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ABSTRACT.
Authors speak as co-authors in collegial alliance, and later as opponents in a nation’s first major dust-up. A national bank is at the center of the controversy. Searching out quantum values divulged and obscured, along with ‘null’ results returned at the quantum level, supply an investigator with plenty of raw material for analysis. The approach is roadmapped in this article and the table annexed. Coverage for each word/word family searched is spread across three tables with articles annexed.
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A. INTRODUCTION. OCL takes the reader through single word surveys three tables at a time. For example ‘constitution’ is surveyed in three tables, with articles annexed. The approach is detailed in this article; the table annexed to this article explains that OCL is surveying ‘constitution,’ ‘necessary,’ ‘exigencies,’ ‘necessary and proper’ [considered as one word], ‘federal,’ ‘republic,’ and finally ‘constru!/construct!’ [here the kinetic is divided from the intellectual effort signified by the word.

By scoring words through values assigned in a grid developed for each word, the diverging and frequently competing semantic values may be stripped from sentences and opened up for inspection. By doing so, word usage leads to insights into the feasibility of solving problems which the sentence (as a management tool) is designed to illuminate.

Thus, one can get at history (which for Madison and Hamilton was simply a resource for assessing the feasibility of crafted text, text-in-the-crafting, rejected text, proposed text, text-in-transition, text-in-action and so forth) if one breaks the stranglehold of demotic elaboration.

B. THREE ARTICLES PER TEST WORD. OCL supplies the quotations from which the test words are drawn in the first of three articles/tables. Hence, the reader can begin with Hamilton and Madison Deploy ‘Constitution’ in Works Dated to 1787/88, 1790/91 and 1817-1836: Semantic Values Surveyed with Quotations, 2 OCL 366. A grid is constructed and counts are made of semantic values exposed in the grid, that is, at the quantum level of analysis. Th

next article is title: Hamilton and Madison Deploy ‘Constitution’ in Works Dated to 1787/88, 1790/91 and 1817-1836: Semantic Values Surveyed and Cumulated, 2 OCL 331. Finally, the percentages of deployment appear at Hamilton and Madison Deploy ‘Constitution’ In Works Dated to 1787/88, 1790/91 and 1817-1836 Surveyed by Percent of Words in Source, 2 OCL 337.

Again, for each single word or ‘word family’ (for example, Madison’s ‘words of science’ or ‘words of interpretation’) OCL will supply three tables with three explanatory articles.

C. SEMANTIC ASCENDANCY. This article now assumes a working familiarity with, for example, the three tables exposing the semantic values of ‘constitution.’ See ¶B above. Why do we care, to start with, that there are different quantum values for ‘constitution’? Let’s put it this way. Suppose a battle was scheduled and no one showed up? If there are two competing values then someone can claim ascendancy for one side or the other.
In 1791 Madison argued that lacking an amendment to authorize the “pursuit of [Hamilton’s Bank] objects” the nation was obliged to “lament the power … omitted, however necessary it might have been.” In other words, if ‘bank’ (or banking services), either as particle (=bank) or at the quantum level (=incorporation of monopoly, sole source contract, financial services or so forth) were not located in the text of the constitution, then the American people were obliged to ‘lament’ its omission or amend these values back into text.

This point flows from ‘constitution’ = text, which Madison explicitly took as a constitutional instruction. In other words, if the sole quantum value of ‘constitution’ is text, then an ascendancy is thereby implied; there can be no source for semantic values other than what text supplies.

It might be hard to see Madison’s point if there were no supermajoritarian semantics; but there is a way to get more values into text, and that is through Article V. Hence, Madison’s ‘lament or amend’ carries a very real bite as a program. He really is saying, ‘well, the idea of a national bank may indeed be a good one and even one that the nation desperately needs, but public need is not a source that supplies a pedigree to legislation co-equal to constitutional text.’

In essence, Madison’s approach demands semantic ascendancy for his program: we know it’s an ascendancy because he says Congress should invoke supermajoritarian procedures in the bank bill debate (1791) to get the national bank what it wants. Madison and Hamilton had a real fight on their hands, with the value each one offered to ‘constitution’ opposed by the counter-value of the other.

D. Hamilton’s Choices. How would someone committed to getting a national bank established, for instance, combat Madison’s position? One possibility is to counter it: ‘Oh, no,’ one might argue. ‘Your semantic program isn’t ascendant. My semantic program is ascendant.’

But that’s not Alexander Hamilton’s way.

On one hand, Alexander Hamilton does unleash a direct assault: he counters constitution = text with the anti-value constitution = government. But then, and here’s the rub, he argues that because there can be no settlement of the issue at the quantum level this means that there’s no such thing as semantic ascendancy.

So it’s a two-prong attack in which his counter ‘constitution’ = government is used as a feint. If values and anti-values exist and there is no resolution – whatever the resolution might be – supermajoritarian instructions, some kind of semantic tradition that grows up, some institutional solution to the problem either through Congress, the Supreme Court, through Congress and the Presidency – unless there is resolution of the battle this means that all semantic programs are defective.

Another way to see this: Hamilton was going to get his bank; that much is obvious from the pages of the Annals of Congress. But Hamilton didn’t want a merely tactical, programmatic or political victory no matter how glorious it would seem. Hamilton wanted to destroy Madison’s polemic ammunition, to obliterate his ability to ever enter the fight again, with semantic values, at the particle or quantum level.

And he won.

Not just the battle of 1791.

E. Hamilton Triumphant. Mark 1791 down for Hamilton and the Washington Administration triumphant: Congress was on its way to becoming, thanks to Hamilton’s ‘nature of government’ reasoning, the assessor-in-chief of our national needs. As such, it could confidently exercise its new role as provider-in-chief of solutions to national crises and exploiter-in-chief of national opportunities.

And there is more. Hamilton’s victory, considered as a moment in American intellectual history, forced Madison to concede all of the points, political and semantic, at issue. When the House of Representatives voted down his position and voted for Hamilton’s Bank of the United States, its 39-20 tally was indeed the “precedent” that gutted the Tenth Amendment, just as Madison had warned the House.

Ultimately, Madison gave as gracious a concession as dignity would allow in his letter of June 25, 1831 to J.C. Ingersoll. James Madison admitted that the First Federal Congress had been right and he had been wrong: The support of “successive legislative bodies through a period of years,” for a popular program, serves as a “course of precedents … amounting to the requisite
evidence of the national judgment and intentions.” The people make their own precedents.

Hamilton’s victory is even more sublime. There is no requirement that constitutional debate founder on competing quantum values (inherent in ‘necessary’ = logical vs. ‘necessary’ = kinetic, for example) or that, at the particle level, which implicates words, words and phrases, subordinate clauses, clauses, half-sentences, whole sentences all the way up to clauses in the Early Constitution’s sections, articles, and so forth – there need be no ambiguity, difficulty, irreconcilability or even so much as a spot of semantic trouble.

Congressional and national need are co-terminous. They exist, side by side, as Newton’s rod and clock mark and tick off a nation’s advance through the Industrial Revolution. In 1826 Madison decried “the fascinating pursuit of objects of public advantage or conveniency” so much in evidence when ‘nature of government’ advocates found themselves in command of unlimited borrowing, spending and taxing powers.

But Madison conceded this side of the equation as well: he despaired, and this is 1828, that text-based methods of reasoning could overcome the imperfections of language. “Tautologies, and the promiscuous use of terms and phrases, differing in their shades of meaning,” Madison declared, “are to be ascribed, sometimes to the purposes of greater caution, sometimes to the imperfection of language, sometimes to the imperfection of man himself.”

F. A QUESTION OF SEMANTICS. For Madison, it seemed straightforward enough to launch his program. Break open the word and expose its various and frequently competing meanings. Elevate one value over another and announce that your method of semantic ascendancy will declare winners and losers.

However one pursues textual analysis, the search will not end with a single word or within a word. Words may contain too much information; that is, they may contain divergent and (frequently) irreconcilable quantum values.

In the case of constitutional text crafted on the eve of the Industrial Revolution, on the other hand, the public vocabulary may not have formed words for situations, concepts and opportunities. If words are lacking in public discourse because ideas and objects do not yet exist, it is hard to say that such non-existent words are unreliable. It is even more wrongheaded for the Devil to smirk, as Mephistopheles did (in Ein Fragment, published in 1790), that ideas themselves have failed. Searching ‘enumerations’ for target words became a road less worth taking as the Industrial Revolution flooded everyday language with words un-enumerable at the Founding. Searching yesterday’s public or constitutional vocabulary for today’s technical and scientific terms is merely inspiration for the likes of Miguel de Saver Cervantes.

G. TABLE ANNEXED. On Selected Works, the table appears as a separate file, cataloged at 2 OCL 811. For this and other works see http://works.bepress.com/peter_aschenbrenner/

H. STATUS. In progress as articles and tables are completed.

I. PREFERRED CITATION FORMAT. Please cite as 2 Our Constitutional Logic 811 or 2 OCL 811.
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