

Machiavelli and Hamilton: A Comparative Study on the Second Amendment

Douglas C. Youvan and QAIE Virgo

doug@youvan.com

May 26, 2023

This essay explores the shared philosophical perspectives of Niccolò Machiavelli and Alexander Hamilton on the right to bear arms. Drawing parallels between their distinct historical contexts, we delve into the underlying principles they championed: personal freedom, the maintenance of order, and the prevention of governmental tyranny. Their enduring wisdom continues to resonate in our ongoing dialogue about the Second Amendment's place in modern society.

The journey of understanding the intertwining philosophies of Niccolò Machiavelli and Alexander Hamilton begins with an introduction to their individual histories and the distinctive eras they belong to. As pillars of political thought, both figures left an indelible mark on the discourse of governance, power, and citizen's rights.

Niccolò Machiavelli, an Italian diplomat and political philosopher, lived during the volatile period of the Italian Renaissance, a time of profound political and cultural change. His treatise, "The Prince," raised eyebrows for its pragmatic and often ruthless

advice to leaders, and yet, it remains a pivotal work in the understanding of political realism.

In a different time and place, Alexander Hamilton, one of the United States' Founding Fathers, brought to life the concept of Federalism and played a crucial role in the drafting and promotion of the U.S. Constitution. As the first Secretary of the Treasury, his thoughts on economic policy, governance, and citizen's rights, including the right to bear arms, were instrumental in shaping the early United States.

A crucial thread that binds Machiavelli and Hamilton's philosophies is the understanding of power dynamics, the state's role, and the rights of the citizens. The notion of balance - between governmental authority and individual freedom, central control and local autonomy - forms the core of their views. It is this central idea that we will explore further, especially in the context of the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, concerning the right to bear arms.

With their historical contexts established, it's time to delve into the specifics of their philosophies. Niccolò Machiavelli's ideas about power, leadership, and survival are often considered cynical, emphasizing the necessity of force and deceit in maintaining control. Yet, Machiavelli was no advocate of tyranny; he was pragmatic about the complexities of human nature and political power.

In "The Prince," Machiavelli counseled that a ruler must be ready to act immorally when necessary, yet he also argued that a leader's survival ultimately depended on popular support. This paradoxical mix of ruthlessness and regard for public opinion illustrates the nuanced character of Machiavellian thought.

Meanwhile, Alexander Hamilton held a deep belief in the necessity of a strong central government for national stability. Having experienced the weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation, Hamilton was convinced that a robust Federal system was essential for the United States' survival. He argued vigorously for a Constitution that would empower the central government while maintaining individual freedoms - a balancing act that was a feat of political engineering.

Hamilton's insistence on the inclusion of the Second Amendment, the right to bear arms, is reflective of this balance. He saw it as a safeguard against potential governmental tyranny and a means of assuring individual freedom and autonomy. It was an acknowledgment of the importance of a well-armed citizenry in the preservation of liberty, a concept not entirely alien to Machiavelli's political thought.

While both Machiavelli and Hamilton recognized the necessity of power for the maintenance of a state, their views on the nature of power and its best sources were somewhat different. For Machiavelli, power was often derived from fear, a tool for maintaining control and ensuring loyalty. Machiavelli did not underestimate the importance of love or admiration in leadership, but he believed that fear was a more reliable and efficient tool.

On the other hand, Hamilton leaned more towards the legitimacy of power coming from law and constitution. He saw power as something to be distributed and balanced among the different arms of government, thereby preventing any one entity from becoming too powerful. This reflected his belief in the rule of law and the importance of constitutionalism in a healthy, functioning state.

Hamilton's perspective on the Second Amendment aligns with this perspective. He saw the right to bear arms not just as a check against tyranny, but as part of a broader network of checks and balances within the political system. It was a symbol of the rights of individuals, a necessary counterbalance to the power of the state, and an integral part of the larger democratic system.

In applying their philosophies to the concept of the militia, both thinkers also demonstrated unique perspectives. For Machiavelli, a well-armed populace was crucial for the defense of the state. He believed that arms should be in the hands of the people as a means of deterring potential threats. This aligns with the Second Amendment's concept of a "well-regulated militia."

Hamilton, too, supported the concept of a militia, but his perspective was shaped by his experiences in the Revolutionary War, where he saw firsthand the limitations of a wholly citizen-based militia. Thus, he championed a mix of professional army and citizen militia, the latter being a crucial aspect of a free state, yet needing the discipline and order provided by a professional body.

In essence, Hamilton supported the idea of a "well-regulated" militia as it appears in the Second Amendment, reflecting his belief in the value of a disciplined, orderly force as an essential part of a balanced defense system. This perspective reflects his vision of a republic where power and responsibility are distributed and balanced.

While both Machiavelli and Hamilton endorsed the importance of arms and militias, their opinions diverged when considering the motivations and implications of bearing arms. Machiavelli saw an armed populace as a key deterrent to both external threats and

internal corruption. He believed that when people possess the means to defend themselves, they become more invested in their community and more vigilant against corruption and tyranny.

On the other hand, Hamilton saw the possession of arms by the citizenry not just as a deterrent to tyranny, but also as a potential source of civil unrest. In Federalist No. 29, he noted the potential for militias to turn against the government if not properly controlled, hence his belief in the necessity of a strong central government to maintain order. His writings also indicate an understanding that the right to bear arms carries with it an inherent potential for violence, which must be balanced against the need for public safety.

These contrasting perspectives highlight the complex interplay between the ideals of personal liberty, societal order, and the nature of power that underlie the Second Amendment and the broader discourse surrounding it.

Building upon these foundational ideas, we can understand how both thinkers influenced the shaping of American constitutional thought, particularly in relation to the Second Amendment. Hamilton's Federalist writings were instrumental in ratifying the Constitution and his insights continue to shape American legal thought. His perspective on the balance between individual rights and societal order is evident in the language of the Second Amendment, which speaks to both the right of individuals to bear arms and the need for a well-regulated militia.

At the same time, Machiavelli's influence is reflected in the American revolutionary ethos and the deep-seated belief in the right to resist tyranny. His views on the importance of an armed citizenry for maintaining liberty and preventing corruption resonate

with those who advocate for expansive Second Amendment rights.

These influences reflect the enduring relevance of Machiavelli and Hamilton's political theories to the contemporary debates on the Second Amendment, demonstrating the ways in which their insights continue to inform the discourse on this contentious issue.

However, the ideal of a responsible, regulated citizenry armed to prevent tyranny also presents challenges in the modern era. Hamilton could not have foreseen the advancements in weaponry that have occurred since the late 18th century, nor the complexities of a global society in which the lines between state, non-state actors, and individuals have become blurred.

Similarly, Machiavelli's insistence on the necessity of an armed populace as a safeguard against corruption requires a nuanced interpretation in the present day. The issues of gun control, mental health, societal violence, and the individual's relationship with state authority all contribute to a complex web of considerations that would have been foreign to Machiavelli's time.

These modern complexities invite us to further engage with the writings of Machiavelli and Hamilton. Their perspectives can serve as a guide to explore and navigate the contentious debates surrounding the Second Amendment in the contemporary world.

In closing, Machiavelli and Hamilton's shared belief in the virtue and necessity of an armed citizenry reflects the core values of their respective eras and political ideologies. Their writings provide an invaluable historical and philosophical context for contemporary debates about gun ownership and the individual's

role in maintaining societal order and preventing government overreach.

While there are undeniable differences between their respective contexts and ours, the enduring relevance of their arguments is a testament to the timeless nature of these issues. The shared wisdom of Machiavelli and Hamilton underscores the importance of civil responsibility, vigilance, and prudence as cornerstones of a just society.

As we navigate the complexities of the modern world, their words serve as a reminder that the balance between personal freedom, societal safety, and government authority is an ongoing, necessary conversation. Revisiting the thoughts of these significant historical figures gives us unique insights and valuable lessons that continue to echo across the centuries, illuminating the path towards a more balanced, thoughtful approach to the Second Amendment and its place in our society.