

# Federalist 2.0 – Chapter 1 – Article 02

## By Publius in 2009

Article 02 – The federalist is pessimistic and a realist (Human Nature)

*So long as the people do not care to exercise their freedom, those who wish to tyrannize will do so; for tyrants are active and ardent, and will devote themselves in the name of any number of gods, religious and otherwise, to put shackles upon sleeping men.*

— Voltarine de Cleyre

From our initial discussion on the equality of mankind and the associated fact that all men do not live equally due to their own “God given gift” of freewill comes the discussion around what constitutes human nature within this context of “freewill”. In short, what are the factors that make mankind “work” and express themselves within nature as a whole and how does this fit into the context of good/right and bad/wrong? But what is right and wrong? How can we define what is right and what is wrong if we do not first understand how we can determine the line that defines that separation? This concept of a line that defines this separation and the associated decision as to what is considered to be “right” and what is considered to be “wrong” is what we will call the “line of separation”. Through our works, as founding fathers, it became apparent that this “line of separation” was something that could fluctuate between individuals, cultures, and governments, and this is the tool in which most of modern man to date has used to manage and manipulate individuals, groups, and the masses. There are two general perceptual understandings that we determined were the key to setting up the initial governing functions for the United States of America. The key was the desire and need to separate, what we called at that time, the “church” and the “state”. Thus, we were able to identify and understand that we had the right as “free men” to determine where that line of separation would fall on those that were to be governed, but more importantly it was not the states or federal’s responsibility to determine where that “line of separation” would fall within the lives and struggles of everyday men and women within the context of spiritual matters and personal struggles. This understanding of our general concept for these causes, we purposefully implemented a system of government that first protected the individual from possible laws that could be determined to be “wrong” at a personal level and we decided to leave the “bad” decisions of the spirit and heart to those that controlled the spiritual house also known as the “church”.

But we now live in a day that most people do not believe in “right” and “wrong” and most of the population does not attend church on a regular basis. Thus, they will discount my words as “old fashion” or “not in the times”, but there is much to learn from the old ways since, for the most part, these old ways are what was necessary to keep general populations alive and in some semblance of working order over the past several thousand years. Was there abuse of these concepts? Yes of course, but we must not forget that the amount of abuse did not overpower the cohesiveness of these ideas that were exercised during the troubling times of the societies of the past. Or in short, in less educated times it was much easier to communicate in terms of what was considered “good/right” and what was considered “bad/wrong” for a group or society. But the more interesting question is this, “What influences, factors, or natures, of mankind, will deliver right or wrong decisions?” And the question we attempted to solve was this, “Can these influences, factors, and nature, of mankind, be guided properly to maximize freedom and minimize suffering?” Thus, it is again our position, as it was some 250 years ago, that man is capable of establishing good government from reflection and choice if we could properly separate the general concepts of right and wrong decisions such that no one group, or individual could oppress another group or individual. This article will demonstrate that this is possible with an applied pessimistic or realistic view of human nature within the context of governance. More specifically, our views, as the founding fathers, mostly aligned with the balancing philosophy of materialism vs. idealism from St. Thomas Aquinas<sup>1</sup> resulting in a moral realism or moral objectivism standpoint that explicitly expresses itself in the Declaration of Independence and the current Constitution of the United States of America.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St.\\_Thomas\\_Aquinas](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St._Thomas_Aquinas) (October 31st, 2009)

<sup>2</sup> Human Nature Defined: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human\\_nature](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_nature) (October 31st, 2009)

Within this context of determining what it means to govern within the context of human nature, we must turn to matters of what it means for mankind to be in the possession of something of value. This concept of possession of value specifically can be split into two areas: possession of spiritual abilities and possession of material objects or functional knowledge. Our efforts as founding fathers specifically called out the need to define the rights we possess around our private property or material/knowledge possessions (intellectual knowledge, learned abilities and physical possessions) in which any human might obtain, while it was determined to be self evident that the spiritual world belonged to the “church” as we understood. This article is not intended to dwell on the matters of the spirit but the necessary understanding to define how a group of people should be properly governed; such that this article will only focus on the matters we have called “Private Property”. Why is this important to note? It is critical to note since we must focus our discussion on human nature to those things that are most appropriate within the context of exchange, which then can be potentially open to be regulated by the state. We also must understand that this topic of private property has been defined within other texts and has been debated throughout the ages so that this article is not intended to debate the details or the concerns about private property but to articulate our original intent and convince you that a new Constitutional Convention is needed to further shore up these concepts to protect our freedoms today and for the generations to come.

So as one of our first principles of human nature it has been observed, that, in proportion to the firmness/solidness or precariousness/doubt of the length of time or tenure by which an individual holds private property (knowledge, ability or objects) will an individual invest effort to keep it. Additionally, for positions of governance, an individual will be less attached to what they hold when they hold a momentary or uncertain title or position, than to what they might enjoy by a durable or certain title or position; and, of course, they will be willing to risk more for the sake of the latter, than for the sake of the former. This remark is not less applicable to a political privilege, or honor, or trust, than to any article of ordinary property. The inference from this concept is, that a man or woman that is acting in the capacity of chief magistrate or statesman, whom has an understanding that in a very short time they *must* lay down their office, they will be apt to feel themselves less attached to the office and thus less likely to risk any material advantage or perplexity, from an effort to exert their powers independently, or from encountering the ill-humors, however transient, which may happen to prevail within their heart, either in a considerable part of the society itself, or even in a predominant faction in the legislative body. If the case should be, that they *might* have to lay their position of powers down, unless continued by a new choice, and if they should be encouraged to continue with their powers, their wishes, conspiring with their fears, would tend still more powerfully to corrupt their integrity, or debase their fortitude or honesty, thus leading them to most likely choose to continue their office.<sup>3</sup> Thus, within today’s world we have known this concept to be “power begets power”, but we can better formulate this construct within the context of human nature as such, “Any rational individual that finds themselves in a position of power will more freely relinquish their powers if they are expected to do so; where given the opportunity, if one exists, as well as if encouraged by their factions to remain, they will justify the need to remain in power.” In short, the taste of power sweetens the desire to remain in power.

Thus, we can further this conversation to say that when an individual obtains “power” through an office or political effort, whether it be through force or democratic institutions, the longer the individual remains in power the more like “property” will the office containing the power be perceived by the holder. Such that this leads to our second principle, “The longer a position of power is held by an individual the more will the holder perceive it as “property” and thus will their desire to continue to hold the power remain and the further “justification” will permeate in their minds that they are the “rightful” owners of the position of power they hold.” In short, the duration of power inversely relates to their willingness to risk their personal security/property to remain in power. Thus, we have seen this time after time through history as shown by the evolution of the Caesars in Roman times as well as the evolution of the Kings/Queens in the Middle Ages. There is no royal blood, these men and women are human as is any other human has lived on this planet, but their factions, in which they had been born, after holding power for decades or centuries, continued the tradition of holding that power through the concepts of a Caesar and King/Queen and their associated hold on force to maintain their positions. Thus, we must pose this as the nature of mankind and

---

<sup>3</sup> From Federalist 71: <http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa71.htm>

the risks this imposes on properly forming governance that has the goal to ensure suffering is minimized within the population.

*I am sure there was no man born marked of God above another for none comes into the world with a saddle upon his back, neither any booted and spurred to ride him.*

— Richard Rumbold before being hanged for planning an insurrection against the tyrant Charles II, 1679

Such that, we must ask the question, “What is power?” and why is “power” an important concept. “Power” from a political perspective, is the ability to govern mankind within the context of a nation such that rules or guidelines of human behavior are created and enforced<sup>4</sup>. Those that create these rules or enforce these rules would be in positions of “power”. As we have mentioned in previous discussions outlined in the Federalist Papers<sup>5</sup> this power is delivered at the hands of those that might govern through the use of favors or advantages (influence and taxation) as well as through the use of force (legal means and police). We have also noticed that those that have wielded “power” over those they govern indirectly hold the “perception of safety” through the means of how they govern. This perception of safety can be influenced by threatening the ability of an individual to provide for themselves or their family, or more importantly they can ultimately threaten those they govern with their life. So, we come to another principle, “Those who have political power will by definition have power over the subsistence, or the means of providing, of those they govern. And in the general course of human nature, *a power over an individual's subsistence amounts to a power over their ability to express their freewill.*”<sup>6</sup> In short, political power is the lock on the “line of separation” for what is acceptable or not acceptable, impacting an individual’s key to freedom and ability to live within their own chosen decisions that are guided by their own “freewill”.

*Intentions will always be pleaded for every assumption of authority. It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions. There are men in all ages who mean to govern well, but they mean to govern. They promise to be good masters, but they mean to be masters.*

— Daniel Webster

Thus, as we have stated before, it is a known fact, in human nature, that its affections are commonly weak in proportion to the distance or diffusiveness of the object. So that any political position that is held for any length of time, by definition holds power over an individual subsistence such that they can control an individual’s freewill to their desires or their faction’s desires; where the longer the individual holds that position of power the more likely they will be willing to risk much to keep it; resulting in their need to make efforts to increase their hold on an individual’s subsistence if so doing will further increase their chances of continuing their hold on power. This tendency to use the leverage of a position of power to further influence an individual’s decision, of those they govern, to keep themselves in power by threatening those they govern through their ability to sustain their lifestyle or subsistence is what we have defined, as founding fathers, as an “abuse” of power, that unchecked will eventually, in the end, lead to tyranny. Thus, we come to our fourth principle, “Any power that can be abused will be abused and will always expand to fill the limits of the resistance to the abuse. If the people being abused don’t resist the abuses of those that govern them, there will be no one to resist the abuses they will inflict once they are governing, such that tyranny, in the end, must prevail.”<sup>7</sup> As history has shown, governments that are set up to govern men in such a manner that special interests, groups and factions determine their own “line of separation” in such a fashion that parts of the society suffer, will find the tables have turned where that group that suffered will justify the need to inflict the same amount of power and suffering, or more, onto those whom they suffered under. This escalating cycle, in the end must and will result in a government managed by tyrants.

*... a tyranny exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron’s cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their own conscience.*

— C.S. Lewis

<sup>4</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political\\_power](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_power) (October 31st, 2009)

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa27.htm>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa79.htm>

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.constitution.org/cs\\_abuse.htm](http://www.constitution.org/cs_abuse.htm)

Finally, it is clear that our efforts, as founding fathers, were to somehow short circuit this curious governing behavior that has plagued mankind throughout the ages. We believe in the early days of our nation we did capture this intent and men/women of the United States of America where the truly freest mankind has been as a society while we have existed on the face of this planet. But those times have faded as those of us, founding fathers, have passed away and left the reins to those that followed us. These principles of power, as we have defined here and in our other works, are relentless in their pursuit to evolve and in the end, we knew that mankind would eventually find the cracks in the armor such that they would once again take a people and guide them to be slaves of the state. So comes our last and most pivotal of all principles, "For a government to ensure that all of the individuals in which they govern are not lead to suffer through unfair and unjust laws defining the line of separation of right and wrong which could bring an advantage to those whom govern, the government must be constructed on a foundation around what they can do on the behalf of the people as well as clear rules around what they CANNOT do to those they govern, with the correct mechanisms in place to ensure and guarantee that men/women that do obtain a position of power and decide to wield their power with abandon are quickly removed."

*The Constitution of most of our states (and of the United States) assert that all power is inherent in the people; that they may exercise it by themselves; that it is their right and duty to be at all times armed and that they are entitled to freedom of person, freedom of religion, freedom of property, and freedom of press.*

— Thomas Jefferson

### **Principles of Political Power**

#### **#1 – Hold on Political Power is Relative**

Any rational individual that finds themselves in a position of power will more freely relinquish their powers if they are expected to do so; where given the opportunity, if one exists, as well as if encouraged by their factions to remain, they will justify the need to remain in power.

#### **#2 – Relative Political Power is based on Length of Time**

The longer a position of power is held by an individual the more will the holder perceive it as "property" and thus will their desire to continue to hold the power will remain and the further "justification" will permeate in their minds that they are the "rightful" owners of the position of power they hold.

#### **#3 – Political Power directly impacts Freewill**

Those who have political power will by definition have power over the subsistence, or the means of providing, of those they govern. And in the general course of human nature, *a power over an individual's subsistence amounts to a power over their ability to express their freewill.*<sup>8</sup>

#### **#4 – Political Power, unchecked, will lead to Tyranny**

Any power that can be abused will be abused and will always expand to fill the limits of the resistance to the abuse. If the people being abused don't resist the abuses of those that govern them, there will be no one to resist the abuses they will inflict once they are governing, such that tyranny, in the end, must prevail.<sup>9</sup>

#### **#5 – Governance Can be Crafted to Guarantee Tyrants do not Evolve**

For a government to ensure that all of the individuals in which they govern are not lead to suffer through unfair and unjust laws defining the line of separation of right and wrong which could bring an advantage to those whom govern, the government must be constructed on a foundation around what they can do on the behalf of the people as well as clear rules around what they CANNOT do to those they govern, with the correct mechanisms in place to ensure and guarantee that men/women that do obtain a position of power and decide to wield their power with abandon are quickly removed.

*... freedom of men under government is to have a standing rule to live by, common to every one of that society, and made by the legislative power erected in it. A liberty to follow my own will in all things where that rule prescribes not, not to be subject to the inconstant, uncertain, unknown, arbitrary will of another man, ...*

— John Locke, [Second Treatise, Ch. 4 § 21](#)

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa79.htm>

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.constitution.org/cs\\_abuse.htm](http://www.constitution.org/cs_abuse.htm)