

The American Federal Experience: A Review

Michelle B. Carter

Freelance Research Analyst, USA

Abstract

The roots of federalism, the independence declaration, the articles of confederation, the establishment of individual states, the Continental Congress, the Federalist Convention, the Federalist Constitution, the Federalist Papers, and the Anti-Union essay are the nine pillars upon which the federalist movement in America rests. Together, they are a monument to the pursuit of good administration because they reflect a remarkable synthesis of intellectual influence, practical experience, and political theory and speech. Not because it is the prototype that made all subsequent federations carbon copies, but because many of its aspects retain significance for contemporary federal experiments, the American federal experience is inevitably brought up again and again in any comparative study of federalism and federation.

Keywords: Federalists, Continental Congress, practical experience, political theory, etc.

Introduction

American thinkers and researchers in the late 18th century recognised a clear difference between federation and confederation. This will provide light on the difficulty that political scientists have had in making sense of the current ideological arguments around federalism, federation, and confederation. This is a significant and extremely worrisome part of the federal heritage in the United States. Therefore, it is important for us to reflect back on what remains a noteworthy occurrence in the history of both an idea and a practical reality in order to comprehend how and why we got at such a peculiar destination. To sum up, going back in time is the only option we have.

First, we'll look at how American federalism came to be; second, we'll look at intellectual debates over federation and confederacy in the United States in the late 18th century; and third, we'll take a look at some of the central philosophical concepts of American federalism, which centre on the interaction between the individual and the community as distinct from one another but nonetheless closely related. Our conceptual analysis is strengthened by the connections between these three unique strands of the American federal experience. In a nutshell, they give substance to abstract thought.

In the first part, we examine the complicated historical context of American federalism's birth and how three uniquely American elements came to construct the first modern federation in 1789. In the second part, we encounter the central point of the dispute, which I will refer to as the federal-federal conflict. It was primarily a philosophical discussion about the specifics of the innovative union the Founding Fathers had created, but the framework of the discussion provides intriguing insight into the political uses and abuses of history. The controversy about the historical continuity or lack thereof in the formation of the federation at the tail end of the eighteenth-century echoes strongly into the new millennium.

The third part delves into the very contested realm of competing and overlapping identities that have found resonance in contemporary federal thought by examining some of the basic

philosophical notions underpinning pre-1789 federalism and post-1789 federalism. “Debates over the nature and purpose of such federations remain topical because of the continued fervour around questions of individual and communal identity, minority rights, and the idea of representation in federal politics. Keeping these thoughts in mind, let's go into the first portion on how federalism came to be in the United States.

Predecessors of American Federalism

Federalism in the United States has complicated and deeply established historical roots. The events in question span the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, far before the well-known defining benchmarks of 1776, 1781, 1787, and 1989, and they cut across the philosophical philosophy of continental Europe, the imperial politics of Britain, and the colonial practise of the United States.

Given the nature of Anglo-American ties, the concept of a British federalist rhetoric throughout this historical epoch may appear paradoxical at first. It was crystal evident that the United Kingdom and her American colonies had a constitutional and political relationship characterised by close cooperation and subordination. To ensure order, stability, and the integrity of the state, the British were open to constitutional and political experimentation and modification as appropriate. Not only that, but he was open to constitutional reforms that might help keep the empire together. British royal connections in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries provided a rich arena for a range of unique and complex political interactions, such as the legislative union between England and Scotland in 1707. The loss of the American colonies in 1776, notwithstanding the advanced forms of colonial autonomy that had been evolved, was an imperial rupture that most British politicians never stopped lamenting and regretting.

Federalism was first proposed in a succession of imperial federalist concepts, the most enduring of which was colonial participation in the British Parliament. Colonial representation, which was first requested for Barbados in 1652, helped bring the many sections of the empire together under one set of rules and regulations. It was advocated for in Adam Smith's seminal 1776 book, *The Wealth of Nations*, and in 1778, the British peace mission to the rebellious American colonies, led by Lord Carlisle, was given representation in Parliament, with acknowledgment authorised for. of the practical supremacy of Congress in American affairs. Also, with the expansion of the empire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the emergence of local colonial autonomy was often seen as covert but functional federal connections. Much of this was assumed for granted and not stated: 'a separation between central and local authorities, even if the latter were delegated and in theory revocable, would work in a federal sense and be thought of as such'. This means that the British imperial-colonial relationship provided a fertile policy arena for a wide variety of frequently quasi-federal political ideologies. It's worth noting that these proposals were offered as practical solutions to issues that were seen as plaguing the burgeoning relationship between the two parties, particularly when the American colonies broke away from the British Empire.

Now we can see that the political concepts of the indigenous peoples of the Americas and the actual experience of local government in the American colonies were also crucial to the

development of federalism in the United States. Don Lutz has previously seen that there were theoretically three types of political ties in colonial America: intracolony, intercolony, and colony-mother nation. He also noted that it is notable that in the first and third situations, the inclination for the answer was federalism, which is an intriguing observation. This 'federalism', however, was not conscious; it was not the product of any particular theoretical framework, and it lacked a label. He brought to our attention the fact that the colonies were not unified states but rather a conglomeration of smaller political units such as towns and counties. For instance, Plymouth Colony grew to include seven separate towns, each of which had its own town meeting. However, because the charters that established the colonies were signed under the royal seal and only recognised a colony as the supreme civil authority, the various colonies responded by writing federal documents such as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut (1639) and the Acts and Orders of Rhode Island (1663). (1647). It established a single colony-wide government with limited powers, while yet allowing local administrations to handle matters within their purview. In a similar vein to Tocqueville's famous findings, Lutz pointed out that both city and colony governments were frequently derived in form and content from contracts and that colonial governments were successful even when they did not originate from contracts. From that point on, they carried out the duties of a federal government, one that had been formed from the ground up.

English Parliament granted the American colonies the right to establish and run their own governments in the early seventeenth century, so long as the laws enacted by colonial assemblies did not directly contradict those of the mother country's Parliament in London. Moreover, there were valid grounds for England to provide charters to the colonies. The voyage between the colonies and England would take at least two months, making it unrealistic for the mother country to manage them. In light of the ongoing civil conflict and the very real danger posed by French imperialism in the New World, the royal authority considered it advantageous to base local self-government and administration primarily on the evident necessities of pragmatism — the connection between the colony and the mother country. Most recently, the nation was federal in function.

Conclusion:

Federalism and unity have always been more than just an American ideal. Despite continuing to have a nuanced connection to state-building and national integration, federalism and the federation now display a dizzying array of variants. Not every contemporary union has adopted the national federalism advocated by Beer.” Neither of these things ought to be expected. In this regard, neither Canada nor Germany are similar to the United States. However, we keep returning to the American federalist experience because we believe that good governance can only be achieved by returning to the basics. To top it all off, The Federalist contains these ideas when they are still new and untarnished. Madison's and Hamilton's works, in particular, have meaning and relevance that will outlast their authors' and their readers' lifetimes. Because of this, his worries about the stability of our administration persist even now. The federal political system is struggling with the majority of the complex constitutional and political issues that have emerged as a result of the recent political shifts. As a result, the lessons learned from the

American federal government are very relevant and may be used in contexts far beyond the United States.

References:

- [1] Abel, F. and Prince, M.J., 'Alternative Futures: Aboriginal Peoples and Canadian Federalism' in H. Boquis and G. Skogstad (eds), *Canadian Federalism: Performance, Effectiveness and Legitimacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), Bachu. 12, 220–37.
- [2] Abel, F. and Prince, M.J., 'Aboriginal governance and Canadian federalism: A to-do list for Canada' in F. Rocher & M. Smith (eds), *New Trends in Canadian Federalism* (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2003), chap. 6, 135–65.
- [3] Acton, Sir John (later Lord), 'Nationality' in *History of Freedom and Other Essays* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1907), 289.
- [4] Bentham, J., *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, ed. J. Bowring (New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1962).
- [5] Bermeo, N., 'Conclusion: The Merits of Federalism' in U.M. Amoretti and N. Bermio (eds), *Federalism and the Territorial Rift* (London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).
- [6] Beran, H., 'A Liberal Theory of Session', *Political Studies*, 32 (1984), 20–31.
- [7] Bhargava, R.N., 'The Theory of Federal Finance', *The Economic Journal*, 63(249) (1953), 84–97.
- [8] Flanner, T., 'Commentary' on 'Swiss federalism' in R.A. Goldwyn, A. Kaufman and W.A. Shambra (Eds), *Forging Unity Out of Diversity: The Approaches of Eight Nations* (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1989), 240.
- [9] Forster, R.H. (ed.), *Emmanuel Seyss: Was ist der Dritte Stand?* (Frankfurt, 1968), 60.
- [10] Fogarty, M., *Christian Democracy in Western Europe, 1820–1953* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957).