

Hamilton and Jefferson Debate

Throughout history, it has been made clear of the different viewpoints on how to interpret the constitution. Some people believe that there should be a strict following while others think that it should be loose. Being a modern day Hamiltonian, the constitution should be followed more leniently to allow more wiggle room when in the face of problems. History has shown that the Jeffersonians believed strongly in a strict interpretation of the constitution while the Hamiltonians believed in a looser interpretation. The debate on the constitution has been going on for years and continues in our democratic and republican parties today.

To begin, the Jeffersonians are followers of a strict interpretation of the constitution opting to follow it to a T. When asked about certain amendments they believed that we should follow them word for word. This is due to the fact that they thought that since the constitution was the supreme law of the land, it should be followed in that way. Nowhere in the constitution does it say that it is okay to have a loose interpretation; it was meant to be followed accordingly. The Jeffersonians had the belief that the purpose of the constitution was limit the use of implied powers and to keep the government small. This was to make sure that the government never was able to become a monarchy and or take away the peoples basic rights. The strict constructionists desired a small federal government, one that would leave most power to the states and to the people. They believed that the government as a whole should not be able to tax the people and that power should be left to the states. This is because they never wanted the government to get to powerful and that couldn't be controlled. The Jeffersonians believed that it was the right of the states to tax individually not nationally. They did not then think that it stated anywhere in the constitution that they could be taxed nationally. Therefore they were opposed to the entire idea of a strong central government. They were more so in favor of the states holding more power and the federal government to be small. Their strict views on the constitution directly connect with the way in which people perceive the right to bare arms. People that feel we should have a strict interpretation see it that the

1 constitution gives them the right to have and hold any firearm without a background check. They
2 think that it is their right provided by the constitution to have this gun. Nowhere does it say that
3 they have to have a background check, they are the people that see it says, the right to bare arms and
4 think they can do that. This correlates to those back in the day to who followed a strict interpretation
5 of the constitution.

6 On the contrary.it is the view of the Hamiltonians that the constitution should be loosely
7 interpreted. They believe that it is meant to be followed more leniently and left to interpretation.
8 Unlike the Jeffersonians, they believed that a strong national government was necessary in the
9 proper formation of America. They were strongly in favor of the elastic clause which allowed them
10 to interpret and deem what 1 constitutional or not. This was the opposing view of the Jeffersonians
11 which did not promote the use of this clause. They believed that Congress should be allowed to
12 exercise many implied powers so that government can take a greater role in society. They thought
13 that this would be beneficial for America because never did we have a strong central government. It
14 was the belief of the federalists that a strong national government would get everyone to be united.
15 That the power would not be abused but embraced. It is the thought that government taxes can be
16 held to help benefit the nation. The taxes will help with war debt and manufacturing new things.
17 The debate on the right to bare arms has been debated for years. This is a subject has been debated
18 on for years and is still today on how to interpret this amendment. It is the loose interpretation of the
19 Hamiltonians that believe that you should be able to have a gun but you should have a background
20 check. This loose interpretation is to ensure the public safety. They believe that the elastic clause
21 permits them to have the ability to restrict certain people to have guns based on their background
22 and gun Licensed. It is merely a way to help protect the people and society. The Hamiltonians
23 believe that the necessary and proper clause give us the power to interpret the constitution loosely.

24 With careful consideration. I know that I am a Hamiltonian at heart. This is because by
25 interpreting the constitution more leniently, you are allowing the government to have wiggle room in

1 which they can deal with problems. For example, say that the government needed to negotiate for
2 the better of society. and the constitution doesn't specifically allow it, we have the ability to
3 interpret the constitution in a different way and are able to do so. How could anyone follow a paper
4 for the rules of society word for word? The constitution wasn't meant to be interpreted so strict in a
5 way that it was impossible to make exceptions. The necessary and proper clauses were created to do
6 that thing exactly. To be able to bend the rules, so to speak, for something to be constitutional. The
7 constitution should be followed closely but honestly can be interpreted many different ways.
8 Everyone has a different way of looking at things and the constitution is no different from any of
9 that. It is my belief that the constitution should be open to different interpretations because in
10 reality, there are two meaning to everything. The power of the constitution is very strong and
11 dictates how we all act and behave but should be loose when interpreting, to better society. Going
12 back to the right to bare arm argument, yes it is your right to have a gun, but for the protection of
13 society it is important to have background checks. Overall, being a Hamiltonian I believe in a loose
14 interpretation of the constitution.

15 To conclude, history has shown the long debate over whether the constitution should be a
16 strict or loose interpretation. Jeffersonians and Hamiltonians have argued daily on this subject which
17 is still a problem today. Both Democrats and Republican parties today have picked p where history
18 has dropped off and continued this debate today. This can be seen especially in the amendments
19 specifically, the right to bare arms. The Jeffersonians believed that everyone should obey the
20 constitution word for word, while the Hamiltonians believed that it was open to be a loose
21 interpretation. I for one am a modem day Hamiltonian and believe that it has a more broad meaning.
22 History has shown that the debate stands strong, should we have a strict or loose interpretation of the
23 constitution?

Works Cited

1. "Hamilton vs. Jefferson." N.p., n.d. Web. 03 Nov. 2014.
2. "The Right to Bear Arms." The Right to Bear Arms. N.p., n.d. Web. 02 Nov. 2014.

!''##\$%\$&' ()&! ' *\$*\$&+\$'), (\$--&. ' -/80' (/&

&4#S01: !; \$0/+S0' !	?' : +!G!	H01+!G!	; # ((+1/' \$D!' 2#. !/@+!! #\$\$%!8' () *+!
544. \$' 4D6! @%'+. &' ()%'') . +%\$80; (*\$44\$*); /+00&' (; #'' 7+' %&' ; ;)#8%\$%&' ; ;) \$'.)3''*4\$%&' () !	T##&	&	***-&' *\$85''''&(8<\$''8-85''&'':8<\$(5&7\$*\$&' ()&<"-5&)\$>,(5\$#6&-\$*B\$&' -&' &),-5*' :5," (& (&' @-''* @, (%857\$&\$--' 62&
	K&	N&	3\$B\$*' #&,*-5&C\$*-' (&C#8*' #&\$>\$*\$ (\$-\$&HW''8*JX&WA\$XI&
	K&	KY&] 8#5,C#\$&8-\$-&'>&:" (5*' :5," (-857' 5&:" (5*,@85\$85''&' (&'B\$*#6&:' -8' ##' (%8' %\$&H' #-''&C' %\$&VJ&#,\$&Q&' ()&C' %\$&VJ&#,\$&F12&
	Q&	K^&	T857''*&\$<C#''6\$)&-\$ (5\$ (: \$&*%<\$ (5&H' #-''&C' %\$&VJ&#,\$&R12&
	K&	K&	\--' 6&:"8#) &8-\$&' &<''*\$857''8%75>8#85,5#2&
	T##&	&	3\$ (5\$ (: \$&B' *,\$56&,-8%\$ (\$*' ##6&#': /, (%&' -&<' (6&@%\$, (&A,57&W57,-X&' *8W57\$62X&
	K&	KR&	W3<' #KX&' -&' (\$&'>&<' (6&\$S' <C#\$-&'>857\$&(\$)\$&' '*8%*\$' 5\$*&\$),5,(%2&

&

!