

Preface

History vs. Myth and Original Intentions Originally

For the 220th anniversary of the Constitution, I would like Americans (average citizens and scholars alike) to *unlearn* at least one myth about 1787. James Madison was not the “Father of the Constitution” as many have claimed for too long now (historians, political scientists, legal theorists, and judges) despite Madison’s own quite explicit admission to the contrary. As he wrote to Mr. Cogswell in 1834: “You give me a credit to which I have no claim, in calling me ‘the writer of the Constitution of the United States.’ This was not, like the fabled Goddess of Wisdom, the offspring of a single brain. It ought to be regarded as the work of many heads & many hands.” More directly to the point is the view of Forrest McDonald: “The myth that he was the Father of the Constitution is a deeply rooted one.” (Madison to William Cogswell, March 10, 1834 quoted in Adrienne Koch, ed., *Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 Reported by James Madison* [Athens, Ohio, 1966; New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1987], xi-xii; Forrest McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution* [Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1985], 205.)

Madison was indeed right about 1787. There were other framers. There were also different intentions that Madison acknowledged as well. A hint as to what these might be is contained in a letter to Henry Lee in 1824 in which he had this to say about “original intentions.”

I entirely concur in the propriety of resorting to the sense in which the Constitution was accepted and ratified by the nation. In that sense alone it is the legitimate Constitution. And if that be not the guide in expounding it, there can be no security for a consistent and stable, more than for a faithful exercise of its powers. If the meaning of the text be sought in the changeable meaning of the words composing it, it is evident that the shape and attributes of the Government must partake of the changes to which the words and phrases of all living languages are constantly subject. . . .

As he also noted, “that the language of our Constitution is already undergoing interpretations unknown to its founders, will I believe appear to all unbiased Enquirers into the history of its origin and adoption.” (Madison to Henry Lee, June 25, 1824, in Jack N. Rakove, ed., *James Madison: Writings* [New York: The Library of America, 1999], 803-804 quote on 804.)

Going a step further than Madison, the challenging thesis is presented that the real framers of our federal republic of 1787-1788 were not Federalists or *The Federalist* or even James Madison but the anti-Federalists. Original intentions, moreover, very much included states’ rights and even Nullification as integral parts of a new kind of federal government unlike any other in history and which ideas were American and not sectional or Southern in origin. This at least is what the *Notes of Debates* of James Madison reveal and why he never published them during his lifetime although he used them in the 1790s in support of the first Nullification movement in Virginia. This is also why Madison biographers and constitutional scholars choose to ignore them altogether or use them very selectively. (Readers are directed to Wood, “Beyond Myths [Madisonian, Federal, Liberal, and Nationalist]: The Constitutionality of Nullification and What the Framers Really Intended, 1787-1800,” *The Early American Review*, V [Winter-Spring 2004], 1-18 (an electronic journal available at <http://www.earlyamericareview.com/review>); “The Union of the States” especially chapters 2 and 3, “Framing a Government I and II,” 177-291; and volume two of “Nullification, A Constitutional History, 1776-1833: What the Framers Really Intended: James Madison and the Constitutionality of Nullification, 1787-1828.”)

As Madison’s *Notes* inform us, the Federal Convention itself can be divided into several distinct phases. Phase one, from May 25 to July 15, was highlighted by the presentation of Madison’s Virginia plan by Edmund Randolph and the ensuing debate about it mostly in opposition to its highly nationalist features (as presented in the propositions of William Paterson). Phase two, from July 16 to July 27, was the Great Compromise itself and its aftermath culminating in a plan of government reported by a Committee of Detail. Phase three, from August 7 to September 12, was the rapid completion of the frame of government and changes as reported in a Committee of Eleven and a Committee of Style. Phase four, ending on September 17, was the end of the Federal Convention and continued opposition to the proposed frame of government that was quasi-federal only with states being represented in the Senate. To a few (and soon to be many), the plan of government was not federal enough (as emphasized in the objections of Edmund Randolph, Elbridge Gerry, and George Mason).

That the Federal Convention met for four months had little to do with great issues needing to be compromised since all agreed that the Articles of Confederation were defective. So much for the “Miracle at Philadelphia” (the title of a book by Catherine Drinker Bowen in 1966 and the thesis as well of Clinton Rossiter’s *1787: The Grand Convention* published in 1967). It had everything to do with the “nationalists” including James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, and James Wilson) and their attempt to impose a single gov-

ernment over all of America not unlike that of Great Britain from which the states had only recently seceded and declared their independence. The catchphrase of the time was “consolidation” and by definition it was a despotic government. This was the essential problem with Madison’s Virginia Plan. It was a government that would operate directly upon individuals without the intervening agency of the states. (The extreme nationalist features of Madison’s proposal literally stunned the delegates in attendance. See the remarks of Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler, and Roger Sherman on May 30th, for example. More to the point was John Dickinson’s speech of June 2 in which he noted “The division of the Country into distinct States” as forming a “principal source of stability” which “division ought therefore to be maintained, and considerable powers to be left with the States. This was the ground of his consolation for the future fate of his Country. Without this, and in case of a consolidation of the States into one great Republic, we might read its fate in the history of smaller ones.”)

The first step toward a solution and a newer federal government beyond the Articles of Confederation was the Great Compromise of July 16, 1787 by which states came to be represented equally in the Senate within the structure of the government itself (which idea Madison opposed very strenuously by the way). At this point, Federalists became those who accepted the Great Compromise and defined federalism as state representation within the government itself. As for the states themselves, their role and rights remained unclear at best. The “nationalists” including Madison and Hamilton were most reluctant supporters of this compromise and technically federalists although their essays for *The Federalist* were aimed at preventing any amendments that would further dilute national authority.

The few who refused to sign the proposed government—Edmund Randolph, Elbridge Gerry, and George Mason—became the forerunners of the anti-Federalists who were appropriately named as well and contrary to most historians of the Constitution and the Federalists and anti-Federalists, “The germ of opposition originated within the convention itself” (as Henry Knox made clear in his letter to George Washington of October 3, 1787 (The Papers of George Washington, Library of Congress, and available online). Their objections were many but centered on the national or “consolidated” nature of the government and the lack of rights for individuals and states (as other anti-Federalists in Massachusetts would later point out, two Senators were not enough to represent the diverse interests within each of the states). There was also the influential maxim of Montesquieu that a republic was only fitted for a small territory.

On September 10th, for example, Edmund Randolph complained of “the want of a more definite boundary between the General & State Legislatures” and “between the General and State Judiciaries.” (Koch, ed., *Notes of Debates*, 614-615). On the 12th, Mason, Gerry, and Sherman all spoke in favor of a Bill of Rights as an essential requisite. (630) Speaking on the 15th, Mason joined with Randolph “in animadversions on the dangerous power and structure of the Government, concluding that it would end either in monarchy, or a tyrannical aris-

ocracy.” Mason also objected that “This Constitution had been formed without the knowledge or idea of the people.” (651) In effect, the real debate about the nature of the government between Federalists and anti-Federalists had already begun.

Alexander Hamilton and Madison, two of the later authors of *The Federalist*, were reluctant supporters of the government to be. For his part, and reflecting his essential nationalism and opposition to state sovereignty, Madison to the end pressed for his “national negative” and the power to negate state laws (See Koch, ed., *Notes of Debates*, September 12, 631). As for Hamilton, he had attended the convention early on (his speech of June 18 in favor of the BRITISH form of government was an eye-opener), left, and returned. On the last day, September 17th, he “expressed his anxiety that every member should sign. A few characters of consequence, by opposing or even refusing to sign the Constitution might do infinite mischief by kindling the latent sparks which lurk under an enthusiasm in favor of the Constitution which may soon subside. No man’s ideas were more remote from the plan than his were known to be; but is it possible to deliberate between anarchy and Convention on one side, and the chance of good to be expected from the plan on the other.” (656)

Agreeing with Federalists that the old Articles of Confederation were inadequate, those to become anti-Federalists nevertheless continued to insist upon a role for the states beyond their representation in the Senate. First, they would be (as observed by John Dickinson early on) the true foundation for republican and federal government in America (being in effect small republics themselves). Second, with the distinction to be made between powers delegated and reserved (this did not occur until the state debates were underway), the states would also be another check on the general government. For their part, those much maligned anti-Federalists were the inventors of modern federalism. In their quarrel with Federalists and *The Federalist*, they were the ones who insisted upon amendments (many of them) that further limited the power of the general government by a Bill of Rights which protected personal rights and those of the states (the two were inextricably linked together).

They did even more. By distinguishing between powers delegated (that were few and very specific) and those reserved to the states (all the rest), the anti-Federalists undid the “Gordian knot” of *imperium in imperio* that many including Madison and Hamilton believed to be an absurdity (see essays # 9, 15, 20, 23, and 37 in *The Federalist*, edited by George W. Carey and James McClellan). In the second essay cited, Hamilton referred to “the political monster of an imperium in imperio” (essay #15, p.74). Besides denying that a line of demarcation could be drawn (essay #37, pages 183-185), Madison also called “a government over governments, a legislation for communities, as contradistinguished from individuals,” a “solecism in theory” (essay #20, p.101).

The line of demarcation thus drawn served another purpose. In defense of reserved rights, the anti-Federalists also demanded a positive power of self-defense on the part of states in the form of a veto or state negative. We know it as Nullification and it was intended to maintain the division of powers between

the governments (general and state). As ratified conditionally with amendments, the Constitution not of 1787 but of 1787-1788 was neither national nor like the old Articles of Confederation. It was indeed something new in the history of the world: a compound, confederate republic that was still a union of the states and not yet the states united and would remain so until the Civil War.

Madison's *Notes*, however, are not the whole story of other framers and different intentions. There's still the matter of defining "republicanism" and "federalism" and distinguishing Madison's and the Federalists' views from those of the anti-Federalists. This is where, like it or not, radical Whig-republican ideology once again provides a useful context not only for clarifying the principles of 1776 but linking them to those of 1787. The connection between these intentions is what this volume is all about. In this sense, "James Madison, Not the Father of the Constitution" is a belated and more lengthy reply to Gordon S. Wood (no relation) and to Bernard Bailyn who appreciated the fact that the Constitution was a second generation expression of radical Whig-republican ideology but who came to different conclusions about who the framers were (the Federalists) and what their intentions were (a government described as federal but which was really national).

What is new here, then, is to put states' rights back into the constitutional equation by describing its natural evolution from federalism which in turn logically flowed from republicanism. The resulting government as amended in 1787-1788 was, as Southerners always insisted between the Constitution and the Civil War, a federal republic and a union of the states rather than the states united. The South, it appears, was always right about the Revolution and the Constitution as expressed in the writings of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison (at least the Madison of the Virginia Resolutions of 1798 and Virginia Report of 1799-1800), John Taylor of Caroline, Nathaniel Macon, John C. Calhoun, Abel Parker Upshur, Jefferson Davis, and Alexander H. Stephens (to name a few Southerners who waxed at length about 1776 and 1787).

Other myths are exposed beyond Madison not being the "Father of the Constitution," no "Miracle at Philadelphia," and no Constitution of 1787. *The Federalist* itself was a failure since the proposed frame of government was not ratified rapidly and many conditional amendments were proposed. Publius, moreover, spoke with a divided voice (national versus federal) that only alarmed the anti-Federalists more than they already were. The Madisonian "extended republic" was rejected as well in favor of the other and neglected one of the anti-Federalists. Finally, the anti-Federalists were not opponents of "the Constitution" but rather the perfecters of it. Without them there would have been no Bill of Rights and no states' rights (those reserved) which truly made the government federal, republican, and limited. As for Madison and the Federalists, they were really "nationalists" before, during, and after the Federal Convention. Reluctant supporters of the Great Compromise at best, they remained very lukewarm "federalists" who wanted nothing at all to do with states' rights or state sovereignty.

While much ink has been spilled in defining the terms "federalist" and "anti-federalist" or "AntiFederalists" and their correct spelling, the following is

suggested as a corrective. At the beginning of the Federal Convention in 1787, there were the federalists or confederalists (defenders of the Articles of Confederation) and the nationalists (especially James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson, and Gouverneur Morris). With the Great Compromise (opposed to by the nationalists), most delegates became federalists in a newer sense, i.e., supporting the representation of the states in the Senate. This definition was not sufficient, however, to those who desired more protection for the rights of states and of individuals. Thus the correct term *anti-Federalists* applied to those who wanted a further division of power between the state and federal governments and beyond just the separation of powers within the national Legislature. Thus, too, the anti-Federalists as the real federalists who led to the creation of our compound confederate government (to use its official designation). As will be noted, the process of government-making was a fluid one over the period 1787-1791.

In the end, the anti-Federalists rather than the Federalists are entitled to the claim of being the real founding fathers of the Constitution we so revere today. Without them, there would have been no Bill of Rights or a line of partition specifying delegated versus reserved powers. Without them, there would have been no new American science of politics—of modern federalism, divided powers, and a complete system of checks and balances finally applied to the states with the Tenth Amendment and originally meant to include a positive power of self-defense or Nullification. (If that N-word is not there explicitly, the intent most certainly is. To suggest otherwise is to deny at the same time the existence of “federalism,” “separation of powers,” and “checks and balances” which nowhere appear in the Constitution.)

By no means opposed to granting extraordinary powers to the proposed new government, the anti-Federalists instead of the Federalists or *The Federalist* were the ones who saw the need for new and different safeguards to assure that the rights of individuals and of states were secure. Opposing the highly nationalist Virginia Plan from the beginning, based on radical Whig-republican ideology, the anti-Federalists held out initially for state representation in the Senate as a first step toward a new definition of federalism that went beyond the old idea of a Confederacy but which did not include a consolidated or a national government.

As for the nature of the new government as amended, it was truly a federal republic or union of the states and not the states united. In keeping with radical Whig-republican ideology, not only had the wheels and springs of government been created anew to afford new safeguards against the abuse of power, but incorporating the states into the new federal system made republican government possible in such a large territory as America. Hamilton may have described it in *The Federalist* #9 as a “confederate republic” and Madison may have claimed it as “in strictness neither national nor a federal Constitution” (in essay #39), but the anti-Federalists were the ones who made the government federal (by insisting upon a role for the states beyond the Senate because their varied interests could not be adequately protected.)

At least early on in our political-constitutional history, the terms anti-Federalist and Federalist distinguished federalists from nationalists. To Elbridge Gerry, a framer, “Those who were called antifederalists [sic] at the time complained that they had injustice done to them at the time by the title, because they were in favor of a Federal Government, and the others were in favor of a national one; the federalists were for ratifying the constitution as it stood, and the others not until amendments were made. Their names then ought not to have been distinguished by federalists and antifederalists, but rats and antirats.” (*Annals of Congress*, 1st Congress, 1st session, August 15, 1789, column 759.)

To George Ticknor Curtis, author of *History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption of the Constitution of the United States; with Notices of its Principal Framers* (2 vols., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1854, 1858) agreed:

As the Constitution presented itself to the people in the light of a proposal to enlarge and reconstruct the system of the Federal Union, its advocates became known as “the Federalists,” and its adversaries as the “Anti-Federalists.” This celebrated designation of Federalist, which afterwards became so renowned in our political history as the name of a party, signified at first nothing more than was implied in the title of the essays which passed under that name, namely, an advocacy of the Constitution of the United States. (Curtis, II, 496-497.)

The history of the terms “Federal,” or “Federalists,” offers a curious illustration of the capricious changes of sense which political designations undergo, within a short period of time, according to the accidental circumstances which give them their application. During the discussions of the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, the term *federal* was employed in its truly philosophic sense, to designate the nature of the government established by the Articles of Confederation, in distinction from a national system, that would be formed by the introduction of the plan of having the States represented in Congress in proportion to the numbers of their inhabitants. But when the Constitution was put before the people of the States for their adoption, its friends and advocates were popularly called Federalists, because they favored an enlargement of the Federal government at the expense of some part of the State sovereignties, and its opponents were called the Anti-Federalists. In this use, the former term in no way characterized the nature of the system advocated, but merely designated a supporter of the Constitution. A few years later, when the first parties were formed, in the first term of Washington's Administration, it so happened that the leading men who gave a distinct character to the development of the Constitution then received had been prominent advocates of its adoption, and had been known as Federalists, as had also been the case with some of those who separated themselves from this body of persons and formed what was termed the Republican, afterwards the Democratic party. . . . Thus, for example, Hamilton, in 1787, was no Federalist, because he was opposed to the continuance of a federal, and desired the establishment of a national government. In 1788, he was a Federalist, because he wished the Constitution to be adopted; and he afterwards continued to be a Federalist, because he favored a particular policy in the administration of the government, under the Constitution. It is in this latter sense that the term became so celebrated in our political

history. The reader will observe that I use it, of course, in this work, only in the sense attached to it while the Constitution was before the people of the States for adoption." (Curtis, II, 497n.)

With respect to *The Federalist*, it should be noted, it was praised before the Civil War more for its federalist-states' rights than its nationalist views (as in Jefferson's praise of the work and the critiques of John Taylor of Caroline and John C. Calhoun among others). This is another subject altogether and one that is being pursued by the author in another proposed book, "The Federalist: A Critique of Publius and His Authority before 1860."

In 2007, the myths of 1776 and 1787 live on much to the detriment of understanding "original intentions" and who the framers really were. Why this is so is explained by almost 220 years of constitutional misinterpretation by which "original intentions" became Federalist early on, nationalist in the 19th century before the Civil War, and Madisonian and liberal in the latter part of the 20th century. Over this same time frame, the real framers became the Federalist rather than the anti-Federalists! As detailed in part in my 1978 Ph. D. dissertation, original intentions became effectively democratized and nationalized over time as the federal republic grew and prospered. As Federalists, National Republicans, and Whigs put a neo-Hamiltonian gloss on the principles of 1776 and 1787 (in support of expanded national powers), the Lincolnian Republicans combined Jacksonian Democracy and neo-Hamiltonianism together in a new and more threatening mixture of myth-making (what I call the "myth of democracy").

Historical revisionism or myth-making did not stop with the founders and framers and their beliefs being reinterpreted from distinctly nineteenth- and twentieth-century perspectives. In addition to making them more consistent with later Northern and nationalist beliefs (including abolitionism and the new idea of the union as absolute), politicians and writers above the Mason-Dixon line (aided by James Madison), the myth of a reactionary South was also invented to divest Southerners of their claim to being the true heirs of the principles of 1776 and 1787. (See the works by the author already cited and others in the bibliography and appendices.)

This is a study, then, not only of Nullification but of myth-making (Federalist, nationalist, Madisonian, and anti-Southern) and the long historical and historiographical process by which a constitutional doctrine or theory became an un-constitutional one. Since original intentions are at the heart of the matter of Nullification's constitutionality or not, and given the myth-making that has occurred over the last century and more, volume one of *Nullification, A Constitutional History* goes back to the creation of the American Republic itself. Building upon the author's 1978 Ph. D. dissertation at the University of South Carolina, "The Union of States: A Study of Radical Whig-Republican Ideology and its Influence upon the Nation and the South, 1776-1861," an alternative history of America and the South from the Revolution to the Civil War is reconstructed that makes the anti-Federalists the real framers of our federal republic,

Nullification constitutional, and the South (and John C. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis) the real heirs to the principles of 1776 and 1787 as was long maintained before and after the Civil War.

In abbreviated and outline form, the following arguments are advanced.

1. The American Revolution was the first secession movement from the British Empire in defence of “antient English liberties” and republican and limited government and had very little to do with democracy, nationalism, or liberalism.
2. Eighteenth-century radical Whig-republican ideology and federalism were linked together early on with the establishment of the Articles of Confederation of 1781-1787. At this early stage, a federal government was defined simply as a league of independent and sovereign states and this ancient model worked well enough until the many problems of the 1780s (political and economic) revealed themselves.
3. The Federal Convention of 1787 at Philadelphia was ostensibly about correcting the defects of the Confederation government or was it? At issue was not the granting of more adequate authority to a federal government but the role and rights of the states.
4. From the start, two quite different solutions emerged. There was the nationalist or Virginia Plan of James Madison designed to abolish state authority and influence altogether since its basis was proportional representation and an extended republic contemplating a direct relationship between the general government and individuals or citizens.
5. Opposed to the nationalist Virginia Plan (and Madison) were federalists, old style, who did not advocate a continuation of the old Articles of Confederation at all (as we've been misinformed by one of many myths about 1787) but who wanted some guarantees about the role and rights of states! A federal government, they insisted, somehow involved the sovereignty of its members as a check against the abuse of political power (one of the principal legacies of Whig-republican ideology).
6. After more than a month of debate, and when the Federal Convention had achieved very little, the Great Compromise of July 16, 1787 gave federalists what they most wanted: state representation in the Senate as a check against governmental usurpation on the part of the states.
7. With the Great Compromise, a new kind of federalism had been invented. No longer independent and sovereign, the states were now represented in the structure of the government itself and armed with a negative of sorts. In a word, here was the constitutional origin of Nullification!
8. Modern federalism it was not, however. Nor was the proposed government truly limited without a Bill of Rights. With additional objections raised toward the end of the Federal Convention, the debate between Federalists and anti-Federalists had begun in earnest at Philadelphia and before adjournment (and here is yet another myth to be exploded). At issue were not only the rights of individuals to be protected from the general government but the rights of states again.

9. As presented here, the subsequent ratification debate of 1787-1788 was not about a finalized *Constitution* and its proponents (all in the right) and its opponents (all in the wrong). After September 17, 1787, there was only a proposed plan of government still to be ratified (and amended if need be) by the people of the states.
10. This debate was won by the anti-Federalists rather than the Federalists (including *The Federalist*) and it is to the former that we owe our Bill of Rights with its tenth amendment and states' rights, modern federalism, and Nullification as integral parts of other original intentions that have long been covered up by myth making on a grand scale.
11. *The Federalist*, it appears, was a failure. It was so because its authors remained the nationalists they had been including James Madison. When anti-Federalists reacted strongly to the proposed government between September and October, 1787, because of its nationalist or "consolidated" nature, the first numbers of *The Federalist* (#s 1-8) responded in kind with fear tactics about the inherent weaknesses of federal governments and the need for a national polity to meet the exigencies of the time.
12. In response to the continuing and effective anti-Federalist charge of a "consolidation," of the government being attempted *The Federalist* tried to reassure Americans of the federal and limited nature of the proposed government beginning with essays #9 by Alexander Hamilton and others thereafter mostly by Madison (thus the origins of the "Split personality" of Publius).
13. With no clear message about a Bill of Rights or about states and their rights, the anti-Federalists finally demanded amendments as the price of the union. The rights of individuals and of states had to be guaranteed (and the two went together) as the final ten amendments, reduced from hundreds and then to twelve, clearly indicate.
14. As of the inauguration of the government in April of 1789, and pending the final ratification of the Bill of Rights, the intentions of the framers (the anti-Federalist) were clear. In America, government would be republican, federal, and limited. Neither national nor like the old Articles of Confederation, it was to be new kind of federal republic of a compound nature (technically, a confederate republic) and a union of states rather than the states united.
15. At this point, the myths of *The Federalist* and of James Madison have been exposed for what they are. There were different framers and other original intentions including the constitutionality of Nullification.
16. The basis for these startling revelations (and other to come) is to be found in James Madison's own *Notes of Debates*. Therein is to be found the real intentions of the framers (not Federalists) and from this consensus, North and South, in favor of republicanism, federalism, a compact view of the union, states' rights, strict construction, the various Nullification movements become not manifestations of early sectionalism and disunionism (as many myth makers would want us to believe) but defenses of the republic against different efforts to undo original intentions beginning with Alexander Hamilton in the 1790s, the liberalization of the Republican party in the early

1800s, and the neo-Hamiltonian revival of the post-War of 1812 era as seen in the American system of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay.

17. Using his *Notes of Debates*, it was James Madison the nationalist moreover who became the “father of Nullification” if not the Constitution. Not only did he inform Thomas Jefferson of the right of Nullification, but he used his *Notes* to author the Virginia Resolution of 1798 and the Virginia Report of 1800. Put another way, the principles of 1798-1800 were not “bastard doctrines” at all.
18. What happened to Nullification and its constitutionality after 1800 and in the long run is very much connected with the non-publication of Madison's *Notes of Debates* and a national amnesia about 1776 and 1787 that the lapse of time and events leading to the disastrous War of 1812 encouraged. Old-fashioned republicanism and federalism seemed quaint and out of style. The republic needed the real politic of Alexander Hamilton in 1815 at least for a while.

With original intentions still being debated today and in some cases denied, perhaps it is time to recover what the founders and framers intended originally and even who they really were beginning with the American Revolution or “The First Secession Movement: In Defense of Antient English Libertyes.”