

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Honors College

Undergraduate Honors

12-2019

Exploration of Human Nature in the Federalist Papers

Jenna Ashley Salzman
Abilene Christian University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/honors>

Recommended Citation

Salzman, Jenna Ashley, "Exploration of Human Nature in the Federalist Papers" (2019). *Honors College*. 64.
<https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/honors/64>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Honors at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

Exploration of Human Nature

Exploration of Human Nature in the Federalist Papers

An Honors College Project Thesis

Presented to

The Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice

Abilene Christian University

Exploration of Human Nature

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for

Honors Scholar

by

Jenna Ashley Salzman

December 2019

Exploration of Human Nature

Exploration of Human Nature

Copyright 2019

Jenna Salzman

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Exploration of Human Nature

This Project Thesis, directed and approved by the candidate's committee,
has been accepted by the Honors College of Abilene Christian University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the distinction

HONORS SCHOLAR

Dr. Jason Morris, Dean of the Honors College

Date

Exploration of Human Nature

Advisory Committee

[Typed Name Here], Committee Chair

[Typed Name Here], Committee Member

[Typed Name Here], Committee Member

[Typed Name Here], Department Head

Abstract

The Federalist Papers are the canon of American political thought. Scholars have been dissecting their meaning for 250 years. Much of the analysis has focused on the structure of government and the aim for liberty and freedom. A smaller amount focused on the presentation of human nature found within the writings. To understand human nature is to understand how a government should be established and administered. This paper seeks to examine how the Federalist writers Alexander Hamilton and James Madison understood human nature by comparing their writings to John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, and David Hume. I argue that the writers did not share the same perspective of human behavior shown in the writings of John Locke, and to a lesser extent Thomas Hobbes, but find a common perspective in the philosophic writings of David Hume.

Exploration of Human Nature

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Review of Theory and Literature</i>	<i>2</i>
Hobbes	2
Locke	4
Hume	5
Literature	7
<i>Methodology</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Federalist 6</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Federalist 10</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Federalist 51</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Federalist 78</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Works Cited</i>	<i>38</i>

Introduction

Human nature is the starting point for politics. If politics are defined as the way individuals interact and distribute power in groups, it is integral to know their nature. Some, like Plato, believe that there is an ultimate form that citizens should work to achieve, but each person has a specific part to play in society whether that be as a slave or as a philosopher king. Aquinas believed that we are all bad people at heart, striving towards a perfect God and failing. In the modern era of theory, Hobbes agreed with Aquinas claiming that humans are always in a state of war with each other. For him, the State of Human Nature was the worst existence. Human nature was emotional and volatile. The worst thing humans could do was govern themselves, as it would always end in disaster. However, Rousseau and Locke had very different perspectives: Rousseau took the point of view that humans should live in their state of nature because it results in true freedom, Locke agreed that we had true freedom in a state of nature but believed the protection of property merited a creation of a politick to organize protection in a larger, more robust manner. Just a few years before the revolution, David Hume was writing about rationality and emotions—what makes up the core of a human being or trying to discover what their original state of nature was. He came to the conclusion that men (and women, but for brevity, men) were emotional beings and could not truly separate themselves from their emotional states.

Historically, theorists and writers have drawn comparisons between the Publius writings of the Federalist Papers to those of Rousseau and Locke. They have similar stances on freedom and liberty, despite coming from very different experiences and points of view. Just like in “real life,” political theorists are deeply impacted by the circumstances in which they are socialized. Because of this, I believe that the Federalist Papers speak towards a view of human nature

Exploration of Human Nature

similar to that of Locke and Rousseau but mitigated with the observations from Hobbes and Hume. Neither Madison nor Hamilton were immune to the realities of the colonies within which they resided. However, due to their prior circumstances (mainly that of an oppressive monarchy), they desired the freedom they found within the writings of Locke but feared the reality of Hobbes that they also saw in their populations. Nevertheless, they desired a system to provide that freedom but checked the emotional and disruptive nature of human beings.

Review of Theory and Literature

Hobbes

Thomas Hobbes' work was radical and unique in a myriad of ways. Born April 5, 1588, he is best known for his 1651 book, *The Leviathan*. This work outlined his thoughts on social contract theory, authority, and famously, his view of human nature. He viewed human nature in an increasingly negative way. After his education Hobbes served as a tutor to Charles and William Cavendish. To William Cavendish, Hobbes dedicated his book *Elements of Law*. His work prior to 1629 did not approach the topic of political philosophy and focused on translations and scientific works. In 1628, when his pupil, Earl of Devonshire passed away he was let go from that employment and then two years later was re-hired to tutor his son William Cavendish. They spent seven years in Paris where Hobbes was engaged with issues about philosophy and ethics. They returned back to England in 1637. A few short years later the English Civil War began and with his new student, Charles Prince of Wales, he was ousted from the country. Due to his close relationship with the royal class and the destruction he saw from the English Civil War, he wrote his most famous work, *The Leviathan*. The book described a sovereign with extensive powers and rights. It also went in depth and described what truly dark and depressing

Exploration of Human Nature

realities existed in human nature. This book made a significant impact in contemporary thought.

Hobbes was lauded for his unique perspective, but it also threatened his life. He became infamous and hated from the different classes as well as the religious classes; his book had a secular bent to the writing they did not approve of (Morrow, 2011, 35).

Many suggest that the reason Hobbes suggested such a strong executive power was due to the instability and destruction that the English Civil War caused (Collins, 2005, p. 122; Morrow, 2011, p. 38). The constant disruption of governments, state sanctioned executions, and Hobbes' own exile lead to his belief that human nature was inherently wicked and prone to cause disruption and chaos. This meant that the natural state of humans was war and destruction (similar to what Hobbes saw during the English Civil War). Because of how terrible human beings are this state is (p. 72):

In such condition there is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no culture of the earth; no navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by sea; no commodious building; no instruments of moving and removing such things as require much force; no knowledge of the face of the earth; no account of time; no arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

This is one of the most well-known description in all of political philosophy. This description is what Hobbes suggests life would be life if we did not have a strong central authority to protect human beings from themselves. Furthermore, Hobbes suggested that the sovereign (leader of the strong central government) is to control all aspects of government; unlike other philosophers and theorists, Hobbes does not agree with a separation of power in government because when human beings enter into a social contract with the sovereign they give up their

Exploration of Human Nature

political power in exchange for protection. This philosophy had wide reaching effects in political theory and beyond. Hobbes was the marking point for modern political thought (Finn, 2006, p. 59). He popularized the concept of a social contract, which was the starting point for John Locke. While not everyone agreed with him, Hobbes was significantly influential throughout the centuries that followed his death and writings.

Locke

John Locke, a premier political philosopher of the 17th century, is commonly known as the Father of Liberalism coined specifically in his book, *Second Treatise*. His influence can be seen across the globe from Francis Bacon, Jean-Jacque Rousseau even in the United State Constitution (Lee, 2010, p. 66). Classical republicanism and the on start of liberal theory also started with Locke. Furthermore, he developed Hobbe's view of the social contract theory, most notably adding that the citizens had a right to revolt if the "sovereign's" side of the bargain was not fulfilled. Perhaps his most notable addition to the social contract theory is the idea that human nature is defined by rationality and logic (Locke, 1690, 54). He is also one of the first philosophers to consider the concept of self and identity, which became important for the philosopher David Hume a few decades later.

Both of Locke's parents were Puritans and his father worked as a lawyer, who was also a captain in the English Civil War. He was born on August 16, 1623 in Somerset, England. While in school Locke studied as a physician among other things and then became the personal physician to Anthony Ashley Cooper. Ashley, who founded the Whig part in England, had a significant impact on Locke. Ashley became Chancellor in 1672 which led Locke to travel abroad in France teaching Caleb Banks. After his return to England he penned *Two Treatise on Government* which significantly influenced the Whig party's views on natural rights and a

Exploration of Human Nature

negative view of an absolute monarchy (for which Hobbes was a proponent). His views on natural rights also led him to beliefs about political legitimacy and the buy-in of citizens (Lee, 2010, p. 94). He believed that civil laws should reflect laws found in nature and that man should be left to his own devices (Parry, 2013, p. 95). These views on property, political legitimacy, and civil laws directly impacted the writing of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution; they were significantly impact to Thomas Jefferson and were well known by the writers of the Federalist Essays. Despite his fondness of freedom, this did not always extend to religious views such as Catholicism and Islamic beliefs (Rose, 2013, p. 119). His views on human nature and republican governments are vital to the understanding of our political system today.

Hume

David Hume is known for his contribution to philosophic skepticism. He was critical of Descartes suppositions that humans were inherently rational, and his empiricist approach put him in annuls of philosophy about human nature. His “problem of induction” is the concept that human actions cannot be justified with rationality, as humans are not rational and logical human being first, rather they justify their actions after they have decided to act (Berry, 2009, p. 68). He argued that all human knowledge is found in experience opposed to rationalizations and that it is human passion that dictates how individuals will act; this is a direct opposition to philosophical rationalist who were incredibly popular and prominent during the Enlightenment period in which Hume wrote (Waldow, 2009, p. 49). According to Kasavin’s 2012 book, “For Hume, then, in total contrast to his predecessors, man's social being is prior to his rationality” (p. 30). In other words, passion comes before rationality, and human cannot be expected to always act rationality.

Hume was born April 26, 1711 in Edinburgh, Scotland. His father died when he was young, and his mother raised him without remarrying. Hume when to Edinburgh University but

Exploration of Human Nature

possible due to his aversion to law and his professors, he did not graduate. When he was 25, he became a merchant's assistant. Despite how his first book, *Treatise of Human Nature*, fell short at the time he became a lifelong essayist, and was the dominant interpreter of English history. In the present day, the most popular and influential works of his is *Treatise*, which is where the majority of his influential thoughts and philosophic arguments are found. He was only 23 when he first started writing that book, and yet it is seen to be one of the most influential philosophic works in the Western canon.

Despite his unique philosophical ideal, he held political beliefs that would be considered both conservative and liberal (Berry, 2009, p. 127). Thomas Jefferson actually banned one of his books from the University of Virginia. He stressed the importance of law, which demonstrated Hobbesian influence on his work (Demeter, 2016, p. 169). He was in support of the American Revolution, and Benjamin Franklin was inspired by his suggestion that those holding high office not receive a salary from their work (Werner, 1972, n.p.). He believed that laws should be general and impartial but does not truly advocate for one form of government over another, just that they ought to be general enough to remove oneself from the common distresses (Hume, 1740, p. 294; Berry, 2009, p. 128). He agreed with the republicanism form of government and that the representative elected should not be paid for their positions.

Literature

The Federalist Papers are the beginnings of the United States political canon. They contain a multitude of thoughts and views on human nature, governmental systems, and responsibilities not found elsewhere in the same volume. Their reflection on human nature has been uniquely seen and study over the past 250 years. For some theorists, they indicate that human nature has always been egalitarian without government, and egalitarian it should remain

Exploration of Human Nature

(Betzig, 2009, p. 2). For others, however, they created a nuanced view of it pointing out that it advocated for a virtuous elite, different from the common man plagued by their human nature (Millican, 1990, p. 115; Pidlunzy & Bessette, 2019, p. 128). The papers acknowledge that people are significantly impacted by their passion and it affects their action and the way they govern (Pidlunzy & Bessette, 2019, p. 123). Hamilton is greatly impacted by this view of human nature and is found multiple times throughout the papers to discuss the selfish nature that most humans are endowed with (Millican, 1990, p. 70). Because of this view, theorists advocate the point is thus, “given the proper conditions and constraints, imperfect and selfish human beings are capable of self-government, and that this is not only a plausible circumstance of human governance, but it is also its highest aspiration” (Brunello, 2018, p. 108). Human nature does not prevent men from leading government, so long as the government is set up in a way that acknowledges reality and constrains the worst part of an individual. Furthermore, the constraints also impact the citizens to keep factions from taking over as Madison views that as the chief fear of a republic (Millican, 1990, p. 116).

The political objective of these papers functioned in a similar way to propaganda (Millican, 1990, p. 25). The authors—John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, and James Madison—were attempting to convince the public to ratify the constitution and it is clear that they drew significant influences from the theorists that came before them in their justification and explanations. While John Locke believed that human nature was the ideal and humans were rational actors (Stein, 2011, p. 233), the writers did not. Furthermore, despite property being a chief concern Locke, it is never mentioned in the Constitution because the Framers thought that would be a redundant addition (Stein, 2011, p. 255). Hobbes does not fare much better with his impact of the constitution, as his preference for a strong central sovereign was not included

Exploration of Human Nature

(Stein, 2011, p. 217). Despite this, Locke's ideal governmental system, republicanism, is the basis of the system of government the Federalist papers are advocating for and Hobbes's view of human nature is far more represented than that of Locke (Stein, 2011, p. 221). Comparisons and acknowledgements of Locke and Hobbes to the United States Constitution and Federalist Papers are common, however, David Hume does not have the same notoriety, despite the similarities in his view of passions of human nature to Hamilton (Berry, 2009, p. 124).

Methodology

I will focus on four essays from the Federalist Papers: 6, 10, and 51. I chose these due to distinct mentions of human behavior. Alexander Hamilton wrote essay 6, while James Madison penned the other three. This choice allows for an in-depth look at the two prominent writers of the papers and provide a thorough foundation for my conclusions. In this paper, I will be evaluating mentions of human nature and behavior through an interpretive lens of close reading. This is a tool of rhetorical analysis. It is defined as the following: "Close reading, also known as close textual analysis, investigates the relationship between the internal workings of discourse in order to discover what makes a particular text function" (Allen, 2017, p. 2). However, Plato thought of government as "Man Writ Large". In other words, government in man but to a massive scale. Therefore, by evaluating how they talk directly about human nature, and also by how they talk about government in relation to man, one can draw conclusions about the authors' opinions of the state of nature.

I will also be using two works to compare and contrast the authors' views of human nature: *The Leviathan* by Thomas Hobbes and *Treatise of Human Nature, Book 2 Passions* by David Hume. These two works are uniquely situated to speak to the text due their own views of human nature. While *The Leviathan* has been evaluated in tandem with the Federalist Papers and

Exploration of Human Nature

the founding American documents previously, it has—to my knowledge—not been paired with a comparison to David Hume’s work. Hume’s work only predates the Federalist Papers by 60 years, compared to Hobbe’s 130 years. The recency of Hume’s work allows him to respond to the Enlightenment ideals that are seen in some of the founding document’s appeals to rationalism and logic. The elements in both of these works have similarities and comparisons that have not been extensively discussed. It does stand to be mentioned that Hume is not considered a political theorist, rather a philosopher. However, his insight on how human beings make decisions and utilize emotive aspects of their psyches is an evaluation that has not been a large focus on the Federalist Papers as of present. Due to this, I seek to evaluate how impactful the three philosopher’s views of human nature are in the Federalist Papers.

Federalist 6

Summary

Federalist Essay #6 was published on November 14, 1787. Written by Alexander Hamilton, it sought to enumerate why the confederacy would not succeed in keeping the disparate colonies together. Throughout his essay, Publius (Hamilton) walks the reader through the destruction that should follow if the colonies remain separate. He is making the argument that discord and strife are immediate consequences of ignoring the calls for a union and fusing under one federal government. Hamilton was answering the criticisms that states lose power and do not gain under this federal union. In response, Hamilton argues that the benefits of a national constitution and union far supersede those that are lost. In this particular essay, he is outlining the negative consequences of not uniting. Greed, cheating, lying, and war are only a few of the major consequences Hamilton argues will befall the colonies should they not intervene with a federal constitutional government. He briefly mentions that under a republican government, states are

Exploration of Human Nature

not losing significant power, but outside the union, tragedy and dissolution will eventually assault weak union.

Analysis

This essay speaks directly to human nature within the first two paragraphs. Hamilton wastes no time in outlining his thoughts on how human beings behave, claiming, “men are ambitious, vindictive, and rapacious” (para. 2). He argues that because of this, there would be no success if the states were to remain separate, essentially ending this paragraph with the claim, “look at history!” History speaks to the terrible things countries and people groups have done to one another. Hamilton warns if the colonies are not careful, the same history will repeat itself on this side of the Atlantic. His focus on the ambitious, power hungry nature of the individual mirrors what Thomas Hobbes claims in his own book *The Leviathan*. “I put for a general inclination of all mankind a perpetual and restless desire for power after power, that ceaseth only in death” (para. 2). Conversely, Locke saw human nature in a very different light. Found in his writings of the *Second Treatise*, Locke argues that humans are self-interested, so God designed government to keep those instincts in line (1689, p. 6). However, he truly defines the state of nature as, “It is also a state of equality, in which no-one has more power and authority than anyone else” (1689, p. 4). Because of this equality, men are unconcerned with war or discord. Unlike Hume and Hobbes, Locke has a more positive view of human nature; he believes they do mostly good things with their efforts. While Hamilton’s flair for dramatics fell short of Hobbes’, their view of the ceaselessly ambitious nature of human beings’ ring similar. They are looking at human behavior and inclinations from a very specific point of view. Both views are arguing that it is hard for man to not strive for more power, more wealth, and more prestige. This is contradictory to what Locke believes and argues. Despite similarities in their ideal government,

Exploration of Human Nature

Hamilton and Locke (and by extension, Madison and Locke) do not see wholly eye to eye on what natural inclinations are shared by human beings.

Hume speaks to a similar sentiment in the third chapter of his book, *Treatise II*. He says, “Reason is and ought to be a slave to reason” (1736, p. 216). Frequently, humans react and then justify. Modern psychology has supported this to an extent with our understanding of Cognitive Dissonance. When humans see power they desire, according to Hume, they justify it with ideas like equality. Therefore, it is not benevolent kindness that guides them, rather their own selfish passions that manifest in a republican government that remains somewhat efficient and supplies a source of power. Due to Hobbes’ pessimistic view of the individual, he would most likely agree to this. In fact, he concurs that humans are driven by their passions and those passions can emerge in deadly and destructive ways. However, Hamilton would temper that point of view. He was a child of the Enlightenment and believed that rationality still held value even if our emotion sometimes controlled the show.

There are numerous reasons that lead to the desire for power and refusal to compromise, according to Hamilton. He splits them up into three sections. He claims the first are consistently at work within each person, these include: “love of power or the desire of pre-eminence and dominion—the jealousy of power, or the desire of equality and safety” (para. 3). This quote seems contradictory; humans desire power and dominion, but also equality and safety. I suggest that Hamilton meant we desire our own equality with less consideration for others. So long as we see ourselves as equal, we are more content; however, should it appear that we are less than in some function, we will strive to gain the power and dominion he suggests in the beginning of his description. Hume argues that we act in line with our motives, which sounds simplistic and obvious. Nevertheless, he postulates that humans are motivated by passions and those passions

Exploration of Human Nature

do not know reason, rather they control reason. This suggests that our passions and motives are one in the same and control our actions without a logical thought process to follow until after we have decided to act (1736, p. 210).

There are more limiting factors that impact how human beings behave that, despite their restrictions, are still impactful in our society. Hamilton outlines, “the rivalships and competitions of commerce between commercial nations” which would impact the success of independent colonies (para. 3). Just between Hamilton and Madison, observers could see the tension between New York and Virginia. These are “too numerous to name” but frequently are the result of unequal economic success. Virginia, for example, was not in debt from the Revolution due to their agrarian output. It stands to mention that a significant part of this success was due to slave labor, which was almost all unpaid. These factions would result in wars and fighting. Hobbes believed that competition would lead to war which would lead to death (1652, p. 62). Hume’s passions’ framework would result in the same outcome: humans desire money and their passions will lead them to attain it. This paints a picture of human nature that is pessimistic, yes, but Hamilton’s ultimate argument is that their new government is the control for this phenomenon. He is acknowledging that Framers knew humans could be a slave to their passion, but the new government is the check that allows society to control for the worst of impulses and seek to unite a dissimilar group of people.

The final vein of hostility that separate colonies is private passions such as, “the attachments, enmities, interests, hopes, and fears of leading individuals in the communities of which they are members” (para. 3). Individuals are motivated and impassioned by a variety of things. Some are motivated by money, other agrarian land, other cattle, and so on. Sometimes the motivation lies in power and influence rather than material good. Nonetheless, Hamilton argues

Exploration of Human Nature

that these personal passions can lead to conflict between states. The easiest examples would be found in the different monetary system that the states had. Each state had their own currency; until Hamilton established the national bank there was no easy way to trade good. If this continued, trading amongst colonies would have been needlessly complicated and strife between individual trading partners would arise. This could spill over into local and statewide government. Hume predicted this, as we have seen previously. Hobbes also spoke to trading, suggesting that humans inherently break promises and contracts if not controlled by a powerful authority (p. 83). Money has the power to break a union into factions, and Hamilton wanted to ensure that their new government controls for that tendency.

For the next few paragraphs, Hamilton's writes about various instances of history and how the separation of connected governments have been their downfall. He focuses on a variety of governments including democracy to demonstrate that despite the freedom and liberty citizens now have access to, problems still remain. Society and citizens remain flawed and motivated by their passions and impulses. Hamilton argues that these observations are obvious saying, "those who have a tolerable knowledge of human nature will not stand in need of such lights to form their opinion either of the reality or extent of that agency" (para. 7). Most of the people that Hamilton is writing to are somewhat educated which means they are potentially aware of Hobbes, Hume, and other's opinions and speculation on the true realities of human nature. Moreover they are aware that he is disagreeing with Locke—champion of liberty.

What truly separates Hamilton from Hobbes and Hume is his solution, which is more in line with the suggestions of Locke (a trend that is seen more in the essays written by Madison as opposed to Hamilton). Hobbes argued for an all-powerful king to control the minutiae of lives and Hume advocated for succumbing to our passion. Hamilton mirrors some of Locke's

Exploration of Human Nature

suggestions and offers a more moderate solution to giving into our whims or ceding freedom to an all-powerful king: a republic. He argues that republics are ideal and work as a sieve for the rough edges of humanity:

But notwithstanding the concurring testimony of experience, in this particular, there are still to be found visionary or designing men, who stand ready to advocate the paradox of perpetual peace between the States, though dismembered and alienated from each other. The genius of republics (say they) is pacific; the spirit of commerce has a tendency to soften the manners of men, and to extinguish those inflammable humors which have so often kindled into wars. Commercial republics, like ours, will never be disposed to waste themselves in ruinous contentions with each other. They will be governed by mutual interest and will cultivate a spirit of mutual amity and concord.

He sets up the depressing reality of human nature and responds with “the best of both worlds”; citizens will keep a significant amount of freedom and the freedom they sacrifice will be sent to a limited government that will create the laws of the land by general consensus and enforce them without the all-powerful Leviathan-like power of Hobbes’ ideal king. This is similar to what Locke suggests in his writing is a legislative system that seeks the continual consent of the people for the making of rules and laws that may regulate their power (1689, p. 42). This is similar to the Constitution’s republican set up. Locke determines this system is ideal because humans do not have the need to be strictly regulated, so his preferences lies closer with a true democracy than a republic, but he acknowledges that different governmental systems are acceptable (1689, p. 42).

Throughout Federalist 6, Hamilton outlines a problem that is different from much of the common sentiment of the time: Humans are inherently rational. He finds himself with similar

Exploration of Human Nature

arguments to Hume, that humans are controlled by their passions and as Hobbes claims, resort to war. What Hamilton does is mitigate their extremes. Yes, humans are more controlled by passion than the Enlightenment period might suggest, but they are rational enough to create this republican government to create freedom and order in a balanced amount. The Lockean theory that much of the Constitution was inspired by, has a clear line of thought regarding the intricacies of organization or this new government. What is not occurring is an acceptance of Locke's view of human nature. There is not acquiesces to the ideal that men do not have a need for regulation; they do. Hamilton argues that men are carried by their whims and selfishness. They are prone to cause problems and, thus, adapting the liberty and freedom of Locke's system with a republican government is the best way to control the negative consequences of human nature and the freedom so desired after the British rule. As for Hobbes, Hamilton would not strongly disagree against a strong monarch, which he argued for during the Constitutional Convention; however, he is writing arguments for this new government, and if they are to get the support they need, he is required to outline the problem and advocate for the best solution, one that people will agree with. By advocating for this nuanced republican government, he offers a solution for the problem of discord and strife between individuals and independent colonies.

Federalist 10

Summary

Essay 10 was published November 22, 1787 and was written by James Madison. The biggest concerns that Madison wrote about are factions and how they impact the union. He argues that the solve for this problem is found in the representative republican government that Hamilton argued for in Essay 6. Madison argued that factions were inherent to mankind and the best way to counter them was to elect wise men as a go-between for citizens and the legislative

Exploration of Human Nature

body. These factions are over complicated and tense issues like wealth and property but also over small and meaningless things. Due to the frivolity of faction, Madison wanted to ensure that those who argued for a direct democracy had to respond to the argument of a mob mentality. This essay is meant to reject direct democracy and Madison accomplished this by using the examples of mob mentality and factious human nature to explain why a direct democracy was so dangerous. Furthermore, he spends considerable time explaining how the new union and constitution recognize that problem and seek to remedy it without sacrificing liberty. Madison compares liberty to air in that, "Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life, because it imparts to fire its destructive agency" (para. 5). For Madison, there was no union without liberty.

Analysis

The very first sentence in this essay is, "Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction" (para. 1). Without the fanfare of Hamilton, Madison states his point exactly: Factions are a problem and we solve them. Hume does not speak much to factions beyond that humans are riddled with strong passions and emotions which can lead to the wide scale consequences we see in society such as war, strife, and even mob mentality. Hobbes argues that men naturally sort themselves into factions and create problems from there (1661, p. 111). While this says much about Madison's initial view of human nature within the colonies, it also demonstrates that he has a less pessimistic view of human nature from either Hume or Hobbes. Neither truly believed this type of human nature could be solved for beyond a strict authoritarian government (Hobbes). Frankly, Hume did not

Exploration of Human Nature

believe this to be a wholly negative aspect of human nature that we see with Hobbes. While the three writers agree about the reality of humans, they disagree on the true problem that stems from it. Hume thought that, after living at the tail end of the Enlightenment, we should embrace these passions and emotions more than what we have in the past, and that logic is truly a slave to that passion; humans justify the emotion after the fact to create the logical rationality so coveted by scholars. Hobbes was witnessing a Civil War as he wrote his theory. He truly saw the worst of human behavior and his opinions were shaped likewise. Madison was, like the previous two men, shaped by his experiences and perception of the Revolution and the creation of this new government. They were not naïve springtime babies but were optimistic that this new form of government could flourish their colonies in a way that the strong-armed monarchy never allowed them to.

Many people were afraid that this new government was not the answer to their hopes and dreams, but a subtle return to the control they received from the English monarchy. Madison describes these complaints as such, “Complaints are everywhere...that our governments are too unstable, that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority” (para. 1). Madison argues that these are the consequences of factions and with this new representative government, with a dilution of direct power over government, they can control for the mob mentality that many feared after Shay’s Rebellion. No one wanted another recap of poor domestic policy and revolt of the very people that were responsible for feeding the union. While this is a unique situation the colonies were dealing with, the broad concepts were not new. For Hobbes, he believed that the best solve for this mob mentality was a strong authoritarian government, and that with this

Exploration of Human Nature

“Leviathan” rule men had no need for factions (1661, p. 145). Interestingly, Hobbes acknowledges factions and that his form of government would extinguish their negative consequences, but he does not go into the same specific detail that Madison does.

Madison saw that there were two ways to solve this issue of factions: controlling causes or effects. If the government were to control the cause for factions, they would be removing liberty from their citizens, something that Hobbes would support but not Madison. Madison believed that liberty was essential to existence (para. 4). So, while the two men might agree that human beings are flawed and those flaws can result in negative consequences in a body politick, they do not agree on how to solve it. This is a unique contrast as one would assume agreeing on the realities of human nature would lead to a consensus on how to deal with it. Over 100 years passed between Hobbes and the Federalist essays and there were major changes due to the Enlightenment’s impact on politics and political thinking. Pure rationality may not be the case, but Madison believed that at the heart of it, they could set up a government that could check a citizen’s worst impulses and tendencies; this implies that while they may agree significantly on the negative of human nature, they do not agree on the best way to remedy it. John Locke explored what theory would look like for a multitude of his books. For Locke, liberty was inherent to human nature. Every human being was born with liberty imbued within them. That liberty could be obstructed by overbearing government subjected their citizenry to unnecessary laws and regulation, but it was never destroyed. All humans had a right to unhindered freedom. In chapter 8 of his Second Treatise, Locke says, “The only way anyone can strip off his natural liberty and clothe himself in the bonds of civil society is for him to agree with other men to unite into a community, so as to live together comfortably, safely, and peaceably, in a secure enjoyment of their properties and a greater security against outsiders” (1689, pg. 32). Individuals

Exploration of Human Nature

can remove parts of their liberty and exchange it for the safety that come with being inside a politick. Beyond safety and peace, Locke saw little other purpose for government. He had a more optimistic view of man's state of nature than Madison.

Hume has a unique argument in his third book about human nature. He argues that men are bad at self-governance and will prefer present advantages over long term peace (276). Therefore, the way governments create order is, "by changing our circumstances and situation so that obedience to obeying the laws of justice becomes our nearest interest and disobedience to them becomes our most remote interest" (1736, p. 277). While Hume would not agree with Hobbes, he does not believe the solve for human nature is found in self-governance because the very aspect of their human nature prevents them from success. The immediate gratification of their current impulses is too powerful for them to ignore, and to an extent Madison acknowledges that some actors are like that. Regardless, Madison does not believe ALL governmental officials would succumb to the worst parts of themselves. In fact, he argues that a republic is the best form of governance because in these impulses and decisions are "passing through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations" (para. 16). Essentially, what Madison's argument boils down to is that some people (the common people) are the victims of their own impulses, but they will elect the wisest of them all and these impulses will be checked by a wiser and educated governing body. It is not hard to see the impact of Enlightenment thought in this sentiment. If one is educated, one is rational, but Hume argues that regardless of an individual's education, wealth or power they are at the whims of their impulses and it is folly to think otherwise.

Exploration of Human Nature

Madison comes close to making this point a few lines later by saying, “as long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed” (para. 6). Factions will occur regardless of who the individual is and yet his system of government operates like a fine mesh sieve that attempt to separate the good impulses from the bad. Madison goes on to argue that money causes much of the dissension that human history has seen which is why government must first, and foremost protect property. Therefore, when humans self-govern, these traits have a tendency to pop up and make themselves known because the “causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere” (para. 7). Without using the same philosophical terms (as Madison’s audience was not the highly educated philosopher), he agrees with Hume that man kind’s initial impulses are hard to ignore and frequently sow discord. This is evident in the seventh paragraph when Madison says, “and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good. So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities, that where no substantial occasion presents itself[.]” Madison is walking this thin line of freedom and liberty are the best, but men are fallible. However, according to John Locke, as soon as government starts to regulate behavior—even negative ones— liberty has been taken away. Locke argued that the purpose of a government is the preservation of property. Madison says that unequal distribution of property causes the most factions and conflicts. When one looks at the bare bones of the Revolutionary War, that’s why the colonies went to war against the British. They were stealing their property and economic rights. Madison knew how people treasured their property, because property was (and, it could be argued, still is) political power. Nevertheless, he

Exploration of Human Nature

argued for the control of “various interfering interests” in property ownership, including people like debtors and creditors, once again walking this fine line of freedom and control.

Madison continues on that enlightened statesmen may not always be able to control these clashing factions, but in the next sentence suggests that is not because they, as powerful and influential politicians could not achieve it, but rather that enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm of this new government. This argument seems contradictory to his overall point: governmental leaders will be able to sort through the good and bad wills of the populous. This speaks to human nature in the same way that Hume would see it, that all leaders due to their very nature are self-serving and will desire for the easiest and most pleasurable present choice.

Hobbes, similarly, argued that the reason there should be one all-powerful leader is that humans could not be trusted to govern efficiently. Furthermore, he really argues that as long as this all-powerful leader protects the people from war and crime, he is doing his job regardless of how inefficient or cruel his actions are in other aspects of governance. While he would agree with Hume and humans are selfish and could not efficiently and sacrificially run a government in the way Madison claims they could, Hobbes would take it a step further and argue that it doesn't matter so long as everyone is safe and not in a state of war.

Madison's republic, he clearly wanted to differentiate from a direct democracy. Like nearly every other theorist mentioned thus far, Madison believed that direct democracies were the gateway for destruction of the union. Because when democracies are in direct control of the government their every passing whim is felt across the board, “Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention;” (para. 13). Interestingly, after focusing on how essential liberty is he come close to arguing against it by saying, “politicians...have erroneously supposed that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality in their political rights, they

Exploration of Human Nature

would...be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, their opinions, and their passions” (para. 13). Meaning, if the union were to continue with a direct democracy, factions and strife would still exist. In an almost hyperbolic comment, he argues that even if everyone were equal, humans would still find something to argue and disagree on. This perfectly adheres to Hume’s idea that humans are not rational individuals rather they are driven by emotion and utilize logic to support their decisions.

If a direct democracy is bad and if human beings—regardless of their standing in society—are going to resort to factious fighting, it begs the question: how will a republic keep this liberty that is so desired and control the strife and violence? According to Madison, “passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations” (para. 15). This once again returns to the citizen of both Hume and Hobbes: what makes these people different. Both men wrote extensively, detailing how humans cannot be trusted to run their own government rationally and without bias. Hobbes argues that as long as one person is doing it and fulfilling the necessary protection of citizens it does not matter how effective the ruler is. Hume lessens the severity of his argument by dictating that the leaders are further away from controversies and are less likely to be impacted by those passions of the common masses. Madison argues that a man cannot be a judge in his own case and Hume argues something similar by saying, “their interests aren’t tangled up with those of many other members of the society, they will decide these controversies more equitably than anyone would in his own case (1736, p. 278).

Hume and Madison tend to have similar views on things, except for how big government should be. Hume’s concern with the size of government has less to do with what areas of life

Exploration of Human Nature

government is involved in, but rather how many people are employed by the government.

Madison argues that government should have more representatives, “however small the republic may be, the representatives must be raised to a certain number, in order to guard against the cabals of a few” (para. 16). Yet, Hume argues something distinctly different; due to how contrary and impassioned human nature is, the larger group of people involved in a decision there is the less likely it is to happen. He argues specifically, “But it is very difficult—indeed it’s impossible—for a thousand people to agree in any such action. [B]ecause each of them will be looking for an excuse to free himself from his share of the trouble and expense and to lay the whole burden on others” (1736, p. 278). Madison would argue that is the “cabals of a few”.

Madison, throughout the tenth essay is arguing that this republican government is useful to control for negative consequences of factions because representatives will ensure that the server and determinantal whims of the people are mediated through wise counsel. Throughout the essay it sounds like Madison is making the case for two different states of nature: one state for the common people and one for the statesmen. The common people are the ones that the government should control for and the enlightened statesmen are the ones who are wise and education and will not allowed their passions to impact their decision making. Hume is actually the one who argues the best way to bridge this gap: it is not that they are any less effected by the state of nature of their passion, but rather they are further removed from the mob mentality of the whims—not falling victim to the passing crazed due to their position and proximity. While that does not wholly explain some of the inconsistency in Madison’s view of human nature, it does allow the reader to see where Hume and Hobbes speak into the Federalist papers. Locke, on the other hand, would argue that these controls are nothing but a removal of liberty for a fear of the “what if”. Locke truly believes that humans, if left unbothered, do not want to bother one another

Exploration of Human Nature

and will allow each person to his own devices. Madison, Hobbes, and Hume would laugh and point to human history as their proof.

Federalist 51

Summary

Published February 8, 1788 this paper highlights the checks and balance system of the United States constitution. While some people think that Hamilton may have had a hand in writing this paper, most agree that it was James Madison who truly wrote and explained this essay. The concept of checks and balances found their popularization in the Enlightenment Era with Locke and Rousseau. The separation of powers in this new government ensured that the liberty of the people was not impacted. However, as each branch was still powerful, they each had checks on each other including from the people themselves. This paper is highly favorable of liberty and freedom that comes with this republican government; however, it also highlights how human nature will adjusted for in the governmental sphere. Or how he constitution checks for the whims of the governmental leaders to ensure they do not gain too much power and government in a way that is of detriment to the people of the union. Because it is run by the people, the Legislative branch has more power due to their ability to create and enact laws. Nevertheless, this is checked by the Judicial, Executive and the people to ensure that their power does not become overpowering.

Analysis

In order to preserve liberty, Madison believes that controlling the functions of government is necessary. While he does not explicitly state this, he recognizes that people who run government can be corrupted and can manipulate and take advantage of the power that has

Exploration of Human Nature

been bestowed upon them. According to Madison, “ambitious must be made to counter ambition” because “should be necessary to control the abuses of government” (para. 3). Because human nature is unreliable and power hungry, the government must have checks on itself to ensure that those running the government do not misuse their power. This answers the questions raised in the reading of Federalist 10 regarding an appearance of double standard with those in and not in government. Hobbes is pretty certain that the best thing to do when confronted with the realities of human nature is to resort to an all-powerful monarch. Hobbes says, “there is no human wisdom can uphold them longer than the jealousy lasteth of their potent neighbours” (1661, p. 162). Essentially Hobbes is making the point that human rationality does not successfully maintain a commonwealth because the negative aspect of human power—the jealousy of power—is long lasting, there is not fix for it. He argues that government are damage control, not preventative entities.

Perhaps the most famous quote from any of the Federalist Papers is from essay 51 when Madison says, “But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary” (para. 3). This is a thought first found in Plaut’s writing. He declared that the government was Man Writ Large or, more simply, the government is the people who are making the decisions. The actions of government are directly related to man and their human nature. Understanding human nature helps us know and understand government. While previous essays did not address the contradiction of limited liberty, this essay attempts to sum up why government is necessary but only inasmuch as it protects citizens from their worst tendencies. Because the government is made up of human beings, who have the same state of nature as those they are regulating, they too must be regulated. Madison argues that those in power may be “wiser” and more patriotic than their

Exploration of Human Nature

average citizen; he does not, however, argue that they should not be regulated. If men were perfect, they would not require a government to check their worst behaviors, but they are.

Therefore, they must also place checks on the government to ensure that the governmental actors are also regulated.

Hobbes never directly addressing whether government is “Man Writ Large”, but he does address that the all-powerful ruler he envisioned is not limited by any regulations because their ultimate goal is to protect the people from their state of nature: war. If he is successful in this, his aim is, “to the end to live peaceably amongst themselves, and be protected against other men” (1661, p. 107). There do not need to be checks on the governmental actors, because there is only one and he only has one goal. When Hobbes weighed the cost and benefits of the power exerted by the all-powerful sovereign, he determined that the benefits of protection far outweigh any cruelty the sovereign could produce. Therefore, in an effort to exercise this responsibility in the best possible way, he should not be regulated in a strict way. Hobbes agrees with the fact that man’s state of nature requires them to be under some form of government, but because he does not endorse a representative republic, the regulation of governmental actors’ state of nature is not something he is concerned with.

Hume does not believe we can change our nature so all we can do is change our circumstances: rules and regulations of government. He says in book 3, “so our only way of correcting the propensity [human nature] is by changing our circumstances and situation so that obedience to obeying the laws of justice becomes our nearest interest and disobedience to them becomes our most remote interest” (1736, p. 277). This is what Madison is attempting to do, he wants to impact the governmental actors in such a way that they are far more likely to view obeying the laws in government as preferable to utilizing their power, and if they still do not see

Exploration of Human Nature

the benefits, there are checks in place to ensure that it difficult to abuse power in the republican constitution he is advocating for. Hume describes this as, “men acquire a security against each other’s weakness and passion as well as against their own” (1736, p. 278). Simply, Hume is suggesting that governments and governmental actors are set up in such a way that they are to set up “insurance” or in Madison’s language checks and balances, against one another to ensure that there is not a way for human nature to overcome the desire of government and liberty and mishandle the power given to them by the citizens. Hume also suggest that men have a tendency to want more power, “It doesn’t take as long for a ruler to become entitled to any additional power he may usurp as it does to give him a right to a power that he gained all of by usurpation” (1736, p. 288). Human nature is to want gratification and power. This is what governments must balance against.

While Madison believes this balance is difficult, he claims that it is supremely important, “you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself” (para. 3). The first check on government is the people themselves. This line of thought is found in Locke’s seventh chapter where he states, “Thus, there is a political (or civil) society when and only when a number of men are united into one society in such a way that each of them forgoes his executive power of the law of nature, giving it over to the public” (p. 29). Locke’s government is only created when the people cede their power to public and vote their leaders and government officials into office. Because they joined their political power together, they have the ability to hold the large-scale government accountable.

Hume cautions people against relying on a mass number of individuals from making these decisions, because they will rarely agree (1736, p. 278). Because men have acknowledged

Exploration of Human Nature

that they need government they are more willing to make decisions that allow that civil politick to succeed. Hume argues that “their own urgent self-interest quickly restrains their actions and gives them an obligation to observe the rules that we call the ‘laws of justice’” (1736, p. 294). Hobbes consistent message in his writing is that human nature cannot be trusted outside a government with a strong all-powerful sovereign. Madison says that while the citizens are the first line of defense against the tyranny of a government, the next is through a checks and balance system. For Madison this system is what protects other branches from each other. It prevents the actors’ human nature from overpowering and hoarding power for themselves, both Hume and Hobbes warn of this.

This essay focuses less on human nature than the others, instead focusing on how to correct for it. What is still evident throughout is the *need* to correct for human nature. It needs to be controlled in the populous, but it also needs to be controlled in those who are administering the government. This essay unintentionally or intentionally serves to clarify some of the contradictions found in essay 10 wherein Madison explains how the republican government keeps citizens’ human nature from completely encompassing the wills of the minority or resulting in a violent disagreement of factions. In this set up, Madison acknowledges that the people leading the government will also be flawed, though he stops short of accepting they are prone to the same behaviors of the general citizenry. The importance of human nature is exemplified in Madison’s comment about why government is necessary. Humans are not always good, if they were then there would be no need for government. Hobbes makes a similar argument in the Leviathan. Hume is not arguing for one type of government or another, rather he is trying to explain human nature. Conversely, Locke believes that the chief aim of government is the protection of private property from those outside and inside the commonwealth (1689, p.

Exploration of Human Nature

40). He does believe that the government's job is to control for negative human behavior—mainly because there is not much of an overt undesirable consequence resulting from it.

Federalist 78

Summary

This essay focuses on judicial review and how the judiciary will act in tandem with the constitution and not as an overpowering force. This paper was written by Alexander Hamilton and published May 28, 1788. It focuses on how the judiciary would have no way to force oversight or their decisions, rather they would just hand down judgements of laws. In particular this essay was concerned with refuting the Anti-Federalist stance that the lifetime appointment would lead to insulated judges that would allow political actors to continue to wield influence long after they left office. Hamilton responds to this by saying that judgments require the other branches to carry out their suggestions. He also goes on to say that these lifetime appointments only are in the case of good behavior. As of 2019, however, the “House of Representatives has impeached only 15 judges...Justice Samuel Chase is the only Supreme Court Justice the House has impeached, and in 1805 the Senate acquitted Chase” (Keith, 2018, para. 6).

Analysis

The judiciary is a unique branch of our government. Judgeships are lifetime appointments and their power indicates much about how Hamilton and Madison thought about human nature—who can the union trust to hold such positions. According to Hamilton, these positions are only holdable during good behavior, “of the convention, all judges who may be appointed by the United States are to hold their offices DURING GOOD BEHAVIOR; which is conformable to the most approved of the State constitutions and among the rest” (para. 6).

Exploration of Human Nature

Hobbes believed that the only person who can handle the office of the judiciary is the sovereign (1661, p. 110). However, he has the ability to transfer some of that power to those below him in order to ensure there is a functioning system (1736, p.112). Hume looks at the judiciary through a justice point of view saying that justice is the goal, “a constant and perpetual will to give everyone his due” (1736, p. 272). Hamilton viewed good behavior as a necessity for the judicial branch. Their actions directly reflected on the government. Their words interpreted the law. In fact, according to Hamilton judges are meant “to secure a steady, upright, and impartial administration of the laws” (para. 6). In essay six, we saw how Hamilton viewed human nature, and now we are seeing how he desires human being to function in his government: with impartiality.

Critics were concerned about the power of the judiciary, as well. In response, Hamilton argues that this branch is truly not that powerful; they are not in charge of the money (congress) and they are not in charge of the sword (executive). They rely on the other two branches of government to carry out their decisions—judgements, “And it is the best expedient which can be devised in any government, to secure a steady, upright, and impartial administration of the laws” (para. 6). Hume would argue that no human could be impartial (1736, p. 289). Because humans are not ruled by rationality like Locke would suggest, but rather controlled by their passions, it would be impossible for the judges to uphold strictly impartial judgements. However, the further they were from the individuals they were judging would also impact that as Hume believed that if the laws were general enough and those “judging” were far enough away their judgment would not be as clouded.

The next line, Hamilton makes an interesting point about influence, “For I agree, that "there is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive

Exploration of Human Nature

powers” (para. 7). While he may not be wholly concerned with the decision making of judges, he was concerned about what power and influence the other two branches were going to exert over the judiciary, once again pointing to the idea that those in government are just as affected by their irrational state of nature as the common citizens. If the legislature or executive branch have this influence and can impact the laws, Hamilton says, “that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of powers, may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid” (para. 11).

The accountability that Hamilton seeks in his governmental system is one that is supported by two of the three philosophers. Locke and Hume agree with and support a separated, checks and balance system that ensure the government does not overstep and negatively impact the citizenry. Hume does not trust human nature to rational and logical while Locke does not want other impacting his life to a great extent. Property protection is Locke’s true goal in his system, because unlike Madison and Hamilton, he believes that man is innately rational and will not seek out trouble where there is none to be had. Hobbes disagrees with the solution for human nature. He does not trust human without an all-powerful government. He believes that they will resort to fighting and killing, what he saw during the English Civil War. This impacted him significantly because of that experience the only governmental system he believes will result in peace, is that of a powerful sovereign who has direct control over every branch of government. To him, the state of nature that the sovereign has—his innate desires—will not result in the same consequences to the citizenry, as if they were to run freely with their natural desires. In simpler terms, the negative consequences of a bad sovereign, someone who gives himself to his worst tendencies, is still far superior to have a government that does not exert the same control and peace, allowing the citizens to give themselves to their worst tendencies.

Exploration of Human Nature

Hamilton, continues, and advocates for a power system that would cause Hobbes great fear, “It only supposes that the power of the people is superior to both [the Constitution and statutes];” (para. 13). While Hobbes would fear this system due to his lack of trust in the general population, this would be exactly what Locke envisioned as the correct point of view. Men are inherently rational and thus deserve to have this influence and control over the people who govern them and make the laws they are required to follow. While they must submit themselves to a civic body, which is not what Locke would prefer, the next best option is if men are allowed to be their freest selves, selves that are in touch with their natural state. Hume seemed to ride a middle ground between Hobbes and Locke in this case. He believed that the laws and leaders should be very specifically general as to allow the passion to negatively influence the civic system to a great degree. For him, as long as the governmental system had checks on human passions, he was content. In this section, it appears like Hamilton is agreeing, that however bad human nature is, what is worse is an all-encompassing government.

As the paper continues, Hamilton bring attention to the fact that the judiciary also serves as a check for the worst aspects of human nature. While citizens are in charge, their power is also checked by this governmental design, “judges may be an essential safeguard against the effects of occasional ill humors in the society. These sometimes extend no farther than to the injury of the private rights of particular classes of citizens, by unjust and partial laws” (para. 20). Hamilton acknowledges that the citizens and their elected leaders could make decisions that could negative impact the other section of the population. If they were to ratify the constitution, the judiciary would correct for this behavior. Hume’s understanding of the state of nature, supports this view from Hamilton. Men are driven by their passions; they are seeking instant gratification and enacting laws that benefit them even if they hurt others is in line with what Hume theorizes.

Exploration of Human Nature

Hobbes fully believes that human beings would destroy themselves and others if given the chance. Therefore, as Hamilton describes this phenomenon that the judicial branch would protect the population from, he is also subtly acknowledging his view of human nature from essay six has not changed much.

This essay focuses much more on the systematic set up of the judicial branch, but within each section Hamilton is pointing the reader to how he views the state of nature found in mankind. He does not trust they will always make the best decisions for themselves or for their society. Therefore, the judicial branch works as a check on both the government and the people, a function that the other branches share, but not to the same extent. For Hamilton, this branch is imperative to ensure everyone has access to liberty and to the protection from human nature that is self-serving, and passion driven. It is clear that Hamilton does not wholly believe that human being are war-mongering fools like Hobbes, but he does believe that they will act on their impulses more often than not. Hobbes, more so than Madison, seems to adhere to the view of human nature iterated by Hume.

Conclusion

Discussing human nature is important as it directly applies to how we should form a functioning government. Without understand how human interact with one another, their relationship with power, and their relationships with others, it is impossible to understand governments. Exploring the mentions of human nature in Federalist 6, 10, and 51 demonstrated how both Hamilton and Madison felt about the subject, as well as their proposed solutions to solve for this new problem. In essay 6, Hamilton makes a case that human nature is very similar to the views of Hume and Hobbes, but the best attempt at solving this issue is found in a republican government, an adaptation of Locke's ideal government. Similar ideas are explored

Exploration of Human Nature

within 10 and 51 by Madison. Madison's description of human nature ring more optimistic, but not by much. He acknowledges that factions are a problem and they lead to the destruction of the union. He solves the contradiction of government checking the people, by explaining how the people will also check the government because if human beings are the government, it is also doomed to be imperfect. Ultimately, human beings are destined to be fallible; however, that does not remove their right to freedom and liberty, so it is imperative that government designs prioritize liberty while establishing a checks and balance system that limits the worst aspects of human nature. By far, David Hume had a clear and significant impact on the Federalist Paper's description of human nature, seen in Madison and Hamilton's writings.

Works Cited

- Allen, M. (2019) *Close Reading*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc
- Berry, C. J. (2009). *David Hume*. New York: Continuum.
- Betzig, L. (2009). But what is government itself but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? *Politics and the Life Sciences*. 28(2). 102-105.
- Burnello, A. (2018) Brunello, A. R. (2018). The Madisonian republic and modern nationalist populism: Democracy and the rule of law. *World Affairs*, 181(2), 106–132.
<https://ezproxy.acu.edu:2262/10.1177/0043820018787391>
- Collins, J. R. (2005). *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*. Oxford: OUP Oxford.
- Demeter, T. (2016). *David Hume and the culture of Scottish Newtonianism: Methodology and ideology in Enlightenment Inquiry*. Boston: Brill.
- Finn, S. (2006). *Thomas Hobbes and the politics of natural philosophy*. Cromwell: MPG Books.
- Hamilton, A. (1787, November 14). Concerning Dangers from Dissensions Between the States. *New York Daily Advertiser*.
- Hamilton, A. (1788, May 28). The Judiciary Department. *New York Daily Advertiser*.
- Hobbes, T. (1968). *Leviathan*. Baltimore: Penguin Books
- Hume, D., Norton, D. F., & Norton, M. J. (2000). *A treatise of human nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasavin, T. (2012). *David Hume and contemporary philosophy*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Keith, D. (2018, March 23). Impeachment and removal of judges: An explainer. *Brennan Center for Justice*. Retrieved from <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/impeachment-and-removal-judges-explainer>
- Lee, W. (2010). *John Locke and Modern Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Exploration of Human Nature

- Locke, J. (1948). *The second treatise of civil government and A letter concerning toleration*.
Oxford: B. Blackwell.
- Madison, J. (1787, November 22). The Same Subject Continued: The Union as a Safeguard
Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection. *New York Daily Advertiser*.
- Madison, J. (1788, February 8). The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper
Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments. *New York Daily Advertiser*.
- Morrow, J. (2011) Leviathan and the swallowing of Scripture: The politics behind Thomas Hobbes' early
modern biblical criticism. *Christianity and Literature*, 61(1), 33-54. Retrieved from
[http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=lsdah&AN=ATLA0001
877588&site=eds-live&scope=site](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=lsdah&AN=ATLA0001877588&site=eds-live&scope=site)
- Parry, G. (2013). *John Locke*. Hoboken: Routledge.
- Pidlunzy, J. & Bessette, M. (2019). Avarice and ambition in America: The founders' debate on
the political place of selfish passions in the Constitutional order of the United States.
Journal of Market & Morality, 22(1), 117-145.
- Rose, J. (2013). John Locke and the state of toleration. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 64(1), 112-
120. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046912001698>
- Stein, J. (2011). *Commentary on the Constitution from Plato to Rousseau*. Lanham: Lexington
Books
- Waldow, A. (2009). *David Hume and the problem of other minds*. London: Continuum.
- Werner, John (1972). David Hume and America. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 33(3), 439–
456. [doi:10.2307/2709045](https://doi.org/10.2307/2709045). JSTOR 2709045.