

## The Three Federal Populations - Retrospective Detail

By Anna Von Reitz



I am forwarding a pdf copy of the Georgetown Law Review, November, 1912, and directing your attention to the first article by Hannis Taylor.

<https://annavonreitz.com/georgetownlawjournal.pdf>

Please consider that unique work by Pelatiah Webster, The Constitution for the united States of America adopted in 1787 and resulting in what would later be termed, the Federal Constitution, or, The Constitution of the United States (old language conventions apply here with "the United States" then being synonymous with The United States as defined in 1851).

Most Americans have heard vaguely of "the Federal Constitution" and "the Federal Republic" but even in 1912 during a review celebrating the 125th Anniversary of this key document, people writing for the Georgetown Law Journal had lost track of the actual name of the Constitution being celebrated and were ignorant of the 1851 change in style conventions, too.

The less favored in society are left to suppose, erroneously, that Pelatiah Webster's famous work was the same as The Constitution of the United States that we see published under that name [today](#) by the Municipal Government in Washington, DC.

What a comedy of errors promulgating more errors.

Even in 1912, more than a hundred years ago, nobody remembered the actual architect of the 1787 Constitution, and nobody remembered the style convention changes of 1851, either, so we wind up talking about "the Constitution" and don't even know the actual name of the document or the identity and nature of the political body that issued it.

This country is well and truly lost, if a mammoth effort of self-education is not made.

The Federal Constitution issued in 1787 was titled The Constitution for the united States of America --note the use of the word "for" which is unique and the use of the word "united" as an adjective written in small case letters.

This was a second run at crafting a Constitution for the Confederation of States doing business as the States of America. The original effort, The Articles of Confederation, begun in [January 1777](#) and ratified in 1781, left much to be desired.

The States of America was a doing-business-as name of the original Union nation-states, which joined their individual State of State organizations into a Confederation with the intention of leveraging their mutual economic and trade interests in international and global jurisdictions.

It was this Confederation of State of State business organizations that operated the American Federal Services Contractor known as the Federal Republic from 1787 to [April 15th 1861](#), and which provided the bulk of all Federal Government services during that time period.

It was this Confederation that was rendered inoperable for lack of a quorum when the seven Southern States walked out and left it without a date set to reconvene, [April 1st 1861](#).

Within days, and despite Lincoln's Inaugural Address in which he declared that changing the institution of slavery in the Southern States was not his intention little more than a month prior, our country was plunged into an illegal Mercenary Conflict euphemistically called The American Civil War.

It was the break-down of the Confederation operating under Pelatiah Webster's brainchild, The Constitution for the united States of America, that led to the spin-off Confederate States of America, which proposed to bargain independently for their trade relationships and commercial contracts.

The intent of The Articles of Confederation was to form a "perpetual union" of the business interests of the States joined together as a single economic power. Pelatiah Webster's new Constitution first published for discussion on [February 16, 1783](#).

The Confederation operating as the Federal Republic was so far successful in applying the mutual economic and trade powers of the States that by the 1850's the United Kingdom and most of Europe was frightened of this new world economic power.

In unity was our safety and our strength in dealing with the rest of the world, but disagreements about economic priorities and policies between the industrialized North and agricultural South found their breaking point.

Looking back with 20/20 hindsight it seems that there were many possible solutions short of going to war, chief among them the Federation of States' desire to simply buy all the plantation slaves and set them free. This was what was done in England and other European countries. Why not America?

As The Articles of Confederation were already bypassed in 1787, together with the "perpetual union" clause, there was nothing so wrong with the industrialized North tending to its knitting

and allowing the Southern States to do the same. They could have simply split into two camps and negotiated separate trade agreements.

Why didn't they?

The most likely reason is that slavery was a much bigger issue than the General Public knew, and it was not an issue of only Southern economics, or injustice, or the repugnance of elitist claptrap.

No, slavery has a much deeper and darker history---and profitability for both North and South was at stake. More to come regarding that snippet of additional history you never knew and the Dutch Government's complicity in it all.

-----  
See this article and over 4300 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website.