

The Great Secrecy NDA: How the Founding Fathers Never Made It to the Constitution

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

April 12, 2024

In an alternate universe where the U.S. Constitutional Convention of 1787 is dominated not by debates over states' rights or executive power, but by a contentious Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA), what would have become of American democracy? "The Great Secrecy NDA: How the Founding Fathers Never Made It to the Constitution" explores this satirical scenario. This narrative reimagines the founding fathers—figures like George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison—caught in a quagmire of secrecy before they could draft the Constitution. As they deliberate over whether to sign this anachronistic document, the essential values of transparency and public discourse are overshadowed by absurd secrecy. Through a blend of historical humor and sharp political critique, this paper highlights how minor procedural distractions can derail significant democratic processes. It serves as a poignant reminder of the perils that secrecy and procedural overreach pose to governance, urging a return to openness as a fundamental democratic principle.

Keywords: U.S. Constitutional Convention, Non-Disclosure Agreement, Founding Fathers, democracy, political satire, governmental secrecy, transparency, historical humor, political critique, procedural distractions.

Introduction

The United States Constitution stands as one of the seminal documents in the history of democratic governance, a beacon of the Enlightenment's ideals distilled into a guiding framework for a burgeoning nation. Its creation, during the summer of 1787 in Philadelphia, was a confluence of philosophical innovation and pragmatic statesmanship. This revered document not only delineated the architecture of the U.S. government but also embedded the fundamental principles of liberty, justice, and equality into the American psyche. Its importance and sanctity are undisputed, echoing through centuries as both an aspiration and a legal foundation.

However, imagine a parallel universe where this sacred gathering took a detour into the realm of the absurd. Picture our Founding Fathers—visionaries like George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison—poised to draft this monumental document but suddenly entangled in a preposterous predicament: a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA). Before a single word of the Constitution could be penned, they find themselves mired in a fierce debate over whether to sign this anachronistic document, designed to keep their deliberations utterly secret.

This paper explores the absurdity of excessive secrecy in modern politics through a historical parody. By reimagining the Constitutional Convention as a farcical standoff over an NDA, we delve into a satirical critique of contemporary political maneuvers where secrecy often overshadows substance. The scenario serves not only as a mirror reflecting today's political follies but also as a lens magnifying the implications of prioritizing confidentiality over crucial public discourse. Through this playful yet poignant exploration, we aim to underscore the contrast between the openness intended in the founding of American democracy and the often-opaque practices in today's political landscape.

Setting the Stage

Philadelphia, 1787—this historic city buzzes with anticipation as it hosts a gathering destined to shape the future of a nation. Inside the sweltering chamber of Independence Hall, thick with the heat of a summer's day and the heavier atmosphere of revolutionary zeal, the Constitutional Convention is about to commence. The room is arranged with tables in a semi-circle, quills and parchment ready for the creation of a document that promises to be the foundation of governance for the new republic. Outside, the streets are abuzz with traders, townsfolk, and the occasional crier speculating on the monumental decisions taking place behind the hall's closed doors.

Into this setting stride the characters of our farce—figures of monumental historical stature, now imbued with quirks that echo the eccentricities of modern political figures. George Washington, presiding over the Convention, carries the grave demeanor of a man accustomed to command, yet in this tale, he is overly cautious, constantly wary of stepping on the proverbial cracks that might fracture his carefully curated public image. Benjamin Franklin, the eldest and perhaps the wittiest, brings a sharp tongue and a sharper pen, occasionally letting slip references to his international escapades and penchant for secret diplomacy. James Madison, meanwhile, is portrayed as a fastidious note-taker, always drafting, redrafting, and worried about leaks of his prolific documentation.

As these luminaries gather, ready to embark on their historic task, a courier interrupts the proceedings. He delivers a hefty, sealed document, not the expected supplies of ink or additional parchment, but something wholly unexpected—an NDA. The parchment crackles as it is unrolled, the header flamboyantly declaring it a "Binding Document of Secrecy." The room falls into an uneasy silence as the implications sink in.

The arrival of this mysterious document sets the stage for the unfolding drama. Meant to secure the confidentiality of their revolutionary ideas, the NDA instead introduces a seed of discord among the delegates. Some see

it as a necessary shield against British spies and political saboteurs; others view it as a muzzle meant to stifle the very freedoms they are gathered to ensure. This NDA, absurdly anachronistic yet strikingly familiar to the modern audience, becomes the pivot around which the convention's discussions begin to swirl, turning a straightforward historical event into a comedic yet pointed commentary on the absurdities of political secrecy.

The Debate Over the NDA

As the Non-Disclosure Agreement makes its rounds from one Founding Father to the next, the room becomes a theater of the absurd, with each delegate bringing their own peculiar blend of contemporary and historical concerns to the fore.

George Washington, ever the stoic leader, eyes the document with a blend of suspicion and disdain. He asserts that a leader must have the trust of his people, and whispers loudly enough for all to hear, "I cannot tell a lie... but perhaps I shouldn't tell anything at all if this is to be signed." He hesitates, claiming he must first consult with his wooden teeth, which, rumor has it, have an uncanny knack for sniffing out trouble and deceit.

Benjamin Franklin, with a twinkle in his eye, raises a concern about the potential leak of his latest invention—the bifocals, and his still-secret experiments with electricity. "Imagine," he jests, "if the details of my kite experiment were to shock the world prematurely!" His argument is a thinly veiled satire on the ridiculous lengths to which modern politicians go to secure their personal communications and projects.

James Madison, the intellectual, strokes his chin, pondering the philosophical implications of such secrecy. "If a tree falls in the forest and no one is around to hear it, does it make a sound? If a constitution is drafted in secrecy, is it truly democratic?" His questions resonate deeply,

highlighting the absurdity of excessive confidentiality in a process meant to lay down the very laws of a free and open society.

The debate intensifies as more Founding Fathers chime in:

- **Alexander Hamilton** wryly suggests that the financial dealings of the treasury should certainly be kept under wraps, lest his adversaries use the information against him in the press—an obvious nod to contemporary concerns about financial transparency in politics.
- **Thomas Jefferson**, an advocate for the yeoman farmer, humorously posits that his detailed notes on crop rotation and the design of the plow should be classified to protect the agrarian secrets of the young republic.

The discussion escalates into a riotous affair as the delegates begin to suggest ever more ludicrous secrets that the NDA must protect:

- **Franklin** declares that the actual recipe for his famous Pennsylvania stew must remain a secret, lest the British attempt to replicate its comforting properties to pacify their own discontented masses.
- **Madison** argues that the detailed blueprints of Montpelier's architecture should be kept secret to prevent any architectural espionage that might compromise the aesthetic supremacy of American democracy.

As each Founding Father debates the merit and folly of the NDA with arguments blending real concerns with comical exaggerations, the room becomes a mirror reflecting the sometimes farcical nature of modern-day politics where transparency often takes a back seat to the perceived need for secrecy. The absurdity reaches its peak as someone suggests that perhaps even this very debate should be classified, and the NDA itself becomes a paradoxical point of contention.

Consequences of the Secrecy Standoff

As the debate over the Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) spirals into ever more ludicrous territory, the core objective of the Constitutional Convention—to draft a new framework of government—becomes tragically sidelined. The NDA, initially introduced as a simple procedural document, morphs into a behemoth that dominates discussions, overshadowing the profound task at hand.

The Distraction Takes Center Stage The scene becomes an absurd caricature of modern political meetings where minor procedural issues and legal technicalities often derail substantive policy discussions. As hours turn into days, the Founding Fathers find themselves embroiled in debates over the semantics of secrecy rather than the principles of governance. Franklin quips, “We came here to light the lamp of liberty, not to hide it under a bushel of bureaucracy!” This reflects a biting critique of how today’s legislative processes are bogged down by partisanship and procedural wrangling, often at the expense of actual governance.

The Satirical Reflection of Modern Detours The absurdity of the situation is heightened by the delegates’ increasing fixation on the NDA. They engage in hypothetical scenarios and slippery slope arguments about what disasters might befall the young nation should the slightest details of their deliberations leak. Hamilton, ever the financial mind, suggests that even the brand of tea they drink could become a matter of national security, mocking the modern tendency to inflate the importance of trivial details in political discourse.

The Eclipse of Critical Decision-Making As the standoff continues, the pressing issues of how to balance power between the states, the design of the judicial system, and the rights of individual citizens are all but forgotten. Instead, the hall resounds with arguments over whether the NDA should include clauses about the confidentiality of their wig styles or the exact

recipes for their ale. Jefferson, exasperated, finally stands and dramatically questions, "Are we to be the architects of freedom, or merely the clerks of our own cautiousness?" Madison might lament, "We are here to secure the blessings of liberty, yet we chain ourselves to secrecy and fear."

The Resulting Public Confusion Outside Independence Hall, rumors swirl among the populace. The secrecy and apparent lack of progress feed wild speculations and conspiracy theories, mirroring the confusion and misinformation that often accompany modern political machinations hidden behind closed doors. A satirical newspaper headline might read, "Constitution Delayed: Founding Fathers Too Busy Hiding Secrets to Secure Liberty!"

This section not only underscores the folly seen in the historical parody but also serves as a reflection on the dangers of letting minor issues and secrecy overshadow crucial decision-making processes in modern governance. The consequences are a mix of comedy and tragedy, providing a stark warning against the overuse of secrecy in politics.

A Failed Convention

As the debates over the Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) reach their fever pitch, the Constitutional Convention grinds to an ignominious halt. The expected groundbreaking document, heralded as the dawn of a new democratic era, is stalled indefinitely, tangled in the web of its own secrecy.

Imaginary Fallout Word of the convention's impasse leaks out, despite the irony of the situation given their debates over secrecy. The news spreads like wildfire through the colonies, carried by horseback and shouted across town squares. The headlines in fledgling newspapers scream of the debacle: "Founding Fathers Found Floundering: Constitutional Convention Crumbles Over Confidentiality!" This fictional fallout serves as a sharp critique of how,

even in its infancy, American politics could be imagined as vulnerable to the same trivial disputes that plague it today.

Public Reaction The public reaction is a mix of confusion, humor, and disillusionment. Town criers, the social media influencers of the 18th century, turn the situation into a farce, mocking the revered figures with rhymes like, “They came to pen rights and liberty, but left only with secrets and hypocrisy!” Newspapers, thriving on the sensational, spin wild tales of what secrets might be so vital as to derail the founding of a nation. In taverns and homes, citizens debate heatedly about the implications of such secrecy, with many feeling betrayed by the very figures they hoped would elevate the common good over private interests.

Reflection on Modern Political Communication and Media Portrayal

In today's world, important legislative sessions often devolve into sideshows dominated by minor scandals and procedural deadlocks, while substantive issues go unresolved. The media, both traditional and social, plays a dual role—amplifying important issues but also contributing to the spectacle, often favoring the sensational over the substantive.

The portrayal of the convention's failure acts as a satirical mirror, reflecting how contemporary politics can be bogged down by similar trivialities. It underscores the disconnect between political leaders' preoccupations and the public's needs and expectations. In your narrative, the historical context provides a poignant backdrop for critiquing the often circus-like atmosphere of modern political processes, where transparency is promised but secrecy often prevails.

By imagining such a disastrous outcome from what was historically a successful event, the paper highlights the absurdity and potential consequences of allowing minor, yet highly politicized, issues to overshadow the core objectives of governance. This not only serves as a cautionary tale but also encourages readers to reflect on how much—or how little—has changed in the political landscape over the centuries.

What If They Never Signed the NDA?

Imagine a different turn of events at the pivotal moment in our farcical tale: as the room buzzes with endless debates over the Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA), Thomas Jefferson, portrayed here with a mix of his historical gravitas and a dash of rebel flair, grows increasingly impatient. Amid the cacophony of his peers' arguments, he strides to the center of the room, the NDA in hand. With a dramatic flourish that belies his usually composed demeanor, Jefferson tears the document into pieces, declaring, "We are here not to hide from the truth, but to proclaim it!"

The Courageous Act This act of defiance from Jefferson injects a shock of clarity into the room. His bold move serves as a powerful metaphor for cutting through needless bureaucracy to address the true needs of governance. As the shredded pieces of the NDA flutter to the ground, so too does the pretense of secrecy that had shackled the convention's progress.

The Quick and Efficient Drafting of the Constitution Freed from the constraints of the absurd secrecy pact, the delegates experience a renewed focus. The atmosphere in the room shifts from one of contention to collaboration. Ideas flow freely, unimpeded by the fear of leaks or breaches of confidentiality. The constitutional drafting process, which had been mired in stasis, moves forward with remarkable speed and efficiency.

The contrast is stark. Where there had once been discord and distraction, there is now a concerted effort to lay down the laws that would form the bedrock of the new nation. The Articles of the Constitution are discussed and debated with vigor and earnestness, reflecting the true spirit of democratic engagement that the Founding Fathers intended.

The Message: The Importance of Transparency and Focusing on Real Issues Jefferson's theatrical destruction of the NDA serves as a turning point in our narrative, emphasizing the critical importance of transparency

in governmental proceedings. It highlights how secrecy can often obscure and obstruct the very objectives it purports to protect. The delegates' ability to quickly and effectively draft the Constitution, once freed from the unnecessary secrecy, underscores the message that focusing on substantive issues without the veil of hidden agendas is crucial for true progress.

In this alternate scenario, the successful and expedient drafting of the Constitution becomes a symbolic victory for openness and transparency. It sends a powerful message to both historical and contemporary audiences about the dangers of allowing minor issues and secretive practices to derail significant governmental actions.

By ending the farce with a triumphant return to the founding values of the American democratic experiment, the story not only entertains but also imparts a serious critique of and solution to modern political challenges. It suggests that perhaps the best way forward in any democratic endeavor is not through more walls and curtains, but through windows—clear and open for all to see.

Conclusion

The farcical tale of the Constitutional Convention, derailed by an absurd obsession with a Non-Disclosure Agreement, serves as a potent allegory for the perils of secrecy and distraction in contemporary politics. This narrative, while humorous and exaggerated, underscores serious concerns about how modern political environments often prioritize confidentiality over clarity, and minor procedural issues over substantial policymaking. The image of the Founding Fathers, tangled in disputes over secrecy before they could even draft the Constitution, mirrors the current political landscape where important issues are frequently sidelined by lesser controversies.

The call to action arising from this story is clear: there must be a concerted effort towards more openness in political processes. Governments and political bodies should strive to reduce the focus on protecting non-essential secrets, which can obstruct meaningful discourse and hinder democratic governance. By embracing transparency, we encourage not only a more informed citizenry but also a more accountable government. This story advocates for the dismantling of unnecessary barriers to information and promotes a culture of openness that can lead to more effective and equitable governance.

Moreover, the closing reflection on the scenario presented in the tale—where the drafting of one of the most important documents in human history could have been thwarted by something as trivial as an NDA—invites readers to ponder the irony and the lessons therein. It highlights the absurdity that can result when secrecy is allowed to dominate over the fundamental goals of any institution, particularly those in public service. This reflection serves as a sobering reminder of the need to continually evaluate and challenge the processes that shape our political systems, ensuring they remain true to the principles of openness and public service.

Ultimately, this paper does not just entertain with a whimsical "what if" scenario; it also provokes serious consideration of our current political climate. It uses the past as a lens through which we can examine present challenges, urging a return to the core values of transparency and forthright discourse that should define any democratic society. In doing so, it serves as a call to action for all those engaged in or affected by political processes to advocate for less secrecy and more substance in governmental affairs.

