

CHAPTER I

The Democracy That Never Was

The true history of the
American Revolution cannot
be written...A great many people
in those days were not at all
what they seemed to be;
nor what they are generally
believed to have been

JOHN JAY

*First Chief Justice
of the Supreme Court*

DEMOCRACY

When I began this project, I realized I had never once in my entire life thought about the precise meaning of democracy, but had always taken it for granted. So off I went to the dictionary—the first of hundreds of such trips.

Webster's Living Dictionary makes some very interesting observations about the concept of democracy. First, it says democracy is "a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them, or by their elected agents"

Then, it says democracy is "a state in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised directly by them, rather than by their elected representatives"

Here we have two conflicting definitions. The first claims democracy exists, if either the citizens of a society, or their representatives, make political decisions. The second definition claims democracy exists only when all citizens participate in making political decisions.

Either one or the other may be an accurate description of the system called "democracy," but both can't be true simultaneously.

Why not?

Because a social system in which only some citizens hold the authority to make important decisions affecting all citizens won't produce the same kind of society as one in which all citizens participate in choosing the laws, institutions and values affecting their lives.

We American commoners witness this truth every day as we watch how our political "representatives" represent only themselves and those rich enough to bribe them. We daily witness this truth in their priorities and needs—which always seem to be contrary to ours.

Human history is crammed with social systems in which only some citizens have made the important political decisions for all citizens. Without exception, these them-against-us systems have always produced oppressive social environments for commoners.

How can we expect the "representative" democracy of the United States, which is also a them-against-us system, to produce anything else?

Webster's makes one additional, revealing statement about democracy. Surprisingly it says: "the common people of a community as distinguished from any privileged class; the common people with respect to their political power"

This distinction strongly suggests democracy is of interest only to the common, laboring citizens of a society and not to the wealthy, privileged citizens, and poses an embarrassing question: if privileged people prefer a form of governance other than democracy, why have common Americans believed for more than two hundred years that the American political system is democratic?

We know only wealthy, privileged people created the American political system, for we know there weren't any commoners invited to the Constitutional Convention. Few even knew the meeting was being held.

The representative democracy given us by the founders of our Constitution is an entirely different form of political order than a participatory democracy, in which the people make the decisions affecting the laws, policies and values of their community. They can produce only two entirely different societies. Why? Because true human freedom cannot exist without true democracy, they exist hand in hand, or not at all.

The word-symbols "common" and "privileged" have been used traditionally to distinguish between poor and rich people. But what else do the two words mean?

Webster's defines common as "of or pertaining to a community at large, in the sense of public;...shared by two or more individuals, as common property" This is almost as useless as the definition of commoner: "one of the common people; a member of the commonality."

However, the definition of privileged sheds light upon the subject: "one possessing wealth, title, rank, or authority" This definition implies that a person who doesn't possess wealth, title, rank or authority may be considered common.

The ability of only some people to acquire wealth title, rank, or authority while the masses remain common and impoverished has helped to foster the belief that privileged people are superior people. The dictionary supports the belief by also defining common as "second rate" or "inferior"

So like it or not, as most Americans possess neither wealth, title,

rank, nor authority, if we are to believe the dictionary, most of us are inferior people.

I neither like it, nor believe it.

I believe there's much more to the differences between common and privileged people than words in a dictionary or money in the bank. I believe there are other dimensions and truths that will better define the differences between rich and poor people.

I believe there's a direct relationship between the unbridled economic and political power of privileged people and the suffering of the common masses. I also believe the forces unleashed by this relationship have real consequences in the real world among which are poverty, illiteracy, prejudice, misery, war, and death.

Written records show that from its inception until the Great Depression of the 1930s, the outstanding trait of the American republic was the flagrant abuse of common workers by wealthy, influential Americans.

Yet commoners of 2003 naively believe, as they've been programmed to believe, that the Constitution of the United States—and specifically its Bill of Rights—was designed to protect them from the abuse of wealthy, influential people.

AMERICAN PARADOX

In a large sense, this is a history book. But don't let a dislike of history stop the short journey through these pages, I promise the trip will be worthwhile.

Discover for yourself some of the facts that have helped me to understand many relationships of which I had been unaware, and which now enable me to feel the past as strongly as I feel the heat of the sun.

GOOD SYSTEM OR BAD SYSTEM?

No one can deny the United States has provided more people with more material wealth, more individual freedom, more opportunities for happiness, comfort, and security than has any other nation on planet Earth.

But the republic's economic-political system has also produced severe negative results: the deliberate physical and intellectual impoverishment of millions of Americans, insidious government spy agencies, corrupt

public officials, usurious interest rates, unjust justice, the unprovoked and unrestrained use of our military might against smaller, less able countries, and the financial and moral bankruptcy of our society.

If, as we're constantly reminded, being American and living in the United States is so wonderful, why are so many Americans poor and growing poorer while rich Americans grow richer? Why are so many Americans unable to read or write? Why are black and female Americans treated as second-class citizens? Why isn't being an American a wonderful experience for all Americans?

When do Americans publicly acknowledge it's the American System itself that breeds misery, hopelessness and violence; nourishes sexual promiscuity, and encourages children to have children? When do we acknowledge that it's American-style democracy that produces and perpetuates the massive ignorance, illiteracy, and poverty spreading over our land? Where is the public's outrage with the never-ending corruption in the political and economic worlds? Why is there so little public talk about changing the System and what will it take to rouse working Americans to action?

Must common Americans meekly accept the discrimination and oppression of the System for love of country?

Which country?

The United States born on the premise the lives of females are less valuable than males, or the lives of people with nonwhite skin and non-Protestant beliefs of less value than the lives of white Protestants? The United States that overwhelms and represses Central American countries with its economic power, siphoning out their natural wealth, adding to the misery of an already oppressed and impoverished peasantry?

Or is it the United States that supplied Nazi Germany with funds, fuel, and instruments of death during World War II? Or, perhaps it's the country that deliberately devastated small Asian nations and murdered a million helpless, innocent people during the Korean and Vietnam wars?

To which of these nations must we pledge blind allegiance until death do us part? Must we, for love of such a country, reject the dictates of common sense and stop trying to make this a better world for ourselves, and our children?

It's often claimed American government has been established for

the benefit of all American citizens and is government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This is a deliberate lie. For two hundred years it's been obvious the American System benefits some individuals and groups much more than others.

It's claimed we, the whole American people, are the source of political authority. Another lie. Throughout the past two centuries a great many Americans were discouraged from participation in the political system. Today, millions have withdrawn in disgust, because of an inability to influence communal or national decisions, and refuse to participate. Commoners are definitely not the source of the nation's political authority.

It's also claimed we, the whole American people, can remove representatives from public office any time they perform badly. At best, this is a half-truth. Commoners do hold the power to remove ineffective and corrupt politicians from office, should we all vote, which we don't.

The American System, however, doesn't allow us to remove these people when they make laws or policies harmful to the nation. We can stop them only after their term is over and they come up for reelection, only after their dirty work is done.

What's the good of having power, if you can't use it to protect yourself from being robbed and cheated; if you can't use it until after you've been harmed? It's like having authority to lock the barn door after the horse is stolen, but not before. It's not a very useful power.

It's actually no power at all. And as you'll soon discover, that's exactly what the privileged creators of our Constitution intended—for common Americans not to have political power.

Prelude to Revolution

In all probability, you have been taught the United States and the American continents were developed by good, kind, God fearing people fleeing from oppressive social systems. Once-upon-a-time it's what I believed and, of course, it's partially true.

But history reveals these lands were actually developed by groups of European businessmen seeking profit, and kings seeking funds to finance their egotistical wars. European commoners who did flee from political and religious oppression were allowed, and encouraged, to come to the New World by business people needing cheap labor, and by Establish-

ments wishing to rid themselves of troublemakers.

In the 16th and 17th centuries, corrupt government and corrupt business was the way of life in the complex English bureaucracy. The English Crown awarded many of the bureaucratic offices in the New World as repayment of a favor or a debt, knowing possession of such an office was the means by which resourceful people would squeeze out more than a full measure of the debt. Low paid tax collectors and petty officials were expected to make the most of their positions-of-power; they were expected to use intimidation and extortion to increase their personal wealth.

Nor did these men consider themselves dishonest or immoral, for they did no different than most enlightened and privileged Englishmen of the day. The greed and dishonesty of petty English colonial officials and joint stock company managers who lined their pockets with the loot of office have been recorded for posterity.

Corruption is our undeniable English heritage.

In 1607, more than 150 years before the American Revolution, the London Company established a business venture in Jamestown, Virginia. Investors hoped to profit by harvesting and selling the products of the New World to the people of Europe.

To ensure monopoly of trade with its colonies, the English Crown passed an Acts of Trade and Navigation. The laws prohibited Americans from commerce with other nations, obligating them to sell their wares at artificially low prices to English businessmen. Knowing the English resold for much higher prices, American businessmen balked at the arrangement. They took to smuggling, and continued their profitable trade with Europe via the West Indies.

The English navy rarely enforced the Navigational Acts.

These were the days when buccaneers and pirates sailed the seas seeking spoils from helpless merchantmen. Understanding the pirates' need for safe and friendly harbors to fit and provision ships and dispose of loot, the governors of some English colonies offered them safe harbor in exchange for a fee, or a portion of the spoils.

But it was possession of land that produced the greatest wealth in the New World. The immense, uninhabited stretch of North America was the magnet drawing land starved Europeans across the expansive ocean.

By the middle of the 18th century there was little unclaimed land east of the Appalachians. The Crown had repaid debts with virgin land. Colonial governors had lavishly bestowed public lands upon family and friends. Speculators, who had bribed officials or stolen from Indians, claimed the remaining lands.

The land speculators of England and America turned their eyes to the vast untapped lands of the West. It was irrelevant that Indians already populated these lands, such an inconvenience hadn't stopped them from stealing the continent's eastern lands from the red skinned people by brute-force and trickery. Nor were speculators stopped by the complications created by overlapping claims of official colony land grants.

In the 18th century, as in the 21st century, very little was allowed to stand in the way of immediate profit.

In 1748, some of the leading families of Virginia formed the Ohio Company, a land company. The next year other Virginia families formed the Loyal Company. Both companies claimed land in the Ohio Valley, which France had previously claimed.

The French, alarmed at the intrusion into their territory, immediately sent additional troops into Ohio. The war that followed was inevitable, lasting for almost six years. According to some historians it lasted this long only because many English-American businessmen, putting profit before patriotism, smuggled supplies and food past English blockades to sell to the French.

In 1753, the governor of Connecticut and a group of privileged speculators formed the Susquehanna Company. The company claimed land that lay within Pennsylvania, and tricked the Indians to sign away title. It then sold small tracts to settlers who had to deal not only with irate Pennsylvanians, but also with angry Indians.

In 1760, when the English captured Montreal, the French empire in North America ended.

American land speculators had little opportunity to rejoice. The Indians, many of whom had sided with the French, were angry at the intrusion of English settlers onto their hunting grounds. They went on the warpath burning and destroying English settlements.

The English king was almost as angry as the Indians. As his rents

disappeared into the pockets of colonial governors and bureaucrats, his share of American wealth dwindled to a trickle. But when these people confiscated his taxes as their own, it was a transgression the king couldn't overlook. The Crown issued the Proclamation of 1763 denying sale or settlement of lands west of the Alleghenies, and ordered all settlers out of the territory. It was a deadly blow to the schemes of American and European land speculators.

George Washington was a land speculator, a shareholder in the Mississippi Company, a land company trying to obtain a royal grant for millions of acres in the Ohio region. Because Washington, along with most other speculators, believed the king's proclamation temporary, he secretly sent a surveyor to the Ohio region to lay claim to the best lands, cautioning the surveyor to "...keep this whole matter a secret...if the scheme I am now proposing to you were known, it might give the alarm to others..."

But Washington made a serious mistake. Not only did he claim massive plots of land, he disregarded the Virginia law requiring grants to be not more than three times as long as wide, and his surveyor had neglected to take the required oath to the Crown. This invalidated Washington's claim to the land.

It's also suspected by some historians that after the revolution, Washington had illegally applied for—and been awarded—Crown "bounty" land to which he had not been entitled. An action that angered many of his former officers who believed the general had taken the best bottom lands at their expense.

The English Prime Minister ordered the navy to enforce the Acts of Trade and Navigation. Enforcement, however, proved futile for few American merchants were willing to give up their profitable smuggling trade. Customs raised little revenue, forcing the Crown to try other means: stamp taxes, sugar taxes and a host of other taxes—all of which Americans resented; all of which they refused to pay.

By 1775, the wealth of the colonies was still held by very few families. In Boston, it was estimated the top four percent of the privileged owned at least fifty percent of the city's wealth. In other cities the concentration of wealth was estimated to be even greater.

In 1775, Washington and other Virginians were notified their land

claims were null and void. The next day, American militiamen in Lexington, Massachusetts fired upon British Troops: the American Revolution had officially begun.

Contrary to common belief today, the revolution wasn't an uprising of a people against a cruel king or tyrant. Nor was taxation without representation, for at the time our illustrious leaders allowed brute-force to rear its ugly head, the English Parliament was seriously considering American representation in Parliament. American leaders knew this.

The American Revolution was motivated by greed.

It was a revolt of merchants, politicians, and landholders who didn't want to share the costs of protecting the colonies from the Spanish, the French, and the American Indians. It was a revolt of businessmen against taxation that reduced profit, and land speculators against legislation removing opportunities for profit.

It was a revolt most American colonists—privileged and common—believed unnecessary, and many refused to fight.

The American Establishment's propaganda machine, however, cranked out pamphlets and newspaper articles of half-truths and lies, successfully stirring emotions and long-held resentments; a technique that's been used ever since to control and manipulate the thoughts and behavior of American commoners.

Shrewd men were grateful for the war. They knew war offers unlimited opportunities for quick wealth. Speculators waited at the docks to buy supplies needed by American troops, then withheld them from government purchasing agents until the prices were as high as could be forced.

During the war, many American merchants continued to do business with the English. While American soldiers froze to death at Valley Forge and Morristown, American profiteers sold food, clothing, and shoes at prices only the British could afford.

Such is the womb of greed and corruption within which the United States of America was born.

Aftermath

At war's end, the colonies joined together under the Articles of Confederation, the nation's first constitution.

The Confederate Congress, however, was no more than a loose af-

filiation of colonies, similar to today's United Nations. It had little jurisdiction over colonial governments or territories, consequently it could accomplish little of what needed to be done.

Colonists quickly adopted the dishonest ways of the English bureaucracy, which had so annoyed them earlier. American businessmen and politicians eagerly indulged in bribery, graft, extortion, speculation, and profiteering. Many new fortunes were made.

In 1768, western lands were once again opened to settlement. The Virginia legislature validated original land surveys giving George Washington and other privileged speculators millions of acres of western lands.

The war had left both poor and rich Americans with money problems. The problem of the poor was the problem faced by the poor everywhere: too little money. Jails were filled with commoners unable to repay wealthy moneylenders.

The money problems of the rich were varied.

Many privileged citizens found their wealth tied up in worthless government IOUs, for Congress couldn't pay its war debts: the Treasury was empty.

Many had speculated in paper money bought for less than face value from poor, common, war veterans in desperate need of immediate cash. The paper was worthless, because a government authority able to pay the public debt didn't exist.

Many had speculated in land warrants, also bought at bargain prices from needy war veterans. The warrants were worthless, because few people would buy and settle western lands without protection from the Indians. But a government authority commanding troops on behalf of all states possessing western lands didn't exist.

In addition, European goods flooded the American marketplace hurting American manufacturers, who wanted high tariffs to make imports more expensive. But a government authority with the power to impose tariffs on behalf of all thirteen colonies didn't exist.

Increasing the problems of America's rich a few colonial legislatures sympathetic to the plight of commoners enacted laws to help them. Some laws reduced the harsh treatment of debtors, others allowed debtors to delay payment to creditors. A few colonial legislatures committed the sin

of sins by issuing paper money. Few private creditors, however, accepted the paper as repayment for loans, they wanted only hard gold or silver.

Some Americans believed a formal alliance between the colonies was essential to economic stability. They believed only a strong central government could prevent the Union's destruction. Others, fearing the abuse of an authoritative central government, advocated the continuance of colonial sovereignty. Why, they argued, create a situation similar to the one from which they had recently revolted?

These strong opposing opinions are the reasons the Articles of Confederation possessed only paper powers. Under the Articles, Congress couldn't pass laws and couldn't raise revenues without the unanimous approval of all thirteen colonial legislatures; something which rarely happened. It's why the Congress of the United States under the Articles was powerless to do what needed to be done.

The situation in 1787 was explosive. The American privileged feared commoners would react violently, and they had much to fear. For American commoners had often revolted against oppressive conditions in colonial America.

In 1676 there had been Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia. Sporadically throughout the 1700s, tenant farmers had revolted against their abusive treatment. In 1776 there had been the Regulator Movement in South Carolina, and in 1786, only months prior to the Constitutional Convention, there had been Shays' Rebellion in the colony of Massachusetts.

On December 5, 1786, nearly one thousand angry men, determined to stop the courts from passing judgment against debtors and foreclosing upon farm mortgages, had taken possession of the courthouse in a small western Massachusetts town. The men, led by farmer Daniel Shays, were mostly farmers, many having served gallantly in the war. The scarcity of gold and silver made it difficult for them to meet financial obligations and care for families. Physical protest was their way to release frustrations and claim the attention of politicians in the capital ignoring their pleas for relief.

But the response wasn't what Shays and his men expected. The holders of political power in Massachusetts were also the holders of financial power. The makers of law were also the mortgage holders and moneylenders. These privileged citizens demanded all legal contracts be ful-

filled, no matter how severe the hardships for commoners.

Their privately financed army quickly defeated the farmers.

The physical threat to their income, their property, and their authority panicked men of wealth. It was Shays' Rebellion that catalyzed many advocates of colonial sovereignty to reconsider the merits of a stronger central government. It was Shays' Rebellion that convinced many privileged men—who had refused to attend a similar meeting at Annapolis in 1785—to send delegates to the meeting at Philadelphia.

The uprising in western Massachusetts was the straw that broke the camel's back, convincing many rich Americans it was time to take control of the common masses and stop the talk of democracy. Something had to be done. But what?

Many Americans naively believe the only reason for the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia was to replace the weak confederacy with a strong central government. They believe the secrecy of the meetings was merely to prevent those opposed to central government from discovering what was going on until it was too late. In part this is true; clearing the obstacles to national commerce was a prime reason for the meeting.

The extreme sensitivity of the issue of democracy, however, is also a reason the meetings were held behind closed doors; a reason delegates were forbidden to reveal any of the controversial proceedings until after final adjournment; a reason the official records of the convention were kept from the public for forty-nine years afterward; a reason the republic's first constitution was discarded, and the sole reason some of the new constitution's language and meaning are vague, although created and written by acknowledged masters of the English language.

There's little doubt a major objective of that 1787 meeting was to create a vehicle that would give the country's privileged class some measure of control over the masses, pacify commoner discontent, and squelch their demands for democracy without actually giving them democratic government.

There's equally as little doubt the Constitution of the United States is that vehicle.

Constitutional Convention

In May of 1787, a group of determined men met at the State House

in the city of Philadelphia. These men, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention, were exceptional men. They were lawyers, judges, politicians, planters, and men of business. All had helped to conduct the revolution against England. Some had served in the Continental Congress. Others were high, state officials.

The delegates, together with the men whom they represented, owned most of the land and controlled the principal means of production and trade. They were the moneylenders and the makers of law in the thirteen colonies. They were the American privileged: the American Establishment.

There were no commoners at the meeting; few even knew it was being held.

The delegates had assembled in an attempt to solve the divisive problems of the young republic. They had many questions with few answers. How to establish a government favorable to men of property, whose wealth was dependent upon entirely different, and sometimes conflicting, sources? How to eliminate fears of the men who ruled small colonies, and assure them their needs wouldn't be ignored by rulers of large colonies? How to stabilize the young nation's economy?

Some of these men believed a strong central government essential to the safety of the colonies. They believed thirteen separate and sovereign kingdoms would produce economic friction that could eventually end only in military conflict. They believed if each colony remained sovereign, each would be free to form commercial alliances with foreign nations on its own behalf. This they knew would be catastrophic, for if there was one bit of wisdom common to everyone at the meeting, it was that commercial conflict was the surest path to war.

Then there was the issue of western lands. Not all colonies could boast a claim to legal title, and the legality of some was questionable. Furthermore, who was to decide how these vast lands were to be used; for farming, growing cotton, mining, timbering, or manufacturing? If the decisions were left to thirteen sovereign legislatures with different commercial interests, wasn't conflict guaranteed?

All of these were primarily the problems of "capital investment," problems influencing the ways a privileged person invested surplus money. Common workers, struggling to survive from day to day, had little interest

in issues of investment, for few of them had surplus money to invest.

The privileged of the United States had one other major problem to resolve that did involve the common people: how to address the demands of commoners for economic and political equality. General Knox articulated it well in a letter to George Washington:

...The people who are the insurgents have never paid any, or but little taxes - But they see the weakness of government; They feel at once their own poverty, compared with the opulent, and their own force, and they are determined to make use of the latter, in order to remedy the former. Their creed is 'that the property of the United States has been protected from the confiscations of Britain by the joint exertions of all, and therefore ought to be the common property of all...

Commoners had endured great hardships in the fight to free the colonies from England and expected to enjoy the fruits of their effort. They expected to share the good things of North America. They expected privileged Americans to establish a popular government. They expected a voice in the new scheme of things.

Their expectations, however, were unreasonable, for the very basis of life in the New World of North America, like the Old World of Europe was based upon the sanctity of property. Why should privileged Americans voluntarily share their property with the common masses?

A true democracy responds to the majority of a society, not the minority. But in the United States of 1787, as in all other countries of planet Earth, the privileged class was the minority. Why should they establish the republic as a political democracy when the very concept of democracy was a threat to their wealth, their income, and their existence?

Establishing a popular democracy would have been economic suicide for privileged Americans of 1787.

They knew any proposed central government couldn't succeed without the approval and participation of commoners. But being practical men, they had little intention of sharing their political power with the poor and the uneducated. They understood their continued control of the New World's resources depended upon little, or no, political participation by

commoners. Their knowledge of history and personal experiences confirmed that the masses were violent creatures of “self-interest.”

The plain truth is the American privileged feared democracy, were contemptuous of American commoners, and believed a stable society could exist only when the common masses were under control. We know this to be true by their very own words.

...The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy...

ELBRIDGE GERRY

Delegate of Pennsylvania

...Children do not vote. Why? Because they want prudence, because they have no will of their own. The ignorant and the dependent can be as little trusted with the public interest...

GOUVERNOR MORRIS

Delegate of Pennsylvania

...The people cannot know and judge the character of candidates. The worst possible choice will be made...

JOHN MERCER

Delegate of Maryland

...The people immediately should have as little to do as may be about the government. They want information and are constantly liable to be misled...

ROGER SHERMAN

Delegate of Maryland

...The people ever have been and ever will be unfit to retain the exercise of power in their own hands; they must of necessity delegate it somewhere...But further, as prejudices always prevail, more or less, in all

popular governments, it is necessary that a check be placed somewhere in the hands of a power not immediately dependent upon the breath of the people, in order to stem the torrent, and prevent the mischief which blind passions and rancorous prejudices might otherwise occasion...

WILLIAM LIVINGSTON

Delegate of New Jersey

...Wherever the real power in a government lies, there is the danger of oppression. In our Governments the real power lies in the majority of the Community [the common people], and the invasion of private rights is chiefly to be apprehended, not from the acts of Government contrary to the acts of its constituents, but from the acts in which the Government is the mere instrument of the major number of the constituents...

JAMES MADISON

Delegate of Virginia

...All communities divide themselves into the few and the many. The first are the rich and well born, the other the mass of the people. The voice of the people has been said to be the voice of God; and however generally this maxim has been quoted and believed, it is not true in fact. The people are turbulent and changing; they seldom judge or determine right. Give therefore to the first class a distinct, permanent share in the government. They will check the unsteadiness of the second, and as they cannot receive any advantage by change, they therefore will ever maintain good government. Can a democratic assembly who annually revolve in the mass of people, be supposed steadily to pursue the public good? Nothing but a permanent body

can check the imprudence of democracy...

ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Delegate of New York

If you had been one of these delegates and thoroughly believed in the inferiority, the childishness, and the danger of commoners wielding political power; if you had recognized democracy's threat to your wealth and your way of life, would you deliberately have helped to create a democracy; a system that would remove your political power and give it to the common people?

Not likely!

But because change and concession were expected, and because the privileged of America didn't have military might of their own with which to enforce their position, the privileged delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 stooped to deception.

They discarded the Articles of Confederation, because mere revision couldn't make our first constitution appear to foster democracy. Its language and style were wrong.

Using their superior education, their greater knowledge of human nature, and their superb command of the English language the delegates created a new constitution. This document offered the illusion of democratic government; its words implied democracy, but it delivered only anti-democracy.

This doesn't mean the founders of our constitution were evil men, for they were certainly no more evil than any who pursue their own selfish interests above the interests of the whole community, and certainly not as evil as the men of today's elite families who deliberately destroy the republic for personal gain.

When they spoke of "equality for all," they were speaking of the equality of privileged American Englishmen with their privileged English brothers across the ocean. They obviously didn't believe the "ignorant masses" of small farmers and indentured servants were their equals.

And when they spoke of "liberty" and "freedom" for all, they meant it. But the freedom and liberty about which they spoke was the freedom of privileged men to seek monetary gain, and the liberty to utilize their wealth

to acquire more wealth.

What it means is the men of the Constitutional Convention inherited—and were as burdened with—the attitudes and prejudices of privilege as any generations of privileged people.

The one attitude—the one prejudice—meaningful to American commoners of all following generations, but especially relevant to young Americans entering the 21st century, is that the lives of commoners aren't as important as the lives of privileged people.

Stacked Deck

At the start, James Madison clearly defined one of the objectives of the convention:

...To preserve the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction and at the same time preserve the spirit and form of popular government is then the great objective of which our inquiries are directed...

Here in Madison's own words is admission of the great deception practiced during those four summer months.

Because the American privileged of 1787 had little concern for the welfare of commoners, the "public good" to which he referred could mean only the public good of the privileged, not commoners. The term "private rights" could apply only to the private rights of the privileged, for in 1787 few commoners enjoyed private rights.

And what "faction" were the public good and private rights to be protected against? Why, against a faction of economically abused and angry commoners such as Shays and his men, of course.

But "preserving the spirit and form of popular government" is the phrase that gives away the entire deception.

Popular government is government of all the people: it's participatory democracy. Madison certainly didn't mean to preserve the spirit and form of an existing popular government, for none existed in 1787. Not anywhere on planet Earth. And since something that doesn't exist can't be preserved, Madison must have meant something else.

Being extraordinarily competent with words, what Madison said is exactly what he meant. It was a purpose of the secret meeting to create a

style of government containing the spirit and form of popular government, but not its essence.

Never did Madison or any of the delegates actually consider creating a working, democratic government. What they set out to design was a government appearing to be democratic, but wasn't. What they set out to design was a political structure appearing to give power to the common people, but didn't.

Two hundred years ago only the privileged had rights. Only men of property served in American government, and most colonies restricted the "voting privilege" to privileged people only: white males owning real property or personal wealth. Of necessity, political suffrage included poor farmers owning small bits of land, but no other commoners could vote. The poor, the blacks, and the females of the United States were politically disenfranchised.

Ratification of the Constitution of the United States changed nothing. The discrimination and repression written into colonial constitutions and practiced throughout the thirteen states remained.

This is the genius of our federal constitution. It makes no mention of discrimination or prejudice, and so appears to lack them. Its words imply that all people are equal under its jurisdiction, but it's intent was to ensure certain people remained unequal.

Taken in context of reality, a reality in which individual constitutions advocated discrimination and privileged citizens of each practiced discrimination, the Constitution of the United States is a lie, revealed by the unwillingness of its creators to address the prejudices and discriminations of real life.

But after all, it was their prejudices and discriminations.

Most American commoners today believe the Constitution is the republic's prime advocate of human rights. It's not so. The Constitution outlines how the men of central government are to be selected, the nature of their duties, and the division of powers between the three segments of the federal government and between the federal and state governments.

It's the Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments to the Constitution, which addresses itself to the protection of American commoners from abuse by the privileged men of government.

But as originally written and passed into law, our constitution didn't possess a bill of rights. Damning evidence of the delegates' true intentions.

When Thomas Jefferson, who was in Paris at the time, learned from James Madison that the delegates had refused to add a bill of rights to their constitution, he quickly replied:

...A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse or rest on inference...

Most of us are taught our two tiered Congress is a result of compromise: the Senate satisfies the needs of the smaller states for equal representation, and the House of Representatives satisfies the demands of the larger for representation by population.

In addition, some of us are taught our two-tier Congress is fashioned after the English Parliament, because the delegates admired and were comfortable with it.

It's all pure camouflage.

Creating two legislative bodies, gave political advantage to privileged senators and their peers, for although a few states allowed commoners to participate in selecting senators, most required senators be chosen by the men of state legislatures: men of privilege.

Also according to the constitution, as it was ratified, the people weren't allowed to advise senators how to vote on issues, privileged men of state legislatures retained that privilege. This topic of constituent advice was thoroughly discussed by the creators of the document, then deliberately, and overwhelmingly, rejected.

Elections for the Senate were staggered, one third of the seats every two years. Children of commoners are taught in public school that this strategy assures continuous leadership. It's the noble reason.

The true reason is the delegates knew commoners might turn out in numbers to vote on highly emotional issues and win Senate seats in states they controlled. They also knew passionate causes have short lives, that to win majority control of the Senate commoners must sustain an effort of four, and possibly six years: a prolonged effort they believed the common masses unable to sustain. Staggered elections make it more difficult for

commoners to win control of the Senate.

The new constitution gave the House of Representatives power to create tax legislation. But to temper taxation of their wealth privileged men of the Senate held amendment powers over House bills.

To ensure control of central government, the delegates created the Electoral College. Delegates to the college had the “privilege” of electing the President and the Vice President of the United States. In most states, the privileged men of state legislatures, not the common citizenry, chose college delegates.

The two-part Congress was the device created by the privileged to keep control of government away from commoners.

When Alexander Hamilton observed that “...Nothing but a permanent body [of privileged men] can check the imprudence of democracy...” he meant a body such as the United States Senate. And he was right. To this day, wealthy American Senators are still unresponsive to the needs of common working Americans.

The Senate was the response to delegate Livingston’s wish “...that a check be placed somewhere in the hands of a power not immediately dependent upon the breath of the people...”

Perhaps, Alexander Hamilton’s statement in *The Federalist Papers* best explains the true function of the Senate:

...If the majority, (common people) in order that something may be done, must conform to the views of the minority, (privileged people) the smaller number will overrule the greater...

And to guarantee that the masses of commoners never unite to form the greater-force, here is James Madison’s advice to his fellow privileged conspirators at the Constitutional Convention more than two hundred years ago:

“The lesson we are to draw from the whole is that where a majority [the common people] are united by a common sentiment, and have an opportunity, the rights of the minor party [the privileged] become insecure. In a Republican government the Majority if united have always the opportunity. The only remedy

is to enlarge the sphere, thereby divide the community into so great a number of interests and parties, that in the first place a majority will not be likely at the same moment to have a common interest separate from that of the whole or of the minority; and in the second place, that in the case they should have such an interest, they may not be able to unite in the pursuit of it”

Divide the masses into so many groups with different political agendas, he suggested, and they will never be able to muster the greater political force. Isn’t that precisely the way it is today?

By default, commoners were also excluded from the judicial branch of government because judges were to be appointed not elected, and only men with legal experience were chosen to serve on the bench. In 1787, most lawyers were of privileged families.

In 1787, the Articles of Confederation was the country’s constitution and the law of the land. It required state legislatures to amend or change it. But the delegates demanded ratification of the proposed constitution be made by special state conventions and, despite such illegality, the new constitution was ratified by special conventions.

It may have been illegal, but it was brilliant strategy. Bypassing official state legislatures eliminated the awkwardness—and uncertain results—of state politicians having to decide whether or not to relinquish some of their powers to a central authority. It also bypassed state legislatures sympathetic to the plight of commoners, and eliminated the possibility of a legislator amending or changing his original vote at a future meeting of a legislature; impossible with a special convention, for once adjourned it ceases to exist.

By requiring ratification of nine rather than all thirteen states, the delegates made it possible to secure ratification without approval of state legislatures controlled or influenced by common Americans.

It’s amazing how easily Americans today overlook the truth that “Americans” of those times were really Englishmen, or the truth that most of them feared, or didn’t approve of, the new Constitution. Of an estimated three million Americans in 1787 perhaps no more than 100,000, a small fraction, ratified the document.

Certainly it's not a mandate of the people.

Other than in the few states they controlled, commoners weren't invited to attend ratifying conventions. Most, however, didn't believe the proposed constitution would create a government that would protect them from privileged abuse, but that it would merely further ambitions of the wealthy to protect their property.

Others, fearing a powerful central government to be incompatible with freedom, denounced the new constitution as a betrayal of the revolution. Which it was, for common working Americans.

In essence, by discarding the existing constitution and deceitfully creating one that blocked commoners from sharing the power of government, wealthy citizens of the thirteen colonies committed their own mini-revolution. Its purpose: to keep the riches of the North American continent for themselves.

A few delegates to Pennsylvania's ratification convention tried to filibuster the meeting by staying away, but were dragged out of their homes and into the meeting. One of them wrote:

...During the discussion we met with many insults, and some personal abuse; we were not even treated with decency, during the sitting of the convention ...Tis true the majority permitted us to debate on each article, but restrained us from proposing amendments...They also determined not to permit us to enter on the minutes our reasons of dissent against any of the articles, nor even on the final question our reasons of dissent against the whole.

Not a very democratic beginning for a group of men initiating a democratic form of government, was it?

Winning Hand

The new Constitution was ratified and the first Constitutional Congress, which included many ex-delegates, met in March of 1789.

From the start, powers of the new federal government were used to enrich speculators and promoters. The greed of the men who had pushed for the new constitution, and then served in the First Constitutional Congress, was reflected in laws benefiting the rich, but not the poor. Common-

ers, the patriots who had suffered great hardships and made heroic sacrifices during the revolution, received little.

The first tariff bill was passed in April. Those engaged in manufacture profited handsomely.

The establishment of a federal army encouraged the settlement of western land. Those owning land warrants and stock in land companies profited handsomely. Those holding public securities also profited handsomely, for Hamilton's "Funding Plan" was a boon to rich speculators.

Alexander Hamilton was no friend to common Americans. He was a typical aristocrat, scorning the poor and the untutored, righteously advocating monarchy as the best and most effective form of government, believing government should serve only the citizens who owned the country.

At the convention he had repeatedly reminded the delegates that the privileged of America wouldn't support the new federal government, if it didn't support their profit-making interests.

The Articles of Confederation had required war debts be apportioned to the states according to property values. Hamilton's Funding Plan removed the obligation from the states, or to be more exact, from the men of wealth who owned or controlled the natural resources of each state.

The money to repay congressional war debts was raised not by taxing personal wealth, not by taxing real property, and not by taxing income. In no way whatever was the burden of the colossal debt allowed to reduce the wealth or income of the rich. The money was raised by taxing the "consumer." And as there were so many more common than privileged consumers, the war debt was paid primarily by those least able to afford it: the common people.

The second stage of Hamilton's plan, called the "Assumption," allowed commoners to also assume the war debts of the individual states.

The new constitution further favored the privileged by making it illegal for state legislatures to issue paper money, or to interfere in private contractual agreements. And it created a permanent armed militia with which privileged Americans could suppress "insurrection," the insurrection of American commoners, of course.

What about the delegates themselves? How did they benefit as individuals? History books make little mention of their personal motives for

wanting a strong central government and, because many of the official public records have disappeared, an accurate accounting is impossible. But some scholars of American history have estimated as many as 40 of the 55 delegates had much to gain by ratification of the Constitution; or much to lose, if ratification failed.

Robert Morris, delegate of Pennsylvania, signer of the Declaration of Independence, renowned for his efforts to finance the revolution, was the most notorious profiteer in the republic. Morris, who controlled Philadelphia's Bank of North America, speculated in securities, and reportedly owned millions of acres in western land.

George Washington, delegate of Virginia, acknowledged moneylender, friend and confidant of Robert Morris had large holdings in U.S. securities, and reportedly owned more than 50 thousand acres of western land.

Even the honorable Benjamin Franklin, delegate of Pennsylvania held a small part of the public debt and owned western land.

We can see only the tip of the iceberg, but it infers these weren't impartial delegates. Each had much to gain if ratification passed, and much to lose if it failed.

WHAT THIS MEAN

It means the Constitution of the United States—the rock upon which we commoners believe sits our American freedoms—isn't the holy document most of us believe it is, for the delegates to the Constitutional Convention masterminded the greatest deception ever perpetrated in human history. Using their command of language, they created a document of implications and illusions that seemed to change the existing social order, but didn't.

With an arrogance born of superior knowledge, and a superior command of words, they fooled the American colonists into believing their new Constitution offered true equality and freedom. By getting commoners to believe they participated in democratic government, privileged Americans successfully squelched demands for democracy while entrenching themselves more firmly into positions of political and economic power.

It means the federal republic has never been a union of individuals

seeking liberty and security, but of state Establishments seeking to suppress the basic needs of their common citizens.

It means unending poverty, mass ignorance, and artificially contrived wars—all of which benefit wealthy Americans—are possible because the American political system deliberately excludes the common masses from its decision-making processes.

It means the paradox of the “democratic” United States of America is that it is the democracy that never was.

That's what Chapter I means.

