

Without a strong national government, which could open up the West and develop modern industry, local petty establishments in league with the British could preserve rural backwardness and perpetuate slavery. Hamilton likened “states’ rights” to the anarchism of the ancient feudal nobility: “The power of the head of the nation was commonly too weak, either to preserve the public peace, or to protect the people against the oppressions of their immediate lords. The barons, or nobles, equally the enemies of the sovereign and the oppressors of the common people, were dreaded and detested by both; till mutual danger and mutual interest effected a union between them fatal to the power of the aristocracy.”²

Meanwhile, Thomas Jefferson, who had turned away from the humanist influences of his youth, now spoke the language of the cynical British radical philosophers with whom he had recently been keeping company. Though he remained officially neutral on the question of the Constitution while he was abroad as a diplomat, Jefferson wrote:

“In the American states . . . every one, by his property, or by his satisfactory situation, is interested in the support of law and order. Such men may safely and advantageously reserve to themselves a wholesome control over the public affairs, and a degree of freedom which in the hands of the canaille [the human dogs, or riff-raff] of the cities of Europe, would be instantly perverted to the demolition and destruction of everything public and private.”³

At the Constitutional Convention, James Wilson and Alexander Hamilton worked for the nationalist cause headed by the two principal leaders of the Revolution, Benjamin Franklin and George Washington. General Washington, as the Convention’s chairman, did not personally enter into the formal debates; and the 81-year-old Franklin gave his own few speeches to Wilson to read for him.

But the events of 1787 can only be comprehended as part of the long war of the “national party” against the British oligarchy, going back to the 1750s alliance of Franklin and Washington for American military defense and westward settlement, back further to the Mathers of Massachusetts and Spotswood of Virginia, back to Jonathan Swift and Gottfried Leibniz, who organized America as a project of European Renaissance humanism.⁴

Let us now step back to look at the “national party” that shaped the republic and its progress, beginning with the tight organization of Franklin and his associates. We will see the mobilization of the peculiar genius of the United States, the anti-British American Revolution that was to continue through Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Edison.

2. *The Federalist*, No. 17, Hamilton, op. cit.

3. Quoted in Catherine Drinker Bowen, *Miracle at Philadelphia* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1966), p. 72.

4. H. Graham Lowry, *How the Nation Was Won: America’s Untold Story, 1630-1754* (Washington D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1988).

2. Franklin: Plan progress to stamp out usury

Philadelphia was the capital of the Revolution, because Franklin had made that city the headquarters for his own vastly influential organization called “The Junto” (1727-late 1760s). In the same period, Franklin worked in England and continental Europe, spurring the hopes and coordinating the actions of all the world’s republicans.

It has been said, by dishonest Anglophile historians, that Franklin’s opposition to British restrictions on the trade of their American colonial subjects made him an advocate of “free trade,” an enemy of “government interference in the marketplace”!

In a collection of Franklin’s writings published by the MacMillan Company in 1907, the editor, Albert Henry Smyth, says that “Franklin was an unfaltering believer in free trade . . . latter day schools of free traders seem to have borrowed much from him. . . . Franklin’s ideal was a life of thrift, caution, comfort and husbandry.” Franklin himself is then quoted, to the effect that when nations engage in trade war against each other, everyone suffers.

Yes—work, thrift, and industry. But should society *promote* this activity, or passively observe its failure under the

Founding Fathers sought to abolish slavery

Contrary to revisionist, anti-American historiography, the leaders of the American Revolution not only counted on slavery being wiped out, but took concrete moves to abolish it. We list some instances:

1779: Alexander Hamilton proposed the formation of two to three battalions of Negroes for the Revolutionary War, which he notes “will open the door to emancipation.”

1785: Hamilton was a founding member of the Society for Promoting Manumission of Slaves, in New York. John Jay, another author of *The Federalist Papers*, was the president of this society.

1789: Benjamin Franklin’s last political act was an address, written in his capacity as president of the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, which urged support for the emancipated slave, as well as the manumission of slaves, in a memorial to the House of Representatives.