

It's time that we Americans start to question the need for a Federal Government. I argue that we all would be better off just simply having singular State Governments.

Think about it. What benefit does the United States Federal Government provide that the State governments cannot?

And, is that benefit worth the extra multiple layers of taxation?

I strongly believe that it is not worth it at all. The United States today is an out of control corrupt empire, and almost everything it does benefits a mere handful of people, while Joe and Suzy Average derives very little benefit. I would like to expound on this, through the lens of history.

The following article; "The Antifederalists Were Eerily Prophetic" is a most excellent article from *the Mises Institute*. Written 17NOV19. All credit to the author; [Gary M. Galles](#).

The Antifederalists Were Eerily Prophetic

What the Antifederalists predicted would be the results of the 1776 Constitution turned out to be true...

... in almost every respect.

BY GARY M. GALLES

Most school kids are left with the impression that the US Constitution was the inevitable follow-up to the Declaration of Independence and the war with King George. What they miss out on is the exciting debate that took place after the war and before the Constitution, a debate that concerned the dangers of creating a federal government at all.

The Antifederalist Movement

Everyone knows about the Federalists who pushed the Constitution. But far less known are the Antifederalists who warned with good reason against the

creation of a new centralized government, and just after so much blood had been spilled getting rid of one.

The first of the Antifederalist Papers appeared in 1789.

The Antifederalists were opponents of ratifying the US Constitution as (they feared) it would create what would become an overbearing central government.

What the Antifederalists predicted would be the results of the Constitution turned out to be true in most every respect.

As the losers in that debate, they are largely overlooked today. But that does not mean they were wrong or that we are not indebted to them.



ONLY PATRIOTS CAN BEAT THE DEEP STATE

Those that fight the Deep State are antifederalists.

Confusing nomenclature.

In many ways, the group has been misnamed.

Federalism refers to the system of decentralized government. This group defended states' rights—the very essence of federalism—against the Federalists, who would have been more accurately described as Nationalists. Nonetheless, what they predicted would be the results of the Constitution

turned out to be true in most every respect.

The Antifederalists warned us that the cost Americans would bear in both liberty and resources for the government that would evolve under the Constitution would rise sharply.

That is why their objections led to the Bill of Rights, to limit that tendency.


Their Oppositions to the Constitution

Antifederalists opposed the Constitution on the grounds that its checks on federal power would be undermined by expansive interpretations...

... of promoting the “general welfare” (which would eventually be claimed for every law)...

... and the “all laws necessary and proper” clause (which would be used to override limits on delegated federal powers)...

... thus creating a federal government with unwarranted and undelegated powers that were bound to be abused.



One could quibble with the mechanisms the Antifederalists predicted would lead to constitutional tyranny.

For instance, they did not see that the Commerce Clause would come to be called “the everything clause” in law schools...

...justifying almost any conceivable federal intervention...

...because the necessary distortion of its meaning was so great even Antifederalists couldn’t imagine the government could get away with it.

It merits remembering the Antifederalists' prescient arguments and the virtual absence of modern Americans who share their concerns.

And they could not have foreseen how the 14th Amendment and its interpretation would extend federal domination over the states after the Civil War.

But despite that, it is very difficult to argue with their conclusions in light of the current reach of our government, which doesn't just intrude upon, but often overwhelms Americans today.

We need to listen to the Anti-federalist argument.

Therefore, it merits remembering the Antifederalists' prescient arguments...

... and how unfortunate is the virtual absence of modern Americans who share their concerns.

One of the most insightful of the Antifederalists was Robert Yates, a New York judge who, as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, withdrew because the convention was exceeding its instructions.

Yates wrote as Brutus in the debates over the Constitution.

Given his experience as a judge, his claim that the Supreme Court would become a source of almost unlimited federal overreaching was particularly insightful.

Expanded Judicial Power

Brutus asserted that the Supreme Court envisioned under the Constitution would become a source of massive abuse...

... because they were beyond the control “both of the people and the legislature,” ...

...and not subject to being “corrected by any power above them.”



"Freedom of speech is a priveledge intended for educated professionals. . . . It should be illegal for a high school dropout to promote anti-government propaganda on his 5 dollar blog, if he cannot properly verify his statements. . .

When the opportunity arises the corrupt officials will spring into action and restricts the rights of Americans so that they can gain personally.

As a result, he objected to the fact that its provisions justifying the removal of judges didn't extend to rulings that went beyond their constitutional authority...

...thus, leading to judicial tyranny.

Brutus argued that when constitutional grounds for making rulings were absent...

... the Court would create grounds "by their own decisions."

He thought that the power it would command would be so irresistible that the judiciary would use it to make law, manipulating the meanings of arguab-

ly vague clauses to justify it.



America today.

Expanded judicial power would empower justices to shape the federal government however they desired.

The Supreme Court would interpret the Constitution according to its alleged “spirit”...

... rather than being restricted to just the “letter” of its written words (as the doctrine of enumerated rights, spelled out in the 10th Amendment, would require).

Further, rulings derived from whatever the court decided its spirit was would effectively “have the force of law,”...

... due to the absence of constitutional means to “control their adjudica-

tions” and “correct their errors.”

This constitutional failing would compound over time in a “silent and imperceptible manner,” through precedents that build on one another.

Expanded judicial power would empower justices to shape the federal government however they desired...


... because the Supreme Court’s constitutional interpretations would control the effective power...

...power vested in government and its different branches.

That would hand the Supreme Court ever-increasing power, in direct contradiction to Alexander Hamilton’s argument in Federalist 78 that the Supreme Court would be “the least dangerous branch.”

Judicial Tyranny

Brutus predicted that the Supreme Court would adopt “very liberal” principles of interpreting the Constitution.



This is America today.

He argued that there had never in history been a court with such power and with so few checks upon it...

... giving the Supreme Court "immense powers"...

...powers that were not only unprecedented, but perilous for a nation founded on the principle of consent of the governed.



Educating Liberals
@Education4Libs



The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the baker who refused to bake a wedding cake for a gay couple.

Good!

Let's not forget that the couple drove 120 miles past 67 secular-owned bakeries, as well as 6 bakeries owned by Muslims, just to get to the one bakery owned by Christians.

6/5/18, 12:49 PM

This is America today.

Given the extent to which citizens' power to effectively withhold their consent from federal actions has been eviscerated, it is hard to argue with Brutus's conclusion.

Brutus accurately described both [1] the cause (the absence of sufficient enforceable restraints on the size and scope of the federal government) and [2] the consequences (expanding burdens and increasing invasions of liberty) of what would become the expansive federal powers we now see all around us.

We need to understand their arguments and apply them to a NEW Constitution, if there is to be any hope of restraining the government to the powers it

was actually granted in the Constitution.

Today

It's well past time for a change.


But today, Brutus would conclude that he had been far too optimistic.

The federal government has grown exponentially larger than he could ever have imagined...

In part because he was writing when only direct, e.g., excise taxes and the small federal government they could finance were possible before the 16th Amendment opened the way for a federal income tax in 1913.

...far exceeding its constitutionally enumerated powers, despite the Bill of Rights' constraints against it.

The result burdens citizens beyond his worst nightmare



Conclusion

The judicial tyranny that was accurately and unambiguously predicted by Brutus and other Antifederalists shows that in essential ways, they were right and that modern Americans still have a lot to learn from them.

Let us be clear then, for time is growing short. The nation founded by our ancestors in the last quarter of the 18th century no longer exists. It has not existed in anything like its original form for over a century. It serves no purpose now to debate the details of our founding or the intent of the Founders. Debating where, or even if, we have gone astray is no longer of any consequence. We have reached a point where not a single person can do or say anything to change the mind of another. The truth is that the legacy of the Founding has been subsumed in the floodtide of revisionism that has swamped the nation. The plain language of the Constitution has not sufficed to secure our freedom. That was to be expected. That our system has worked as well as it has for as long as it has is an aberration unique in human history. Words on parchment are useless, however, if the ideas they express are not first engraved on the hearts of men.

We need to understand their arguments and take them seriously now, if there is to be any hope of restraining the federal government. Constraining it precisely to the limited powers it was actually granted in the Constitution. This is absolutely necessary given its current tendency to accelerate its growth well beyond enumerated Constitutional limits.

In my mind, the first step to controlling the out-of-control beast is to reestablish State sovereignty. Then, through concentrated and systematic efforts, starve the beast. Allow it to wither and die on the vine.

If Americans are unable to control this raging nasty beast, the rest of the world will need to call Animal Control to put it down, and that will certainly not be a pleasant event to witness.



This is America today. Look around you. The rest of the world is moving forward, and the enormous American empire remains dark and immovable.

I hope that you enjoyed this post. I have other posts that you might be interested in that can be found in my SHTF index [here](#)...

SHTF Articles

Articles & Links

You'll not find

any big banners or popups here talking about cookies and privacy notices. There are no ads on this site (aside from the hosting ads – a necessary evil). Functionally and fundamentally, I just don't make money off of this blog. It is NOT monetized. Finally, I don't track you because I just don't care to.

- You can start reading the articles sequentially by going [HERE](#).
- You can visit the Index Page [HERE](#) to explore by article subject.
- You can also ask the author some questions. You can go [HERE](#) to find out how to go about this.
- You can find out more about the author [HERE](#).
- If you have concerns or complaints, you can go [HERE](#).
- If you want to make a donation, you can go [HERE](#).