

Constitutional Corner – Fundamental Principles- Republicanism

"Monarchy is a merchantman, which sails well, but will sometimes strike on a rock, and go to the bottom; whilst a republic is a raft, which would never sink, but then your feet are always in water."¹

"A republic, Madam, if you can keep it."²

It is simply amazing to discover how many Americans believe we live in a democracy. Several [You Tube videos](#) demonstrate this widespread belief.

Perhaps the surest proof that we do not live in a democracy is the existence of what we commonly call "Obamacare." If we lived in a democracy the program would never have seen the light of day since polls consistently showed 60%+ of Americans opposed to it when it was being considered in Congress. Another example is homosexual "marriage;" 2-3% of Americans were able to force the re-definition of a millennia-old institution on the remaining 97%. If either proposal had been put to a democratic vote of the people, neither would be with us today. Thirty-one states had, in fact, placed prohibitions on homosexual "marriage" in their statutes or constitutions, most through democratic processes, only to have the court declare such to be "un-constitutional."

Of course, if you define "democracy" in its broadest-possible sense: "government by the people," that's what we have; but that is not the form that our government takes; and certainly the 55 men who spent four long hot months in Philadelphia in 1787 did not believe they were designing a democracy. They had studied the governments of history and uniformly took a dim view of democracies. The colorful Fisher Ames once again:

"A democracy is a volcano which conceals the fiery materials of its own destruction. These will produce an eruption and carry desolation in their way."³

And again:

"The known propensity of a democracy is to licentiousness which the ambitious call, and ignorant believe to be liberty."⁴

Fellow Massachusetts man, John Adams put it this way:

¹ Fisher Ames, as recorded by Ralph Waldo Emerson in "Essays, Second Series," (chapter 7, "Politics," p. 97, 1844; Library of America, 1983).

² Benjamin Franklin, 17 Sept 1787, upon exiting the Constitutional Convention and being asked what form of government the delegates had given us.

³ Speech at the Massachusetts Ratifying Convention, January 15, 1788,

⁴ Ibid.

"Remember democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy yet that did not commit suicide."⁵

Of course, if you are a respected dictionary company and you can't abide the fact that America is not a democracy, you sooth this discomfort by taking the definition of a republic and simply combining it with "democracy." Democracy then becomes:

"A government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections."⁶

But then what is a republic to today's Merriam-Webster?

"A government in which supreme power resides in a body of citizens entitled to vote and is exercised by elected officers and representatives responsible to them and governing according to law."⁷

See what they did there? They took exercising power "indirectly through ... representation" (the primary feature of a republic) and merged it with "directly" exercising power (a democracy). Clever folks. Also, a republic appears to be governed by the rule of law, while a democracy does not. Strange, these dictionary people; they should get out more.

The original 1828 Webster's defines democracy as: "a form of government in which the supreme power is lodged in the hands of the people collectively, or in which the people exercise the powers of legislation;" and a republic as: "a state in which the exercise of the sovereign power is lodged in representatives elected by the people." Much clearer -- and more accurate.

In a true democracy then, the people exert their political power directly, not through representatives. Representatives = a republic.

To be precise, we live in a republic where democratic forms are used to select those who will represent us and, in some states, to enact policy by popular referendum (unless overruled by liberal judges⁸).

The omission of "rule of law" from Merriam-Webster's definition of democracy might not have been an oversight.

⁵ letter to John Taylor, 1814

⁶ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democracy>

⁷ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/republic>

⁸ See the fate of California Proposition 8.

“It has been baldly asserted that in a Democracy, majority rules, whereas in a Republic, Law rules. Consider, in a Democracy, there is no need for a Constitution, since the majority can simply change Law at a whim. In a Republic, there is a Law above the government....”⁹

Alexis De Tocqueville observed that America employed both democratic and republican elements, and that religion had played the major role in their establishment:

"The greatest part of British America was peopled by men who, after having shaken off the authority of the Pope, acknowledged no other religious supremacy: they brought with them into the New World a form of Christianity which I cannot better describe than by styling it a democratic and republican religion. This contributed powerfully to the establishment of a republic and a democracy in public affairs; and from the beginning, politics and religion contracted an alliance which has never been dissolved." ¹⁰ (at least not by 1831 -- that would come later)

But there is more to a republic than how the people’s political power is employed, and that is what we will explore in this essay: republicanism, being “the principles or theory of republican government.”¹¹ These principles were instrumental in allowing the fledgling American Republic to flourish and grow to become the leading nation on our planet, and such a beacon of freedom and opportunity that thousands seek to gain entrance each year, legally and illegally.

Having just separated themselves from a hereditary and, to their view, tyrannical monarchy, the Framers wanted instead a covenantal government, one of compact and consent, one where the rights of the minority would be upheld despite the whims of the majority. The word “Federal” derives from “foedus” the Latin word for “covenant.” And so our “Federal” government today is one of covenant or agreement of the people.

The Hebrew Republic provided the Framers with a useful model. To understand the similarities and differences between the Hebrew and American Republics, I recommend: “The Roots of the American Republic,” by Rev. E. C. Wines.¹² Other republics of old were studied as well.

While John Adams saw a tendency for democracies to “commit suicide,” many today believe our American republic is bent on doing the same. Several books make a compelling case.¹³ But

⁹ Scott Whiteman, “What is a Republic Anyway” found at <http://www.theamericanview.com/constitution-course-supplemental-assignments/what-is-a-republic-anyway/>

¹⁰ Democracy in America

¹¹ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/republicanism>

¹² Rev. E. C. Wines, “The Roots of the American Republic,” 1997, Plymouth Rock Foundation.

before we try for an “intervention,” if we are to restore the American republic to its original, vibrant form, it is we best know what features it includes (or included).

What features make a republic?

Since dictionary definitions are a bit sparse, we’ll have to look elsewhere to discern the features of a republic. One source is an essay by Scott Whiteman entitled: “What is a Republic Anyway?” Whiteman writes:

“According to The Federalist [Papers] there are seven essential characteristics of our Republic. In the American Republic, as instituted, there was government:

1. With a Separation of Powers; (Federalist No. 9, 47, 28, 76)
2. By officers governing during a term
 - a. of limited time and/or
 - b. during good behaviour; (Nos. 9, 39)
3. By deputies of their own election; (Nos. 9, 39)
4. Wherein the power resides originally in the People; (No. 39)
5. That is deliberative in action; (No. 71)
6. That acknowledges the right of the people to alter or abolish the government whenever it becomes destructive toward the ends for which it was instituted; (No. 78)
7. That prohibits further grants of entitlement or nobility; (No. 84)”¹⁴

These were Madison’s (Nos. 39 and 47) and Hamilton’s (Nos. 9, 28, 71, 76, 78 and 84) views of the characteristics of a republic. There were others.

“The true foundation of republican government is the equal right of every citizen in his person and property, and in their management.” Thomas Jefferson¹⁵

To what extent is this true of America today? Can Americans really manage their person and property without interference by our government? Certainly not as much as they could in 1790.

We will return to this list of seven attributes of a republic in a moment when we assess the “health” of ours, but first there are other ingredients to explore.

¹³ For starters, see “America's Suicide” by Michael H. Davison, 2014; and “National Suicide-How Washington is Destroying the American Dream From A to Z” by Martin L. Gross, 2009; and “Plundered, How Progressive Ideology Is Destroying America” by Michael S. Coffman, 2012.

¹⁴ Scott Whiteman.

¹⁵ Letter to Samuel Kercheval, July 12, 1816

"Public virtue cannot exist in a nation without private, and public virtue is the only foundation of republics. There must be a positive passion for the public good, the public interest, honour, power and glory, established in the minds of the people, or there can be no republican government, nor any real liberty: and this public passion must be superiour to all private passions." John Adams¹⁶
(Emphasis added)

Public virtue? The only foundation of a republic? Many Americans today would have trouble defining the word "virtue;" it is a word not much in common use. Nevertheless, evidence of public virtue can be found in adherence to the rule of law, in our willingness to self-govern and act for the common good. Here's a test: next time you enter or exit an interstate highway, count the number of people who simply could not wait to get to a proper trash can to discard their drink cup or drive-through lunch bag, whose idea of virtue is having someone else clean up after them.

Another view of the role of virtue comes from the eminent jurist Joseph Story:

"Republics are created by the virtue, public spirit, and intelligence of the citizens. They fall, when the wise are banished from the public councils, because they dare to be honest, and the profligate are rewarded, because they flatter the people, in order to betray them."¹⁷

So, virtue finds its way into the voting booth, or should. Sam Adams wrote:

"Let each citizen remember at the moment he is offering his vote that he is not making a present or a compliment to please an individual - or at least that he ought not so to do; but that he is executing one of the most solemn trusts in human society for which he is accountable to God and his country."¹⁸

Noah Webster had a similar thought:

"When you become entitled to exercise the right of voting for public officers, let it be impressed on your mind that God commands you to choose for rulers 'just men who will rule in the fear of God.' The preservation of a republican government depends on the faithful [i.e., virtuous] discharge of this duty."¹⁹

This "faithful discharge" was important because:

¹⁶ letter to Mercy Warren, 1776.

¹⁷ Commentaries on the Constitution, 1833.

¹⁸ Samuel Adams, in the Boston Gazette, 1781

¹⁹ History of the United States, 1832

"Men in republics are as wicked, as selfish as in monarchies, and with far more power to introduce disorders, both into legislation and into the administration of the laws." Noah Webster²⁰

A final view of the role of virtue in the maintenance of a republic comes from Declaration of Independence signer, the Rev. John Witherspoon:

"In free States where the body of the people have the supreme power properly in their own hands and must be ultimately resorted to on all great matters if there be a general corruption of manners, there can be nothing but confusion. So true is this that civil liberty cannot long be preserved without virtue. A monarchy may subsist for ages, and be better or worse under a good or bad prince; but a republic once equally poised must either preserve its virtue or lose its liberty."

Jefferson hoped the American people would remain virtuous.²¹ But Thomas Paine saw a problem: virtue was not hereditary.²²

Hamilton believed that prosperity could eventually lead to our downfall.

"As riches increase and accumulate in few hands, as luxury prevails in society, virtue will be in a greater degree considered as only a graceful appendage of wealth, and the tendency of things will be to depart from the republican standard. This is the real disposition of human nature...; it is a common misfortune that awaits our State constitution, as well as all others."²³

If virtue is so critical to the success of a republic, how can virtue be inculcated among the people? Benjamin Rush saw the Christian religion as playing the critical role:

"The only foundation for a useful education in a republic is to be laid in religion (which to the evangelical Dr. Rush meant Christianity). Without this there can be no virtue, and without virtue there can be no liberty, and liberty is the object and life of all republican governments."

Noah Webster took a similar view:

²⁰ Letters to a Young Gentleman Commencing His Education.

²¹ "My confidence is that there will for a long time be virtue and good sense enough in our countrymen to correct abuses." In a letter to Edward Rutledge, 1788.

²² "When we are planning for posterity, we ought to remember that virtue is not hereditary." In Common Sense, 1776

²³ In a speech to the New York Ratifying Convention, July 1788.

"Our citizens should early understand that the genuine source of correct republican principles is the Bible, particularly the New Testament, or the Christian religion." Noah Webster²⁴

Alas, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"²⁵

Continuing this archeology project, searching for the roots of our republic, we find others besides virtue:

"In republican government, the legislative authority necessarily predominates. The remedy for this inconveniency is to divide the legislature into different branches; and to render them, by different modes of election and different principles of action, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions and their common dependence on society will admit." James Madison²⁶

In other words: separation of powers and checks and balances.

This will come as a shock to some, but the Executive was not seen by the Framers as the most powerful branch of government in a republic; it was the Legislature. The Legislature was to be the "center of gravity" of the government (to put it in military terms). The President was to set foreign policy, negotiate treaties (with the concurrence of the Senate), appoint judges and senior officers (again, with concurrence of the Senate), command the military (once Congress declared war), and faithfully execute the laws - that was about it. Oh, and once a year let Congress know the "state of the union."

Notice in the preceding quote that Madison sees "checks and balances" operating even within the legislative branch. The legislature was also divided into "different branches" and disconnected from each other "by different modes of election and different principles of action." We abandoned this principle of republicanism with the 17th Amendment. Now the Senate and the House, except for terms of office, are little different from one another. Previously, Senators acted on behalf of the State governments which appointed them. Now they act "on behalf of the people" who elect them, just as do Representatives – in theory. In practice, both act on behalf of the corporate interests who fund their re-election campaigns.

Another principle of republicanism was set forth by Thomas Jefferson:

²⁴ History of the United States, 1832.

²⁵ Psalm 11:3, (KJV)

²⁶ Federalist 51

"I ... place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared."²⁷

Economy of activity, economy of spending; these were features of republicanism. Our astronomical public debt today threatens our republic as much as our loss of public virtue, and, in my view, owes its very existence to the weakening of that same virtue. In another letter, Jefferson said:

"If the debt should once more be swelled to a formidable size, its entire discharge will be despaired of, and we shall be committed to the English career of debt, corruption and rottenness, closing with revolution."²⁸

Thomas Paine added:

"[A]s we are running the next generation into debt, we ought to do the work of it, otherwise we use them meanly and pitifully."²⁹

Are we still a republic?

Jay Cost, in "[A Republic No More](#)" says no! Cost argues that the design of government is more important than the virtue of the people and "[g]eneration after generation has altered the design in subtle but important ways without considering the effect on the broader schema." "The Constitution's checks and balances have broken down because the institutions created in 1787 cannot exercise responsibly the powers of our sprawling, immense twenty-first century government." "[C]onservatives complain about corruption that favors the Democratic Party; liberals about corruption that favors the Republican Party; and neither side seems able to see that they are in fact complaining about the same things!"

In my view, we have not yet lost the republic, but it is slowly but surely slipping away.

Since we began with a list of republican features from the Federalist, let us take an assessment of those seven principles as they operate today.

1. Separation of Powers.

We retain some of the form of separation of powers elucidated in the Constitution but much of this principle's strength has been eroded, first by the improper and unconstitutional delegation of legislative power to the Executive Branch, next by the all-too-frequent "legislating from the bench" in the Judiciary and third, by improper "Executive Orders" of the President.

²⁷ Letter to William Plumer, 1816

²⁸ to Albert Gallatin, 11 October 1809

²⁹ Common Sense, 1776

When Congress passes unnecessarily vague bills and asks Executive agencies to, essentially, “fill in the details,” the Congress acts arbitrarily and unconstitutionally. Nowhere in the Constitution do “We the People” provide Congress the authority to delegate its legislative responsibility. The words: “All legislative power herein granted is vested in a Congress...” were chosen with care, and mean what they say; “rules” promulgated by Executive agencies with the force of law are not constitutional and, if the Founders are to be believed, void and of no effect.³⁰

In addition, for Congress to establish a court system within an Executive agency is another violation of the separation of powers principle,³¹ for then the agency takes on all three functions of government unto itself -- executive, legislative and judicial -- obliterating the separation of powers doctrine. [Tax Courts](#), [EPA Court](#), [FTC Courts](#) all violate this principle. [Wikipedia](#) lists 34 federal agencies that maintain Administrative Law Judges/Courts.

Going hand-in-hand with “separation of powers” is “checks and balances.” This is not working as well as it should either.

This president has earned impeachment, as have other senior officials of this administration, yet this “check” on the executive will not be used by the Congress due to the political fallout it could produce. The American people do not understand their Constitution, they have no idea how its principles have been offended by the Obama administration, thus they will see impeachment as “schoolyard retribution,” and they will vote a Democrat into office in 2016 out of sympathy. The present Congress understands this and will not act on the impeachment articles that have been introduced.

Although the Congress seems to have recovered their willingness to use the power of the purse as a check, they have allowed too many executive agencies and programs to arise which are self-funded and lie outside normal appropriations, denying Congress their “check.”

Past Supreme Court decisions with which Congress disagreed (ex: [Chisholm v. Georgia](#)) have been effectively overturned through constitutional amendment. This Congress shows no inclination to do likewise.

The Supreme Court has displayed an unwillingness to overturn clearly errant rulings of the past ([Wickard v. Filburn](#), [Hilvering v. Davis](#), etc). Thus we will live forever with these decisions, unless and until the language of the Constitution is rendered unambiguous by amendment.

2. Terms of office.

³⁰ “...whenever the general government assumes undelegated powers, its acts are unauthoritative, void, and of no force.” Thomas Jefferson, draft of the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798.

³¹ Although not in the eyes of the Supreme Court. See *City of Arlington v. FCC*.

With the exception of how our Senators are placed in office (17th Amendment), and the two-term limitation of the President (22nd Amendment), this is one feature of our republic that has remained largely unchanged since 1787. The basic terms of office set in place by the Constitutional Convention remain. What has become a problem is the willingness of the public to return Senators and Congressmen to Washington, ad nauseam. The litmus test seems to be the amount of “federal dollars” (as though that’s where they originate) the Congressman has “brought home.”

When 87-year old [Rep. John Dingell](#) (D-MI) retired in January of this year he had served nearly 60 years in Congress. This longevity would have shocked the Founders, who anticipated that elected officials would, “at fixed periods,” “be reduced to a private station” in order to experience once again “the burdens of the people.”³² Due to the public’s apparent unwillingness to exercise this option, a [term limits amendment](#) to the Constitution has gained support. Despite being introduced multiple times in Congress, it is unlikely to ever be passed and sent to the states for ratification. If such an amendment is to ever see the light of day, an Article V convention, requested by the states, is the only approach with any chance of success.

Similarly, there is mounting support to include federal judges, including Supreme Court Justices, in any term limits amendment. Forty and even fifty years of service [are not uncommon](#) on the high bench. Justice [William O. Douglas](#), who found a right to privacy lurking in “emanations from penumbras” of the Constitution³³ and who survived not one but two impeachment attempts, holds the record at 36 years, 7+ months of active service. Some look at this length of service with pride, I view it with dismay.

3. Deputies of their own election

When only 36.4% of the voting age population actually votes (2014 mid-term election) it is difficult to view the result, “deputies of their own election,” with a straight face. Add to this the low intelligence and forethought many voters bring to the process and you can see why the nation is in trouble (remember that “virtue” thingy?). We’ve already seen how the Founders viewed voting as a solemn responsibility of citizenship, with your vote accountable to God. They thought the success of the republic rested on virtuous use of the ballot box.

"[I]f the citizens neglect their duty and place unprincipled men in office, the government will soon be corrupted. ... If a republican government fails to secure

³² Virginia Declaration of Rights, Section 5, found at: http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/virginia_declaration_of_rights.html

³³ Griswold v. Connecticut, 1965.

public prosperity and happiness, it must be because the citizens neglect the Divine commands, and elect bad men to make and administer the laws."³⁴

Would that people view it that way today. I like the approach of political humorist P. J. O'Rourke:

"Every vote should carry a serial number, so that responsibility for harmful or careless use of the vote can be traced."³⁵

4. The power resides originally in the People

We covered this feature of republicanism thoroughly last week. Many today have forgotten this fact, they think government is powerful just because that's the nature of things.

5. Deliberative in action

There has never been a Congress un-impeded by partisan politics, and there likely never will be. Even the First Congress pitted the Federalists against those Anti-Federalists fortunate enough to get elected. And when Jefferson and Madison's Democratic-Republican Party was formed in 1794, true "deliberative action" took a backseat to party politics.

Although Madison clearly saw the harmful effects of "faction," he thought that in a country so large as the United States there would be a sufficient number of factions to keep any from dominating the political process. While we have many factions today, we have nevertheless become a two-party system, with the power traded back and forth every so many years. The Senate, with its "Cloture Rule" maintains a semblance of deliberative action, nevertheless still spoiled by partisanship.

6. The right of the people to alter or abolish the government

This is the feature of republicanism that simultaneously gives me greatest hope and greatest fear. At what point is Jefferson's "light and transient causes" threshold breached? Locke and others before him confirmed this to be a right of the people. The hope comes from the possibility of an Article V convention. Opponents of a convention cry that a whole new Constitution could result. So, what's your point? I think our present Constitution is just fine if we could somehow return it to its original meaning; but if the American people want a brand new Constitution, who is to stop them, on what grounds? While any recommendations of an Article V convention must still be ratified by $\frac{3}{4}$ of the states, if, somehow, a totally new Constitution were to emerge from a convention and were to be ratified by $\frac{3}{4}$ of the states (Congress would surely insist on conventions as the ratification method), are Article V

³⁴ History of the United States, Noah Webster, 1832.

³⁵ http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/p/pjorour617508.html?src=t_voting

opponents suggesting that “We the People” lack the power and intelligence to determine what’s best for us and our posterity? Even if the output of an amendment convention fails ratification, the fifty ratifying conventions would initiate the greatest “schoolhouse on government” the public has ever seen.

What I see lurking in the comments of those opposed to an Article V convention is Constitution-worship, the idea that somehow our present Constitution was inspired by God, and to mess with it will somehow invoke His wrath.

Our present Constitution represents the best efforts of 55 amazingly smart but fallible men. They were all students of government, but what emerged on September 17, 1787, was the best of many compromises, and it would take 27 Amendments (so far) to straighten out some of its “failings” (not all amendments were improvements).

Alexander Hamilton³⁶ and Ben Franklin³⁷ both thought the document inspired, Benjamin Rush³⁸ did not. To lose this document would be tragic, but would not signal the end of the world as we know it.

My fear comes from the belief that if we do not show, soon, that measured changes can be safely made to the Constitution, our republic will continue to deteriorate to the point where “Jefferson’s Option,” as it is sometimes called, appears as the best, perhaps the only option.

The Constitution must be open to further amendment, particularly amendments which serve to reduce the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, impose fiscal restraints on that government, or emplace limits on the terms of its officials. We must also return its meaning to the original, and unless the Supreme Court is willing to reverse previous rulings, the only remaining avenue is to amend the ambiguous language in key clauses. Thanks to George Mason, the people have as much right as Congress to propose these changes.

7. Prohibiting grants of entitlement or nobility

³⁶ "For my own part, I sincerely esteem it [the Constitution] a system which without the finger of God, never could have been suggested and agreed upon by such a diversity of interests." Hamilton, thought to be writing as “Caesar” in the New York Daily Advertiser on October 17, 1787.

³⁷ "I beg I may not be understood to infer, that our general Convention was divinely inspired when it form'd the new federal Constitution...yet I must own I have so much faith in the general government of the world by Providence, that I can hardly conceive a transaction of such momentous importance to the welfare of millions now existing, and to exist in the posterity of a great nation, should be suffered to pass without being in some degree influenc'd, guided and governed by that omnipotent, omnipresent Beneficent Ruler, in whom all inferior spirits live & move and have their being." Ben Franklin in the Federal Gazette, April 8, 1788.

³⁸ "I do not believe that the Constitution was the offspring of inspiration, but I am as perfectly satisfied that the Union of the States in its form and adoption is as much the work of a Divine Providence as any of the miracles recorded in the Old and New Testament." Benjamin Rush In letter to Elias Boundinot on July 9, 1788.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution reads:

“No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.”

To strengthen this provision in the Constitution, the 11th Congress approved a [Titles of Nobility Amendment](#) on May 1, 1810 and submitted it to the state legislatures for ratification. It would strip United States citizenship from any citizen who accepted a title of nobility from a foreign country. The amendment appears to have been thought ratified by some states (Virginia for one, even after rejecting it themselves) and the amendment was included in some printed copies of the Constitution at the time, but then quietly removed. The official record shows it came within two states of being ratified at the time. It would require 26 more ratifications today.

How can we return to a true constitutional republic?

I wish there were time to consider this question in detail; perhaps a future essay. There are several great books I can recommend: “Restoring America, One County at a Time” by Joel McDurmon, among the very best. “Restoring the Lost Constitution” by Randy Barnett also deserves your attention. There are, however, similar books written by liberals, such as “Restoration of the Republic” by former Senator Gary Hart. Hart believes “the equitable distribution of national revenues to achieve [economic justice], need not and should not be relaxed in an effort to revitalize the republic.”³⁹

A republic may not be a perfect form of government, but it beats whatever is in second place by a long shot. John Dickinson warned the delegates of 1787 to keep the long view.⁴⁰ They did; but I think they underestimated the damage that could be caused by a decadent people and designing men. Look around the world and find a country where the citizens have as much freedom and liberty as those of the United States. You will be hard pressed to do so, but if you do, you will find it is built upon a republic, a form of government that must be preserved or the “blessings of liberty” will not remain secure for “ourselves and our posterity.”

“Constitutional Corner” is a project of the Constitution Leadership Initiative, Inc. To unsubscribe from future mailings by Constitution Leadership Initiative, [click here](#).

³⁹ Gary Hart, “Restoration of the Republic,” Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 8.

⁴⁰ “We are not forming plans for a Day Month Year or Age, but for Eternity.”