middle class. This essentially refers to the regulation of industry when it becomes too large to be fair. The maintenance of a free market becomes the duty of the federal government in the ideal Antifederalist system, where the government has a duty to control those of greater weight and economic power in order to ensure the viability of the middling and lower classes, that they would still and forever have the capability to rise and to improve their own lives through the wonders of capitalistic gain. This approach might have the modern Antifederalist looking more like Theodore Roosevelt, marching toward a corporate entity with weapon drawn, preparing to bust the trust that would endanger the business potential of the middle class.

Foreign Policy

If the Antifederalists views on the development of the United States were based on their own subjects of unease and apprehension, then the area most clearly defined must be that of the most fear. In the development of this new nation, there were few prospects that brought more

unease to the Antifederalists than the concept of their new nation having a degree of foreign influence at the time of its founding. Now, when comparing modern politics to those of the late 18th century, the difference must be drawn as to which country would be doing the aggressive work. In the time of the founders, the United States would obviously have been the weaker nation that would without a doubt have had its culture quickly affected by the foreign influence of larger European powers. This thinking would lead to an increased fear about the development of too much in the way of foreign relations. In fact, the general opinion of most Antifederalists with regard to foreign policy relations was that the new United States need not have them. They felt that the established republic would not attract enough in the way of negative attention that they would have to form a foreign policy. As Jonathan Marshall observed in his article for *Inquiry* magazine, “most Antifederalists were convinced that a peaceful and virtuous republic need attract no enemies” (Marshall 245), and the development of international relations apart from defense would have been unnecessary and dangerous to the existence of the republic. There were simply no matters of foreign threat that would require the strengthening of the central government or the development of new government bodies for their maintenance (Marshall 244). If anything, the perceived answer among the Antifederalists was one of isolation, in which the new nation could survive on its own due to its far distance from the rest of the known world. However, the generic Federalist view when considering the capabilities and necessities for international responsibilities in the new government requires looking no further than the constitution itself that makes for a strong national government with the defined capability to act effectively in foreign affairs (Tarcov 39) without having to consider the opinions and views of each and every state. This was, after all the main Antifederalist concern when it came to

international relations, they believed that there were no foreign threats or concerns which the states could not handle as a confederation (Marshall 244) and that the establishment of a central government that was empowered to speak on behalf but without the constant consent of all of the territories could lead to political instability. This was not a concern without founding. After all, the XYZ Affair was the first major chance that that United States government had to act as a body for foreign relations and they fumbled on their first run, leading to a two-year war at sea (Elkins & McKittrick 1993). In point of fact, the Antifederalists simply did not feel that this new government needed to take part in international relations in order to preserve the union, but merely look inward to find the real threat to liberty.

The answer is that the Antifederalists were slightly xenophobic, fearing the influence of European nations and beliefs upon their fledgling republic; they asserted that the homogeneity of the republic must be upheld (Storing 19) in order to maintain its veracity as a government of and by the people. After all, the concern that the Antifederalists had with regard to their own safety and that of the new government was not one based on a fear of an invasion from the outside but rather from within. This viewpoint was not altogether different from the views of the Federalists at the time. In fact, one of the more famous quotes from the Federalists supporter George Washington is from his farewell address where he asserts his belief that “The United States ought to make no permanent foreign alliances” despite the fact that they had already made a very strong alliance with France against England in the revolution. This was a concern that the Antifederalists brought to mind several times, with one sentiment asking, “To what purpose have you expended so freely the blood and treasures of this country? To have a government with unlimited powers administered by foreigners?” (Republican Antifederalist 4.13.26). To the

Antifederalists, international relations were just another way that their new government would become infected with the germ of tyranny and the fear of the strengthened influence of foreign powers was tantamount to their sentiment. However, there were some other concerns of import that would need to find some resolution with the development of a new national government, whose job it would be to resolve the issues that the Articles of Confederation had proven impotent at completing.

Now, at the time of the constitutional debates, there was one foreign policy issue that is no longer one today, and that was exactly what was to be done with the western territories. In William Grayson's Antifederalist number 2, he expresses the possibility that the lands could be sold to foreign interests in order to pay off the growing national debt (Borden 3). However, the consensus among the Federalists seemed to be that such lands could be colonized and brought into the new nation, the idea of Manifest Destiny at its roots. This idea was not entirely opposed by the Antifederalists; in fact it was a protest of the Jay-Gardoqui treaty, a limitation on the settlement of the western Mississippi basin that prevented Patrick Henry from attending the Philadelphia convention. The idea that these territories could become states that would be part of the new union was shared by each the prevailing political groups of the time. However, the means by which these areas would be incorporated was still a matter for heated debate. While the Federalists would quickly incorporate the territories as a whole into the new United States, the Antifederalists, as was their tradition, were more cautious: "the Antifederalists envisioned a succession of new states joining a confederation, rather than being swallowed up into an empire" (Marshall 249) fearing that the quick addition of many new territories joining at once would make the new nation seem to have the imperialistic goals of its forbears and thus might

lead the development of the same tyranny that once forced them to a bloody revolution. After all, with the apprehension that the Antifederalists had expressed at the formation of a central government that would control the original lands of the thirteen colonies, it comes as no surprise that they would think such a large incorporation of new territory to be counterproductive to the creation of a free territory. In an address meant for the constitutional convention, James Monroe asserted this belief, stating that “so extensive a territory could not be governed, connected and preserved but by the supremacy of despotic power” (Monroe 39) that there would be necessary an amount of power that would be distasteful to those who had just recently dealt with the problem of England’s colonialism in their own territories.

This suggestion comes from a greater statement that can be made about the Antifederalist mindset with regard to international politics. Since a nation must be in possession of a recognizable and fearful amount of power in order to hold other nations or settlements at bay, it would be necessary for the government that engages in a strong international policy with eyes on territories further away than its own borders to grow to fit the new job. With a simple observation of the meaning of this assertion to the present condition of the United States, it is easy to observe that the warnings that the Antifederalists brought to consideration were indeed meaningful and applicable. While many at the time felt that the new nation that had sprung from the thirteen English colonies could never become a worldwide superpower, the Antifederalists were cautious of the looming dangers of just such a development. Ever since Jefferson’s purchase of the Louisiana territories, the United States has been in a mode of domination that had led to the conquering of new territories that now go well beyond the North American continent and span into the economic and military controls over many distinct nations. This type

of a mindset has led to what libertarians would believe to be a twofold failure on the part of government. First of all, the government is far too active in the lives of citizens, with a growing fear of clandestine foes, the eyes of defense begin to look inside the nation and begin to peer within the borders of its own country to find foreign foes. Quite succinctly, the development of a strong international interest will inevitably lead to a larger and more intrusive government policy within a country's own borders.

The fear from without obviously was not as large a concern to the Antifederalists as the fear from within, but that did not mean that they were willing to engage in open international relations. To them, the only solution that could present full protection for the development of a stable and functioning republic was maintenance of homogeneity among the citizenry. The Antifederalists stated openly "In a republic, the manners, sentiments and interests of the people should be similar" (Storing 19) that they should struggle to maintain one unified identity as the citizenry of a republic that a diversity of cultures and viewpoints would inevitably lead to strife. This could be considered a relatively negative view of humanity overall, that any perceived difference will automatically be assumed to have some sort of evil at its root, but to the Antifederalists this was simply reality at the time. The maintenance of one culture that would be relatable by all citizens would aid in the better republican representation of the citizenry to the national government.

The question now inevitably comes as to what this means for the growing definition of the modern Antifederalist. When presented with the concept of a growing globalization, the modern Antifederalist would without doubt tend toward a greater focus on the matters of intranational import. This clearly means that any modern political active with a modern

Antifederalist viewpoint would have great amounts of apprehension as to the United States' role in international politics. Since the US has grown to be one of the premier world powers, the government has inexorably grown with it, causing a greater amount of regulation, attention, and more importantly and notably, concern on the part of the modern Antifederalist as to its actions. The modern Antifederalist would seek a cease to this sort of unilateral presence on the part of their nation. This would inevitably mean a decrease in the amount of military activity that the United States takes throughout the world, leaving battlefields in the middle east, in Africa and retreating for the purpose of formation of a stronger defense of the homeland. While many would suggest that the development of a strong multinational presence is necessary for the proper defense of the Union, the modern Antifederalist would disagree, suggesting that if the people of the United States wish to feel safer, if they wish to remove themselves from the crosshairs of international enemies, the first step is to cease unilateral action and focus on the development of local defenses instead. The Antifederalist view of peaceful relations is quite similar, as a fear of influence on the part of international powers as well as a fear of the obligations that inevitably go with an international friendship would cause them to shy away, opting that the United States attempt to emulate the Swiss approach and remain neutral on matters of international import. This viewpoint would inevitably lead to the development of a negative sentiment toward the United Nations, as such a membership within an international community would be considered a threat to the Unique American identity in the mind of the modern Antifederalist. The most apt term to define the Antifederalist viewpoint with regard to foreign affairs is isolationism. The modern Antifederalist would no doubt shy away from such a label, but would inevitably find the terms of such a situation more agreeable than not.

State Sovereignty

At the forefront of the concerns for the Antifederalists at the time of the founding was the preservation of the rights that each state had to their own self-determination. The Articles of Confederation was a document written with the preservation of state Sovereignty in mind, and as such left most of the powers to taxation, defense, and business to each state's discrimination. However, with the failure of the Articles and drafting of the Constitution, the Federalists forewent a great deal of each state's rights and favored instead a strong federal center that they felt would better serve all of the states in the formation of a new union. This action in the drafting of the constitution is the main area with which the Antifederalists found fault. They felt that the establishment of a strong federal body would inevitably lead to a decrease in the authority of states. They feared that the new government, if established based on the proposed constitution would "possess absolute and uncontrollable powers" (Borden 42). They felt that the development of a strong "Federalist Power" would eliminate the role of the states in their own determination of laws, of trade, or even of self-regulation. In Antifederalist 44, the bulk of these issues are addressed as the author, Deliberator, explains *What Congress can do; What a State Can Not*. The issue is quickly brought to the reader's attention that the congress has the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states" (Borden 122) a power that the author explains would lead the congress to the capability to inspect and oversee all trade that occurs between two of the states in the new union. This type of a power led the Antifederalists to fear the drafting of inspection laws, which would in fact be drafted in the future and make all business that crosses state lines the affair of a national body, and in the views of the Antifederalists, an exercise in a government that existed to a degree to which it should not.

The complaints of the powers of the federal government are further enumerated in Antifederalist 44 to include issues with the opening of rivers and canals between state lines, the regulation of interstate roads and the development of any sort of trade between two states (Borden 124). This great amount of Authority placed in the hands of the new federal government unnerved the Antifederalists greatly. In their supposition, the existence of a Federal government would need to rely on the states at the core; they would be “the guarantor of a limited national government” (Watkins 2). After all, if such a great amount of capability for action were placed in relatively few hands, as the central government no doubt was, the capabilities for corruption and the eventual tendency toward tyranny were not just likely in the minds of the Antifederalists but they were an eventuality.

However much the Antifederalists feared a large amount of power being placed in the hands of federal government, there was still one issue that would bring about even more in the way of apprehension: the decreasing of the authorities of the state and local governments. The exact complaint that Deliberator brings to bear is that “No state can compel one of its own citizens to pay a debt due to a citizen of a neighboring state” (Borden 124). Since any trade that went between state lines became the de facto responsibility of the federal government, this much is true. While there may be means by which a person wronged in such a way can have their debt repaid, the local powers in this case are impotent to provide assistance. Another major area of contention for the Antifederalists with the proposed constitution was that “adopting the new government will enervate...[the states’] legislative rights and totally surrender into the hands of Congress the management and regulation of the Indian trade” (Borden 127). This authority had previously been in the hands of state government who would be able to make contracts and trade

with Indian nations without the interference of any federal body, a right that the Antifederalists sought to uphold with the implementation of a new government. Delineations of federal power that removed authority from the states were seen as inevitable with the proposed constitution, a concern voiced in Antifederalist 45 by Robert Yates in his address to the 1787 Convention. He stated that the “powers of the state government will be either totally or partially absorbed” (Borden 126) and that the state governments would not be sovereign to the degree that they had been in the past, but merely, they would be “as mere decencies, existing solely by its toleration” (Borden 126). This lack of authority and capability on the part of the local government was adverse to everything that the Antifederalists believed about the establishment of government.

To the Antifederalists, government was not meant to be a body that was removed from the local society and managed the affairs of those many miles away. The way that the Antifederalists perceived it, “if the government had been truly a federal government...[it would be] formed *by states, as states* that is in their *sovereign* capacities, in the same manner as *treaties* and *alliances* are formed” (Storing 54) they saw a federal government as the collection of each of the state government and not one great *Leviathan* that would control the entirety of the country from its center of power. The question might arise as to where this desire for state supremacy originates in the Antifederalist mindset. Quite simply, it was their understanding that government should be something handled locally “the key tenet of Antifederalist political ideology was localism- a belief in local control as opposed to a strong central (national) government” (Allen 77) so that the needs of the people could be better met by those who might know them better. They believed that a smaller government would mean a better service to those

who needed assistance, to the citizenry of the state. As one Antifederalist asserted “In large republics, the public good is sacrificed to a thousand views; in a small one, the interest of the public is easily perceived, better understood, and more within the reach of every citizen” (Kenyon 6-7). Making a system that is more localized, in the minds of the Antifederalists, would improve the interaction between the people and the government. This is a logical assertion to make and the main reasoning behind the Antifederalist preference for a state government. To them, the issue was not necessarily one entirely focused on the preservation of power for the sake of possessing it, but rather the localization of government activity in order to better serve the will of the people. The Antifederalists had a deep belief that “people differed greatly from locale to locale and that their unique environments- their geographic, economic, and social differences were of utmost importance in determining their governmental needs” (Allen 78). It is by understanding the motivation that lies behind the Antifederalist apprehension of the surrender of powers from the state to the federal government, that one can truly gain an understanding of the Antifederalist mindset with regard to the lines that divide local from centralized powers.

After this analysis, preferences of the 18th century Antifederalists for a localized government and the reasoning for such a preference provide a greater understanding of the viewpoints of the modern Antifederalist. Since the desire for greater localization of government power is tantamount to the definition of Antifederalism, the modern Antifederalist would no doubt have a strong preference for local authority in nearly any case or measure. The ideal viewpoint would be based on a minimalist approach to federal intervention, instead preferring local government agencies to maintain nearly all-possible facets of the life of the citizenry. This

would also mean that, in cases of interstate commerce or disputes, that the Antifederalist would prefer that the state governments come to some compromise without the aid of any federal body. Fearing that such an involvement would remove from the states the responsibility to resolve their own business and with that the right to do so as well. In summation, the modern Antifederalist believes in a decreased amount of central government control of local affairs as well as the promotion of interstate cooperation without the involvement of federal authorities.

Individual Rights

When examining the eternal role of the Antifederalists, there is one legacy that is seen to have lived on, whether or not their viewpoints indeed have: that is the Bill of Rights. The first Ten Amendments to the constitution are seen by many to be the one legacy that the Antifederalists have left behind, and one that indicates that perhaps their role in American history is something beyond that of a mere agitator who made the ratification process difficult for the Federalists. The rights of individuals were considered tantamount to the cause of the Antifederalists and as one researcher found “the Antifederal party refused to ratify any plan of government without a “Sacred Declaration” defining the rights of the individual” (Allen 83). This desire for the preservation of civil liberties can be traced as the origin of many different Antifederalist viewpoints. For example, it has been documented that their apprehension as to the virtues of founding a national army were linked to a fear of the violation of an individual’s conscience (Kenyon 17). They feared that the ability of the federal government to “impress men for the Army” (Borden 61) would inevitably lead to the recruitment of men against their own conscience. This type of action on the part of the national government is clearly a violation of the private rights of the citizenry, Aristocrotis explains in Antifederalist 51 that “what others call

their natural rights they resign in to the hands of their superiors-even the right of self-preservation” (Borden 145). This removal of a person’s civil liberties is seen as an even greater crime than the formation of the national army because it violates the most sacred of things in the mind of the Antifederalist, the rights of the individual. This tendency can also be observed in the Antifederalist attitude against taxation: where the conflict, though existent in both realms, is predominantly focused on the violation of a person’s right to government action rather than a distaste for income taxation. As Aristocrotis put it “This will make the people attend to their own business and not be dabbling in politics- things they are entirely ignorant of; nor is it proper they should understand” (Borden 145). This prediction has clearly come true in the modern political arena, and the warning of its possibility serves as a grim reminder of the consequences that the Antifederalists saw with a strong central government. However, for the most part, the two parties of the day seemed to agree on that one job of government: to preserve the rights of men. The observation that Herbert Storing brings to light on the subject is that:

The Federalists and Anti-Federalists agreed that government is properly directed to the pursuit of limited ends, namely the security of individual rights, and there was very little debate about limited government in this fundamental sense, although, as we have seen, the Anti-Federalists thought the defenders of the Constitution sometimes exceeded these limits (Storing 53)

The basic sense is that the Antifederalists were, as usual, quite apprehensive about giving the Federal government what they felt to be too much authority over the workings of their day to day lives, and considering their recent activities with the English, who can blame them? The right to freedom of religion was a clear reaction to the establishment of the Church of England as well as a keen observation of the many interactions of faith and government in European history. The development of the necessary right to “the freedom of speech...the press...the right of the people

peaceably to assemble” (Amendment I, US Const) are all based on violations that they saw occur in the past with the English and they were quite certain that without a legal implementation of the preservation of these natural rights, they would indeed be violated by this new government as well. In short, the views of the Antifederalists with regard to the rights of the individual are quite simple, they supported wholly the rights that enumerated in the first ten Amendments to the constitution. For any evaluation of this Antifederalist view with regard to rights, one needs only to peer at the first modifications made to American government.

The definition of the modern Antifederalist is shaped quite fully by an understanding of the necessity for the preservation of these rights. The right to keep and bear arms, though originally intended for the maintenance of a local militia (Shalhope 3), would be seen by the modern Antifederalist as a necessity even in the modern time, because there would always be great amount of unease as to whether or not the government will continue to uphold their own civil liberties. The right to free speech will override the personal opinions of the Antifederalist, and will cause them to appear more tolerant of opposing viewpoints; for while they may not agree with those viewpoints, they would not willingly encourage the existence of a government limitation on the rights of any citizens. The desire for the preservation of their own liberties would also be seen in a deep respect for the right to privacy and against unlawful search. This matter would be particularly fiery in the minds of a modern Antifederalist, as the war on terror has lead to a greater amount of government invasion of private matters, such as phone calls in recent years (Risen). This type of a development would be nothing short of treacherous in the mind of the modern Antifederalist who would see this action as a clear and intolerable violation of the Fourth Amendment. As such, the modern Antifederalist would oppose the neo-

conservative stance on the right to privacy, and would instead cling to the established and acceptable preservation that is enumerated by the Constitution as ratified.

Methods

This next step involves the construction of a test that would determine the core constitutional beliefs of the subject for the purpose of comparison with the model Antifederalist, as they would exist in the modern era. When taking into consideration the five major areas of Antifederalist belief, the solution becomes quite clear: the construction of a survey, with questions in each of the five areas. The answers for the model Antifederalist can be easily extrapolated from the primary portion of this study, with a basis in source documents and previous academic research into the topic of core Antifederalist beliefs. Once these set of responses are gathered for the ideal Antifederalist, however, the challenge becomes just how to determine which groups have a set of views more consistent with this elder ideal. The best way that I can consider would be to address representatives from the two major political parties of the day, the Republicans and Democrats at their respective conventions. As the time of year is quickly approaching, at the time of this writing, for the state conventions of each party here in California, the test could very ideally be conducted at those gatherings. Specifically, by polling the attending delegates from the Democratic convention in San Jose and the Republican delegates to their convention in San Francisco, we might be able to get a clear picture of the core

constitutional beliefs of each of the two political parties. Not only would each respondent polled have a strong support and identity with their political party, but they are also present at the convention for the express purpose of representing the party members from their region to the rest of the state. In order to add a bit more refinement to this study, another element to take into consideration might also be the preferred Presidential candidate for the 2008 election. As these conventions are intended to be the ground for the determination of these decisions, it should prove quite simple to gather each respondent's support for the preferred candidate for the presidency, and overall observations might find that certain candidates' supporters will have views that are typically more or less consistent with the core constitutional views of the Antifederalists. Once this process is complete, it is a simple matter of mathematics to determine which group has the most similarity to the model Antifederalist with concern to each of five areas of core Antifederalist beliefs as well as constitutional view. This process should be able to determine in a meaningful and comprehensible way, whether or not the idea of a cautiously small government is still present in the modern political era.

The Construction of a Survey

Based on the results of the literary review of the subject matter, a survey has been constructed that should be able to determine the core constitutional beliefs of the respondent (See Appendix I). This survey can be easily broken down into the five major categories that have been studied for the definition of the modern Antifederalist:

1. The Assignment of Military Responsibilities

As has been found by a great deal of literary research, the preference expressed by Antifederalists for a local militia over a national army or any national body is quite clear. It is

for this reason that questions 1, 6, 18, and 25 are used in order to test the respondent's own preference, whether they feel that they are obliged to defend themselves, that they should be willing to take up arms or at least encourage locals to do the same in order to preserve their rights instead of relying on a federal body for defense.

2. The Obligations of A Government to Economic Action

My research has shown that there is a clear distaste for action on the part of the government with regard to economics. However, when it is deemed that a monopoly or a form of corporate domination is preventing the activities of a free market, the apprehension quickly disappears. This Antifederalist view on economic action boils down to two areas: the preservation of a free market economy as explored through questions 7, 13, 17, 19, and 24, and the opposition to the idea of an income tax, as tested in question 2.

3. International Relations

The Antifederalist view of what many would consider isolationism is tested in questions 5, 11, 16, 21, and 22. It is by the observation of responses to these questions that the respondent will reveal whether they believe that the interaction with other nations is the responsibility or the right of the United States. While the modern Antifederalist would clearly respond in the negative, each respondent will be able to express just how similar their view on international relations mirrors a clear isolationism or is something nearer to a favor for the United States being a member of the global community.

4. Role of the Federal Government In Interstate Relations

The determination for the Modern Antifederalist is that the federal government should have no meddling in the affairs of the states; that each of the states should be able to maintain the rights

and the wellbeing of each of its citizens without the interference of a federal body. This is tested in questions 3,8,9,12 and 14 as well as the respondent's view of the federal government's role in interstate trade.

5. Individual Rights

This selection of questions: 4,10,15,20 and 23, will determine whether or not the respondent would budge in their support of civil liberties. The rights of the people were of a paramount importance to the Antifederalists and the modern Antifederalist would feel no differently, having no understanding for a situation where one would willingly relinquish one's own rights.

Once the responses from the two parties have been gathered, they can be compared to the responses of the model Modern Antifederalist (See Appendix IV) and from those similarities and differences a clear picture can be determined as to which party, which candidates, and whether or not modern political actives altogether have any resemblance to the core constitutional beliefs of the Antifederalists.

Expected Findings

Now, I must admit that this is not just a pleasant coincidence, it is truthfully more of a reason for the formation of my study as it exists, but Ron Paul is running this year for the Republican nomination. In his campaign material as well as his delivered speeches he has exhibited several core viewpoints that would point to his likelihood of matching the Antifederalist model almost exactly. He has expressed a desire for decreased international relations on the part of the US (Speeches to 2008 Conservative Political Action Conference Feb 7, 2008), as well as an adverse sentiment toward the concept of the income tax (Meet the Press: 2007 "Meet the Candidates" series Dec 23, 2007) as well as an overall fear, seemingly in line

with the ideal Antifederalist, of the capabilities and tendencies of a big government to infringe upon the rights of the individual (2007 GOP primary debate in Orlando, Florida Oct 21, 2007). This is not the only possible boon of modern Antifederalist thought in this election, however! Another fringe candidate for the Republican nomination is Mike Huckabee, whose proposals for an elimination of the income tax (CNN Late Edition: 2008 presidential series with John King Feb 24, 2008) calling it a system that “punishes people for working and punishes their productivity;” as well as a deep support for the rights of citizens to gun ownership (From Hope to Higher Ground, by Mike Huckabee, p.126-127 Jan 4, 2007) set him aside as a possible candidate for the modern Antifederalist party, if one can be said to exist. Admittedly, there are no shining examples of Antifederalism on the Democratic party’s side for this election at least, but that is hardly a surprise. However, the actions that the current presidential administration has taken against the individual’s right to privacy have caused quite an uproar within the Democratic party. The current Republican President has been responsible for invading personal privacy with wiretaps (Risen, NY Times) opposing the right of gay citizens to marriage (Roche NY Times) as well as the general Republican discontent toward the decision in *Roe v. Wade* (Hempstead 19). These actions that the Republican Party has taken against the right to privacy might have some Democrats spinning, ready to lash out against a government with the capability to take such actions. The current Democratic Party’s view on war is also possibly consistent with Antifederalist ideals as an opposition to international military action is only logical to a party that would support only a national defense and minimalistic approach to international relations. Since these are two of the main areas of concern for classical Antifederalists, it is possible that there will be some similarity between them and modern Democrats in this regard. At this point, I

would hypothesize that the modern political party that most closely resembles the model Antifederalist would be that of the Republicans, with specific focus on candidate Ron Paul. However, as a corollary to that statement I would wish to suggest that perhaps the overall mood toward government over time has changed since the founding. As the time has passed between the nation's founding and the present, the American people have been living with a strong central government, (Bennett 8) and as such the ideas of apprehension at such a government that were felt by Antifederalists may have faded with time. It is for this reason that I would suggest that overall; the views of modern political actives from both parties will be in support of a stronger central government than the Antifederalists. Once this study has been completed we will at long last be able to determine just which of our two main political parties more closely resemble the cautious radicals of our nation's founding.

Findings

The results of the proposed survey (See Appendix I) have yielded quite interesting results as to the existence of Antifederalist viewpoints among modern political actives from the two main parties. At each of the two conventions, the full population of delegates was polled and their responses tabulated then compared to the responses determined from study to be consistent with a model of the Modern Antifederalist (See Appendix IV). The differences between the Antifederalist and the respondents were averaged and grouped based on the two gathered classification criteria: the proclaimed political party of affiliation and the most favored candidate for the 2008 Presidential election. If the value is positive, it means that the respondents were in favor of more government regulation on the issue than the Antifederalists, and if it is negative, the respondents see even the Antifederalists as too permissive on the federal government with regard to the issue in question. Not surprisingly, most of the results ended up positive, indicating

that overall, the time of small government is at an end, and that, as Linda and Stephen Bennett suggested in *Living With Leviathan* modern citizens have grown accustomed to an increased presence of federal government influence in their lives. This data displays more than an overall approval or disapproval of government activity; however, it also shows the areas in which respondents are closer or farther from the modern Antifederalists viewpoint. The most fruitful way to examine the whole of this data is to observe it by parts and to determine the relative relations to the core views of Antifederalism (See Appendix III). It is by analyzing the similarities between these averages by category and grouping that one can determine with a near certainty which groups more closely resemble the core constitutional beliefs of the Antifederalists.

Economic Views

The economic views of the Antifederalist party are actually quite distinct from the views of modern political activists when considering the average of all respondents. In total, there was an average difference of +1.645 with regard to responses to economic questions. This makes sense considering the modern state of economic affairs, where a consideration for the preservation of a free market is considered essential with the presence of many corporations. When analyzing the average responses for Democrats and Republicans, it is clear that the two parties nearly agree on the core constitutional duties of government with regard to economic intervention. With relative differences of +1.66 for the Democrats and +1.627 for the Republicans, the fact is quite clear that overall they are in favor of the same amount of government activity in the field of economic interest. This is an observation that carries quite a bit of significance because of the professed existence of the Republican Party as one of small

government, and as a government that would seek to promote a free market economy in the United States. However, due to their outright refusal to eliminate the larger corporations that have made competing in this market so difficult, it is easy to observe that the Republicans have a clear difference from the ideological standpoints of the Antifederalists. The candidates of serious note in this particular area are easily observed, with Hillary Clinton leading the Democrats with a +1.96 average disparity between respondents and the Antifederalist. This does make sense when taking into consideration the common stance taken by her and her supporters on issues of economics. They are usually on the side of larger government and greater activity at the federal level. At the opposite end of the spectrum, however, the Republican party respondents all averaged a variation of less than 0.4 with the high belonging to supporters of Rudy Giuliani, no doubt due to a view on censorship affecting the regulation of television and a degree of unease when considering government manipulation of industry for the purposes of preservation of a healthy economy. The most Antifederalist with regard to economic policy, however, is Ron Paul, whose respondents were almost always within 1 point of the Antifederalist response, averaging +0.25 from the Antifederalist model. This remarkable similarity is amazing but not quite unexpected. It is fantastic however, to find such a clear favorite so early on in observation.

International Beliefs

With this particular category, it becomes quite evident that times have indeed changed since the founding. Many of the respondents polled believed whole heartedly that the United States should be a part of the world community, that it was the responsibility of such a nation to participate and even have a leadership role with regard to international politics. This goes against the ideal of the modern Antifederalist, whose belief in a government's duty to solve the

problems of its countrymen overrides any desire for a participation in a global realm. The average response variation was a notable +2.16 points from the Antifederalists response. This is largely swayed, however, by the average observed for the Democrats, whose difference in this category was an astounding 2.59. This large variation obviously comes from a Democratic sentiment that leads toward a necessity for the United States to interact with nearly all the nations of the world in order to promote a greater peace and understanding. The Republican average variation of +1.74 is tame by comparison. Some notable candidates in this category include the Democratic nominee Barack Obama, whose belief in the United States' responsibility to the rest of the world for peaceful relations leads obviously to a much more liberal international stance than the modern Antifederalist would prefer. Mr. Obama is surprisingly, however, not the candidate who policy most sharply differs from that of modern Antifederalism. The views of two determined Republican candidates, Mike Huckabee and John McCain, place them at variations of +2.23 and +2.6 respectively. What would cause such a thing? They have a strong belief in the United States' ability to exist on its own without participation in the world community, but their preference is for unilateral military action taken by the United States. While John McCain may believe that the US should be held accountable to the United Nations, nor does he believe that we should pursue diplomatic relations throughout the world, he does believe that the United States should taken action against possible threats such as North Korea and Iran by making movements outside of our borders and swiftly into theirs. This preference for increased international aggression on the part of the United States causes a great variation with the views of the modern Antifederalist. The nearest to the Antifederalist model in this category is once again Ron Paul whose respondents averaged a +0.82 variation from the model.

This is just another piece of evidence that perhaps he may be the closest thing to an Antifederalist in the modern political parties.

The Role of the Military

The idea of a person being responsible for the defense of their own rights and the defense of their own territories is not quite dead in modern politics, but the death rattle may come sooner than later. The average response variation from the model Antifederalist for the category that determines the validity of local defense is a mere +1.26. This comes from a +1.47 on the part of the Democrats and +1.04 on the part of the Republicans. The respondents on the whole recognized the role of the militia in the defense of local territories as well as the handling of local disputes. The outstanding candidates in this category end up being very nearly the same and vary throughout political parties. The high in variation belongs to Barack Obama whose +1.76 on the part of his respondents suggests that perhaps there is not a great necessity for the development of local defenses in the minds of his supporters that the people should lean on the federal government for their defense in most situations. The low for this category is a +1.05 and that belongs to the supporters of Ron Paul once again. This leaning away from the localization of defense is something that could clearly be observed as a product of government over the last 200 years. The people have grown quite accustomed to being defended without much action on their own part. Most people see military service as a choice between federal branches and rarely choose to serve locally as the Antifederalists would have suggested. This could be seen as a sign of the times. As the Antifederalists were looking inward for their threats and feared nearly everything around them would eventually cause the collapse of their new nation, the political

actives of the modern day believe most notable threats to be foreign. The desire for a militia has decreased in accordance with a rise in that belief.

Individual Rights

The rights of the individual were seen as the core for the development of Antifederalism. The fear that the new federal government would overcome the rights of the few with a tyranny of the majority, or worse yet an aristocracy, put the rights of the individual into the main spotlight. The average variation from this viewpoint on the part of political actives is a +1.214, suggesting that there has been some development that has led American political actives to relinquish some of their own civil liberties. When examining the two party's averages, one notices for the first time a smaller variation on the part of Democrats than Republicans. While the Republicans score a massive +1.49, the Democrats as a whole only average a +0.94. The reasoning for this is clearly observed when one considers the recent developments in the war on terror. In an attempt to gain a greater control over the possibility of terrorist attacks against the United States, the party in power has been taking liberties with it and removing them from the people. The right to privacy is routinely violated as well as the right to free speech. As the Republicans have sought to define themselves as a more moral party, they have resolutely opposed gay marriage, as well as the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*. The stances that this party has taken have removed them from the realm of the preservation of personal liberty in favor of the establishment of a moralistic agenda. On the other hand, the Democrats have taken no such stances, they have recently been defenders of both major issues in question and are commonly linked with the maintenance of the American Civil Liberties Union. The candidates of the greatest note and weight when it comes to these issues include Mike Huckabee as a primary example of moralistic

thought. It makes sense, considering his background as a preacher that his supporters would favor a more conservative standpoint when considering the rights of homosexuals to marry and a woman's right to choose when it comes to whether or not to keep her child. The fact that he is associated with a moral stance means that his supporters would rather abandon civil liberties in order to promote what they consider to be more moral behavior. The opposite end of the spectrum for this category is John Edwards, whose supporters seem to gel with the idea of a federal government acting in order to preserve the rights of its citizens above all else. Even though he rests among the party with the largest average, the results indicated by Ron Paul supporters are still a thing to note as his is the lowest average variation of his party, with a score of +1.36. While this may not be anywhere near the low, it is important to note that he is the most Antifederalist in his party while still taking a standpoint that is farther away from the model than usual.

The Rights of the States

The determination of state sovereignty is another issue that determines with a large amount of importance the relative views of modern political actives with regard to those of the modern Antifederalist. The total average for this category is a variation of +1.41 from the model. The averages for the parties are remarkably similar in this category with a +1.47 for the Democrats and a slightly smaller +1.35 for the republicans. The high for the Democrats belongs again to supporters of Hillary Clinton with an average of +1.64 from the modern Antifederalist. This is likely due to her supporters' views when it comes to federal regulation as well as the authority of the federal government. After all, this is the candidate who proposed universal health care in the United States that would be provided by the federal government. However, the

overall high in difference belongs to Mike Huckabee, whose supporters seem to have a clear favor for federal bodies in the regulation of crime. They clearly voiced a support for US Army action in the cases of civil unrest instead of local law enforcement. They voiced a preference for the FBI as a law body when a criminal crosses the borders between states. This is quite the unexpected phenomenon to observe in this situation, and one that repeats in McCain supporters' responses, whose support for federal law enforcement over local is astounding and may go along with a stronger support of military presence overseas. The overall low was also in the Republican Party; it was once again Ron Paul, whose supporters varied an average of +0.78 from the Antifederalist ideal. This collection of responses leads to an overall enhanced understanding of the clear shift that has occurred in the maturation of the United States. Since its founding, the powers of the states have been steadily decreasing, and the public has grown accustomed to this for the most part.

Overall

The average differences for the Democratic party and the Republican party were +1.63 and +1.47 respectively. This comes from scores like +1.8 from Clinton supporters, +1.62 for Obama, and +1.47 for Edwards. The averages for this group are clearly weighted by the responses of those who support a socialized healthcare program that was proposed by Clinton's candidacy. The other two were actually quite near the Republican average, which is a statement all its own, suggesting that the majority of Democrats would agree with the majority of Republicans with regard to core constitutional beliefs. While this fact may determine the relationship of the modern Antifederalist to current political parties, there is still one more goal, the crowning of a champion of sorts: the most Antifederalist candidate for the 2008 Presidential

election. By observing the grouped averages, one finds that there are two easy outliers in the Republican party: Huckabee and McCain. The preference of their respondents for a more assertive unilateral military stance as well as a clear preference for federal law enforcement in the resolution of civil disturbances, these two have high averages of +1.59 and +1.55 respectively. Romney and Giuliani put up a decent fight for the Antifederalist candidacy with averages of +1.33 and +1.20, but it is clear from their stance with regard to individual liberties that they simply do not fit with the core constitutional beliefs of the modern Antifederalist. The views of Ron Paul supporters, however, bear a discernable resemblance to those of the modern Antifederalist. Apart from a slightly greater tolerance for the violation of civil liberties than the Antifederalists would be keen to second, the supporters of this candidate have been the closest to the modern Antifederalist with every category. With an average response variation of +0.82, it is clear that the candidate in the 2008 Presidential election with the closest support for core Antifederalist constitutional beliefs is none other than outsider candidate Ron Paul.

Conclusion and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the viewpoints and the location of the modern Antifederalists. The goal was to find out if their views had lived on, if they had left a legacy that was still detectable in modern politics. In the view of this researcher, the facts are clear and

Antifederalism, though hard to find, still exists in the modern day in many distinct facets of modern politics.

The answer to my first research question is best described by the literary review section of this thesis. The modern Antifederalist supports political action for the purposes of the maintenance of a free market, they decry the ability of government to tax incomes. They favor a stronger policy of localized security and do not believe in unilateral military action. In the mind of the modern Antifederalist, the national army exists for the purpose of defending the nation, and nothing more. The militia and its regulation is still a matter of import to the modern Antifederalist, even in its modern state as the National Guard. While there is a recognized role for both the federal government and the government of each of the sovereign states, the blurred line between the two is what would dishearten the modern Antifederalist, and lead them to lean on old methods and a greater localization of government activity and service. It is by this modification that modern Antifederalism would possibly increase political activity among the citizenry, by engaging them at the local level with a government that can clearly aid in the problems of their region. More importantly than any of these, however, must be the preservation of individual rights. To the modern Antifederalist, there is no excuse good enough, no cause great enough for them to forfeit their freedoms from the government. All of these things together make up the core constitutional beliefs of the modern Antifederalist.

My second question was about the prevalence of Antifederalist sentiment in either of the two major political parties. While there is a clear distinction between the two with the Democrats averaging a +1.63 variation from the modern Antifederalist to the Republicans' +1.47, the two are remarkably similarly when one removes the high score of Hillary Clinton

whose favor for a socialized federal health care program as well as controversial big government programs too numerous to name, makes her an outlier even in her own party. It makes sense when one considers the times, after all. While the Republicans have been slashing back at individual rights in favor of greater military development, the Democrats have been removing almost all authority from state government and encouraging increasing amounts of Diplomatic action that would bring the US out from its own and into a global community. Each party has its tradeoffs, but in the end, neither is closer than the other to the ideal set by Antifederalism.

The third and final goal of this thesis was to determine whether or not there was a candidate that was set aside as a remarkable example of Antifederalism. Ron Paul is clearly that candidate. With an average variation of less than one point and an economic category score of a mere +0.25 it is clear that if anyone in modern politics can be said to reflect the Antifederalists' ideals, it must be Ron Paul.

While the original goals of this thesis have been completed and all of my research questions have been answered, there is one observation that leads me to more uncertainty and fear for the future of this country. In the midst of performing this study, one discovery began to occur as the respondents were polled. There was one response that was procured no matter the question, no matter the category and no matter which candidate they supported. The respondents in an alarming number were unable to visualize a government that they could control for themselves. In the responses to the questions for this survey, the clear goal is to gain an understanding not of what the current system is, but what the respondent believes the government should be. Many times, when asking a question, I received the answer of "of course, that's what our law says" or "Isn't that what it says in the constitution?" instead of an honest

opinion on the part of the respondent as to what they *thought* the government *should* do. This type of thinking goes along with one of the overall observations gathered from this study. Over time, the political actives in the United States have drifted away from the idea of a government that was small enough for them to modify. In every single category the average response would favor *more* government than the model Antifederalist would tolerate. The average political active without regard for party or favored candidate had a difficulty in considering the possibility of a government that could be modified to serve not just what was assumed to be the greater good by the will of the majority, but rather *their* will. This suggests that as time has passed, political actives have becomes more complacent when it comes to their role in government.

While they may routinely play the game of getting their candidate elected to a Senate seat, or a Congressional district, they are still unable or unwilling to change the government that is there before them. What happened? Are we not a nation founded by rebels who defied an empire so they wouldn't have to pay taxes? Are we not descendent from a people who broke the law to write their Constitution? American politics has changed in the last 200 years; that much is beyond debate, but the assumption that I have always had is that the American people still have that great capacity within them to forego the establishment and to seek their own fulfillment through a realization of self-governance. Perhaps I have been wrong, this research has led to the answer to my queries about the presence of Antifederalism but to more concerns as to the capability of political actives to be active in government. If these are people who turn out to represent their party, what of those who don't even make that effort? One of the great fears that the Antifederalists expressed with regard to the government's right to taxation was that it would

eventually lead to an alienation of the people from activity within their government. As

Aristocrotis wrote:

This will make the people attend to their own business, and not be dabbling in politics-things they are entirely ignorant of; nor is it proper they should understand. But it is very probable that the exercise of this power [taxation] may be opposed by the refractory plebians, who (such is the perverseness of their natures) often refuse to comply with what is manifestly for their advantage. But to prevent all inconvenience from this quarter the congress have power to raise and support armies. This is the second thing necessary to render government independent. The creatures who compose these armies are a species of animals, wholly at the disposal of government; what other call their natural rights they resign into the hands of their superiors-even the right of self-preservation (Borden 145)

This is a chilling thing to consider while keeping in mind the present state of government. After all, people seem to have consigned from their own involvement in shaping it, foregoing a nation of by and for the people in favor of something else. Perhaps by analyzing deeper the sentiments of the founders one can gain a deeper understanding of just what it meant to have the ability to make a government that would suit the people of its time. There is much that can be gained from this analysis, perhaps even a window into the possible future. It won't start all at once, but if a few begin to gain the courage to stand up against a government that has grown beyond the control of those it was meant to serve, there can be a change. As Robert Kennedy once said "Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance." This is the calling that is placed on each aware citizen here in the United States today. If each person does their part to change this government in order to better fit the needs and desires of its citizenry, just as the founders had the courage to

do more than 200 years ago, perhaps a government of the people, by the people, and more importantly *for* the people, will not perish from this country after all.

References

- Allen, Michael (1981). Antifederalism and Libertarianism. *Reason Papers*. Volume 7 , 73-94.
- Bennett, L, & Bennett, S (1990). *Living with Leviathan: Americans Coming to Terms with Big Government*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.
- Borden, Morton (Ed.). (1965). *The Antifederalist Papers*. East Lansing, MI.: Michigan State University Press.
- Cornell, Saul A. "Aristocracy Assailed: The Ideology of Backcountry Anti-Federalism," *Journal of American History* 76 (March 1990): 1148-72.
- Crane, Daniel A. (2007). Antitrust Antifederalism. *Jacob Burns Institute for Advanced Legal Studies*. 187.
- Monroe, James. "The Address an Reasons of Dissent of the Minroity of the Convention of the State of Pennsylvania to their Constituents," (18 December 1787, pp. 39-40.
- Duncan, C (1995). *The Anti-Federalists and Early American Political Thought*. Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Hempstead, Brooke (2005). *Tradition Versus Equality: An Ideological Analysis of the Presidential Campaign Rhetoric of George W. Bush and John Kerry Regarding Gay Marriage*. Pullman, Wa: Washington State University.
- Henry, Patrick (1786). In Council, February 20, 1786. Richmond, VA.
- Huckabee, Mike. "2008 Presidential Series." CNN Late Edition. 24 February, 2008.
- Huckabee, Mike (2007). *From Hope to Higher Ground: 12 Stops to Restoring America's Greatness*. New York, NY: Center Street Publishing.
- Kenyon, Cecilia M (1955). Men of Little Faith: The Anti-Federalists on the Nature of Representative Government. *William and Mary Quarterly*. Volume XII, 3-43.
- Lienesch, Michael. "In Defense of the Antifederalists," *History of Political Thought* IV:1 (Spring 1983): 65-87.

- Main, Jackson Turner (2004). *The Anti-Federalists: Critics of the Constitution*. Raleigh, NC: UNC Press.
- Marshall, Jonathan (1980). Empire or Liberty: The Antifederalists and Foreign Policy, 1787-1788. *The Journal of Libertarian Studies*. Volume IV, No. 3, 233-254.
- Monroe, James. "The Address and Reasons of Dissent of the Minority of the Convention of the State of Pennsylvania to their Constituents," (18 December 1787, pp. 39-40.
- Norrande, Barbara, & Wilcox, Clyde (1999). *Public opinion and policymaking in the states: The case of post-Roe abortion policy*. *Policy Studies Journal*. 27, 707-722.
- Paul, Ron. Conservative Political Action Conference. Alexandria, VA. 7 February, 2008.
- Paul, Ron. "Meet the Candidates." Meet the Press: 2007. 23 December, 2007.
- Paul, Ron. 2007 GOP Primary Debate. Orlando, Florida. 21 October, 2007.
- Republican Antifederalist 4.13.26
- Richards, Leonard (2003). *Shays's Rebellion: The American Revolution's Final Battle*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Richman, Sheldon (2006). Beware Income-Tax Casuistry. *Freedom Daily*. October.
- Risen, James Bush Lets US Spy on Callers Without Courts. (2005, December 16). *New York Times*.
- Roche, Mark Voting Our Conscience, Not Our Religion. (2004, October 11). *New York Times*.
- Shalhope, Robert (1999). To keep and bear arms in the early Republic. *Constitutional Commentary*. 16.
- Storing, Herbert (1981). *What the Antifederalists Were For*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tarcov, N. (1986). The Federalists and Anti-Federalists on Foreign Affairs. *Teaching Political Science*. 14 (1), 38-45.

Watkins Jr, William J (1998). Live Free or Die Separate. *The Free Market*. Vol 16 No 8.