

# Do you consider yourself a Conservative?

Were the advocates for The 1787 U.S. CONstitution what we consider today, "Conservatives"

What would you think of someone today who advocated more power to the central government?

Would you consider such person a BIG government Liberal?

Alexander Hamilton wrote to James Duane, 13 Sept. 1780 concerning the Articles of Confederation that.....

*"The fundamental defect is a want [lack] of power in Congress."*

It seems Alexander Hamilton was NOT pleased with the small government system under The Articles of Confederation.

James Madison wrote to George Washington, 16 April 1787

*"I have sought for middle ground, which may at once support a due supremacy of the national authority, and not exclude the local authorities wherever they can be subordinately useful."*

It seems James Madison wanted a central body of government to be a supreme authority and the States to be subordinate and only useful when necessary.

Alexander Hamilton of New York and James Madison of Virginia criticized the limits placed on the central government.

These men who Conservatives adore, advocated a new Constitution that established BIG powerful centralized government.

Today Conservatives would call them Liberal, Leftists, yet they are adored by those claiming to be "Conservatives".

**A CON is something accomplished through TRICKERY.**

Was the 1787 Constitution the result of trickery?

Is it a CON-stitution?

*Those men, such as George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and others were no more "Federalists" than Federal Express is federalist; these men were Nationalists, and to perpetuate their CON, it was necessary to gain the support of the masses, therefore they commandeered the title "Federalists" for themselves, labeling the advocates of retaining the Articles of Confederation as "Anti-Federalists".*

*We have all been indoctrinated throughout our lives that the advocates of the 1787 CONstitution were "Federalists", and that those who opposed the ratification of the 1787 CONstitution were "Anti-Federalists".*

*Those who opposed the ratification of the 1787 CONstitution referred to the advocates of the 1787*

*CONstitution as Rats/Ratifiers.*

Now what proof do I have of this CON?

What proof do I offer that the Anti-Federalists were actually Federalists, while those who we have been indoctrinated to believe were “Federalists”, were actually NATIONALISTS?

For this proof we must turn to James Madison's own words in the 1787 CONstitutional debates #39, wherein he states.....

***“But it was not sufficient,” say the adversaries of the proposed Constitution, “for the convention to adhere to the republican form. They ought, with equal care, to have preserved the FEDERAL form, which regards the Union as a CONFEDERACY of sovereign states; instead of which, they have framed a NATIONAL government, which regards the Union as a CONSOLIDATION of the States.”***

Ask yourself....Who were the adversaries who opposed the ratification of the 1787 CONstitution?  
ANSWER....Those we have been indoctrinated to believe were “ANTI-FEDERALISTS”.

Why would “ANTI-FEDERALISTS” be arguing that....

***“They ought, with equal care, to have preserved the FEDERAL form, which regards the Union as a CONFEDERACY of sovereign states; instead of which, they have framed a NATIONAL government, which regards the Union as a CONSOLIDATION of the States.”***

So here we can clearly see that there has been a CON committed and that the 1787 Constitution is a CON-stitution.

Now for those who refer to the central government as a “FEDERAL Government” today, we will prove without a doubt, that NO such “FEDERAL GOVERNMENT” exists today.

If one does not understand this very foundation of which we will expose for you, then one cannot possibly understand his own government system, and should refrain from participation in any CONstitutional discussion until such time as he/she has gained clarity and understanding.

We have been indoctrinated to believe that a federal system, or federal government is the overbearing oppressor which tramples “States Rights”, yet the truth is that the federal system is the States participation in the government that they established between themselves, the federal system was there to PROTECT THEIR AUTHORITY.

The Articles of Confederation operated under a wholly federal system. The federal system was the State governments appointment of representatives to the congress.

The 1787 CONstitution added a National system to function alongside the already existing federal system under the Articles.

The very foundation of the 1787 U.S. CONstitution consisted of two opposing systems, one being a federal system, the other being a national system. These two opposing systems were cobbled together to function alongside and to interact with one another.

The National system was to represent the whole of the people of all of the States, as in a CONSOLIDATION into a single State, while the Federal system was to continue to represent the State governments, as in a Confederacy of States, or a union of States.

James Madison explains these two systems, and how they were to function in the 1787 CONstitutional

debates #s 39 and 62.....

In #39 Madison states ....

***“The proposed Constitution, therefore, is, in strictness, neither a national nor a federal Constitution, but a composition of both.”***

So we see that the 1787 U.S. CONstitution was never a wholly “federal” constitution, hence the government under the 1787 U.S. CONstitution was never a wholly “Federal Government”.

Mr. Madison also states in #39 that.....

***“The House of Representatives will derive its powers from the people of America; and the people will be represented in the same proportion, and on the same principle, as they are in the legislature of a particular State. So far the government is NATIONAL, not FEDERAL.”***

So we see here that the House of Representatives is the National portion of the foundation, and that the House is divided into simple districts and its members ELECTED by the people without regard to State government affiliation, hence this body consolidates the people as in a single American State rather than the union of States.

Madison continues in #39....

***“The Senate, on the other hand, will derive its powers from the States, as political and coequal societies; and these will be represented on the principle of equality in the Senate, as they now are in the existing Congress. So far the government is FEDERAL, not NATIONAL.”***

Lets stop here for a moment to understand just what is a State.

A State is NOT simply a geographically defined area consisting of people. A State is defined in Johnson's Dictionary of The English Language (1755) edition as simply....

“A mode of government”.

Each geographically defined area consists of its own mode of government via constitution, hence is a State.

So the Senate WAS the federal portion of the 1787 U.S. CONstitution as existed under The Articles of Confederation because these members of Congress were APPOINTED by each States legislature as stated in Article I section III of the 1787 U.S. CONstitution.

Madison also states of the Senate in #62 of the 1787 CONstitutional debates that.....

***“It is recommended by the double advantage of favoring a select appointment, and of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the federal government as must secure the authority of the former”***

So the Senate consisted of State government select appointed representatives, there to SECURE THEIR AUTHORITY.

Madison Continues in #62....

***“Another advantage accruing from this ingredient in the constitution of the Senate is, the additional impediment it must prove against improper acts of legislation. No law or resolution can now be passed without the concurrence, first, of a majority of the people,***

***and then, of a majority of the States.”***

So, the federal portion WAS the Senate as members appointed by each States legislature to represent their States government, and to secure their AUTHORITY.

In this federal portion, the States remained united in a union via their appointed representatives INTERACTING with one another, hence the State governments were involved and united.

As a result of Lincolns rebellion the 1787 CONstitution was amended utilizing the puppet institutions that were put in place during the period of Martial law and occupation.

This 17th amendment removed the select appointment of Senators/State government representatives from the State governments and made them elected officials elected by the people, so that the State governments no longer had a department within the central body to protect their authority, or to give them any participation within the central body of government, hence NOT ONLY ENDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, BUT ENDING THE UNION OF STATES, LEAVING INPLACE A WHOLLY NATIONAL GOVERNMENT SYSTEM, HENCE A WHOLLY NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, NOT A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

These Senators/State government representatives are now elected by the people, not appointed by the State governments, hence they represent the political party faction of their affiliation rather than their State government; their State government has no interaction or say in how those Senators vote on a given issue, nor can they recall and replace them if they are not resenting the best interest of their State government.

The former United States are now a consolidated State with puppet provinces in place of the former Sovereign States, now controlled by two political party factions which control the political process and control ballot access, as well as who participates in political debates.

Those who call themselves Conservatives who support the current system, are BIG government liberals only believing that they are Conservatives, they wrap themselves in the U.S. Flag, believing that they are protecting the framers CONstitution, when in fact they have abandoned the founding principles, the union of States/United States, in favor of a Consolidated State, choosing FICTION over FACT.

### ***The Machiavellian Illusion***

***“...[A]llow them [the conquered] to live under their own laws, taking tribute of them, and creating within the country a government composed of a few who will keep it friendly to you.... A city used to liberty can be more easily held by means of its citizens than in any other way....***

***“...[T]hey must at least retain the semblance of the old forms; so that it may seem to the people that there has been no change in the institutions, even though in fact they are entirely different from the old ones. For the great majority of mankind are satisfied with appearances, as though they were realities, and are often even more influenced by the things that seem than by those that are.... [The conqueror should] not wish that the people... should have occasion to regret the loss of any of their old customs....”***

***Niccola Machiavelli***