

## **E Pluribus Unum**

### ***A warning and admonition to the People of America.***

*E Pluribus Unum.* To proclaim this statement is to speak the words that unite a nation. The words echo entreatingly, reverberating with an intensity that matches the weight they carry. As the echoes slowly dissipate, they leave behind them the whisper of their translation: *Out of many, one.* On the surface, it may merely be a pretty sounding adage, meant to foster a flattering sense of nationalism in the minds of the people, but what may be its deeper meaning? Reflection leads me to the belief that it is not some pretentious statement at all, but rather something greater. *Out of many, one.* An axiom to be striven for; a warning of what America has to lose. Indeed, it may very well be the adversarial charge against a great disease which has infected the very core of humanity since its beginnings: Apathy. It is all to be wished for that we could cure such an inoculable detriment through the public mediums of man, but Apathy does not have a topical remedy, and can only be cured within ourselves. Though we do see a physical side of apathy, its greatest and most divisive facade is mental apathy: a force that discourages friendliness and discourse, a force that gives platform to imbecility. The elusive symptoms of this disease are many, spanning across every individual and societal quandary. For the purposes of this treatise I would like to focus on one: Disunity.

The enlightened founders of our country could see, with inspired foresight, the disunity that would infect America. The remedy understood by them, lies in a system that supports and is supported by the Constitution. It lies in a system where numerous political parties are not only plausible, but commonplace. It lies in a system that no longer tears the people of America apart. Upon reading these previous statements, I am aware

of my reader in understanding that to the casual eye such a remedy only seems to further divide the people. Again, I repeat my meridian statement: *Out of many, one* – America's motto, one of its foundational truths. A combination of states, races, religions, beliefs and people consolidate to give life and truth to this statement. Why do we choose to surrender our diversity to an amphibious stockade?

I do not claim to be a faculty of the providential hand of understanding and thus see myself unfit to determine a remedy to mankind's innate defects. Though it would be much to speak of to attempt to derive some specious antidote to such a great disease, it is, however, plausible to hope for a remedy of its symptoms. Thus, my ultimate design shall be to prove the injurious nature of a two-party system, and give hints toward what may be the remedy.

### **The Bipartisan System**

Stemming from that great disease and its symptomatic disunity we see its noxious fruit: The bipartisan system. Upon direct examination of the bipartisan system, we see immediately the danger which it poses to the public good of our country. This system in its nature creates a dramatic rift between the people of America. No longer is bipartisanship the result of a pertinent polarizing issue; it is now at the very core of our politics, our philosophies, and our social circles. It is a system built on the vindication of oneself and the vilification of others; a system built on apathy. To live subject to immediate gratifications, free from consequence, may be the subliminal basis for the bipartisan system. The immediacy of partisan wiles take prerogative over principled discourse, harboring the spirit of digression so inherent to apathy. In defense of a party, we are in defense of emotional whims, and in the offense of civil discourse. Thus, as we stray further

from each other in the defense of a party, we stray further from the principles we claim to defend. Through its numerous defects, it has disunited America to a level commensurate to any before seen.

Though useful, it may not be prudent to spend time scouring numerous ethical or governmental treatises in search of a remedy to the bipartisan system. Where then, may this cure be found? As it stands today, the Constitution of the United States may be the greatest remedy to be hoped for. The Judicious Framers of our Constitution, with the inspired foresight which they possessed, understood partisanship to be a deadly symptom of this great disease that, since the beginnings of our country, has infected the very core of our society and our government. From the start, our founders warned against the dangers of party politics. In many political writings from the founders of Constitutional America, caveats are presented as to the dangers of this system. George Washington speaks fearsomely, saying, “The alternate dominion of one faction over the other, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissention [...] is in itself a frightful despotism.” In the time when this was written, tensions with Great Britain were high. Not only were there factious parties within the United States, the United States itself was a party opposing Great Britain. For Washington to have so explicitly labeled the effects of vengeful partisanship “A frightful despotism”, should be the only proof against such a system that we need! In a two party system, despotism is exercised in the purest form of the meaning. As one party grows stronger, it is innately inclined to enjoy the merits of oppression over its opposing party.

Further arguments against such a dissident system are presented in the succeeding writings in defense of the Constitution. In the Federalist, John Jay warns against disunity. “This country and this people seem to have been made for each other, and it

appears as if it was the design of providence, that an inheritance so proper and convenient for a band of brethren, united to each other by the strongest ties, should ever be split into a number of unsocial, jealous, and alien sovereignties.” Jay speaks of the confederacy here, in the context of becoming a union, though I would like to entertain the idea that the same principle applies to our current political systems. I do not mean to say that parties in general are something that can be avoided, in fact, I believe to do so would be quite impossible; I do mean, however, to focus on the descriptors Jay used of the factions: “*Unsocial, jealous, and alien.*” Along with Jays’ three descriptors, I would like to add my own: destructive. The three descriptors used by Jay are the addends that create detrimental sum that is destruction. We see it all around us: in our personal interactions, in our media, in our government. It seems that these several descriptors of the system push happily along the disunity of the people of America, and the apathy of their actions.

What then, is stoking the fire of apathy? Why then, do we continually adhere to the bipartisan system when there is no provision for it in our founding document, and the writings of its framers? Who then, does the burden fall on, to repair America and restore its potential glory? To answer such questions, it is imperative that we understand the fundamental writings of our country.

## **A Defense of the Constitution**

To truly see the fault that lies within the Bipartisan system, one must first understand the Constitution, its processes, and its application. It seems that any faulty political systems adopted by a country could only have been the result of two things. Firstly, a fault in the Constitution (our other founding documents). Secondly, a misunderstanding or lapse in recognition by the people (including a

lapse in judgement of those people holding office in the government) of the intended systems of government to be adopted. Assuming first a fault in the people must be prudent over that of the assumption of fault in the Constitution. The reasoning behind such a claim is this: Should we assume the Constitution bears fault sufficient enough to have propagated such injurious systems as bipartisanship, it may also then be sufficient in the minds of the people to revolt, and to attempt to recreate the Constitution anew. Hamilton warns against this, "I dread the more the consequences of new attempts, because I know that powerful individuals,[...] are enemies to a general national government in every shape." As a living document, the Constitution only retains its status through its power to be amended. Amendments are the only medium through which the document can span generations. Unless The Constitution were overtly injuring the people, there is no reason to assume detrimental fault, as any discrepancies can be amended.

Any candid observer of the state of America will see that we have lapsed in upright application of the principles laid out for us in the Constitution, *but* that it is not at the fault of the document itself. The fault can in this instance, be placed on the people. Presently, to find an American who has read the Constitution is rare; but to find one who truly understands it is highly improbable! The hypocrisy in this fact is laughable. If you do not know the principles of music it will certainly be hard to compose a symphony! If one does not understand the most basic mathematical principles, how can he expect to become a great mathematician? Indeed, the surest way to grow in a system is to understand the system. So, if one does not understand the Constitution, *the most basic principles of our country*, how can he expect to become a great American? Regardless of whether one sees the effects of the liberty that the Constitution

protects, if we do not know where our rights come from, we will be far more apt to cast them aside than to use them. Concealed by ignorance, it will be only from the inside that America will fall.

To extreme ends, there are many who have become so polarized in partisan views as to say that the Constitution, as the supreme law of the land, is no longer applicable to America. They speak of the Constitution as though it were endangering them. They speak of equality as if it were some distant phantom, fueled by their wantenness for truth. They speak of rights as though they do not already have them, or as though they are not protected! So I ask, what is stoking the fire of apathy in American society? Indeed I see it to be the only force which both halts and promulgates growth: Opposition, especially that held within a differing belief. No longer is there a culture of hard work or resilience in American society. Though these timeless principles are not completely lost, they are no longer believed by the overwhelming majority. Rather there is a culture of ease and victimization. As we are faced with opposition, many see it more effective to tear down any opposing ideas with emotional appeals, than to engage in productive discourse, or to educate themselves. This only leads to the further diminution of civil discourse in American society. People of opposing viewpoints have become either too scared, or too prejudiced against each other to engage in productive discussion! Truly, the most terrifying aspect of this is that often, we do not see people with differing views from us as humans. Commonplace now is the dehumanization of any opposing force to our own. What is the great perpetrator of this sickening attribute? Again I say: Apathy. More specifically: Mental Apathy, as touched on previously. This aspect of the disease bears a great danger, for Mental Apathy leads often to physical violence. Rather than use articulate speech to remedy the flame

of anger, mental apathy would lead us to forsake our ability to reason. To demonize our opposition appears exponentially easier than reasoning with it.

Having spoken of the polarized groups who speak angrily against the Constitution, it is important to recognize that these people are certainly not a majority. Many of the people of America simply do not understand the document enough to see its purpose. Many schools have stopped teaching America's founding documents as curriculum, and those who are taught them hear only the strained and biased words of textbooks. To provide an understanding of the Constitution to the sensible citizen, it may be pertinent to refute the greatest current argument against it.

The greatest, yet most ill founded argument which I have seen against the Constitution and the words of its Framers in the present day is that of an appeal to progression. By an appeal to progression I mean the fallacy of discounting the legitimacy of something for the feeble reasoning that it supposedly is not relevant to the present day. The argument most oft spoken is this: "The Constitution is not a relevant document to the present day, as it does not protect my rights, and its relevancy is not sufficient to provide for current issues." What rights does the Constitution not protect? It may very well be that our rights are so protected that many do not notice they have them! The Constitution is likely the document that is the most sufficient for the protecting of rights that the world has ever seen. Of course, to make such a resolute statement must require some explanation of the reasoning behind it, and henceforth I am inclined to enter into a defense and explanation of the United States Constitution.

***Insert on the state of nature:*** As defined by Locke, the state of nature is "a state of perfect freedom to order [ones] actions and dispose of [ones] possessions and persons as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of

nature, without asking leave, or depending upon the will of any other man." Locke specifies the *Law of Nature* to be reason. In his definition, reason is that "no one ought to harm another in his Life, Liberty, or Property." To live in a state of nature presents us dangers and injuries not otherwise presented should we relinquish our innate powers to the government and enter into civil society. Therefore, we leave the state of nature for the securities given us by civilization.

As we relinquish our natural powers to the hands of the government, we are met with new dangers and opposition that must be accounted for. In order to protect ourselves from these dangers, we have found it expedient to create a constitution and bill of rights for the people, to be ratified and upheld by the people. To keep and adhere to such things is essential to civil government, and requires an understanding by the people.

These rights granted to the people in our Constitution are to be found in the Preamble thereof, and in the Bill of Rights.

*"We the People* of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Through examination, we can see that nearly all of the rights granted to us in the Bill of Rights are already granted to us in the Constitution. Before the American Bill of Rights was ever written, Alexander Hamilton warned against bills of rights. He argues that to create an outline specifying how rights *shall not* be infringed assumes that rights *may* be infringed; hinting that bills of rights could be a guidebook to tyranny. Though idealistic, he evidently understood the Constitution to be sufficient as a protector of our rights, calling the preamble to the Constitution "a better

recognition of popular rights, than[...] bills of rights.” Thus, to avoid repetition and semantics, I shall endeavor to outline the rights granted to us in the Constitution without outlining those in the Bill of Rights.

Delineated in the preamble of the Constitution are two things at the very same time: the rights of the people, and the responsibilities of the government. The striking genius of this document is shown already. For a *single paragraph* to sufficiently outline these two things is unrivaled by any document in history. The preamble then proceeds to lay out clearly the reasoning for the document it supports, and the most basic rights that it will protect.

First, for the purpose of the forming of a *“more perfect union.”* Immediately, we see the propriety of our national motto: *E Pluribus Unum*. Explicitly described in this first phrase, we first see the Constitution as being the antithesis to the disunity created by a separation of the states into individually governed sovereignties, and second, the disunity created by the alternate dominion of factious parties. In application, we have seen the first take affect; indeed it was the first great cause for, and effect of the Constitution. From this example of unification we have already seen, I endeavor that we have not seen the second mended because of the distance that we have strayed from the Constitution.

Second, to *“establish justice.”* Provided for by this second clause is the right of the people to just trials, with prosecutions held speedily and publicly, and punishments being held under the eye of reason. Implied also is a restriction on the legislative branch to make any laws unjust in nature; and the right of the other branches to uphold checks and balances on each other for the security of justice. Included lastly are all other enumerated rights outlined in the Constitution and bill of rights relating to the Judicial courts, and the rights of criminals.

Third, to *“insure domestic tranquility.”* Expressed within this clause is the right of internal peace, cooperation and balance between the government, the states, and the people. The application thereof is seen in the individual rights and freedoms granted to these three bodies, respectively.

Fourth, to *“provide for the common defence.”* Provided here is our right to be protected in our properties and our persons under our government by the provision of armies and navies for the defence of the country against foreign invasions; and militias for the protection of the individual states from encroachment by the several other states of the union. Included here also is the responsibility of the government to uphold the right of the people to be armed and protected against the dangers of other citizens, states, or the tyranny of a corrupt government, and the encroachments on their rights that may occur.

Fifth, to *“promote the general welfare.”* Illustrated here are two of our inalienable rights according to Jefferson: *“The right to Life, and the pursuit of happiness.”* More specifically, the right to be autonomous and sovereign in our person from any dangers that may arise; and the right to equality of opportunity in our pursuits. The importance of the protection of these rights is not to be diminished. Assumed also is the responsibility of the government to promote such rights through the upright standing of the officers therein.

Sixth, to *“secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”* Encompassed by this final clause is the explicit *Right of The People to Liberty*. Especially, the right to the uninhibited betterment of oneself in pursuit of an upstanding community, country and civil society. Furthermore, implied in this clause is the right of the people to the Freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition. Finally, granted by this specification is the reservation of any rights not delegated in the Constitution to be exercised by the

government or the states; to the Liberty of the people thereof. The final implication here is the right to a strong republic.

Now we have seen through the enumeration of the rights granted to the people by the Constitution, that indeed *every* right granted to the people by the Bill of Rights is the same granted to the people by the *very first sentence* in the Constitution. Those who speak of the Constitution as being adverse to the rights of the people must obviously have not put in the time that it takes to analyze for a moment, *let alone to read*, that very first sentence in the document. If a complete annotation of the numerous rights protected by the constitution is not all it takes to defend the Constitution, then the fault is more likely within the detractors than the document itself.

As for the second part of the argument, questioning the Constitution's relevancy: the simple timelessness of truth must never be understated. If there is some clause adverse to the equal rights Life, Liberty, or Pursuit of Happiness within the Constitution, I should be intrigued to see it. I would next be surprised if it has not been profusely scrutinized under the public eye to the ends of amending so dangerous a disparity! If there is no erroneous clause, the argument against the Constitution no longer retains foundation enough to justify further refutation.

One solemn caveat that must be presented is this: Without responsibility, we lose our Liberty. The rights that have been so carefully outlined and protected in our Constitution are not infallible, nor are they licentiously operated; to have rights is to be responsible for them. The treasure hunter creates a map to his riches just as The Framers have created the ultimate design to the use and protection of our God given rights: The Constitution. Should we burden our shoulders with the immediate affliction of responsibility, our Liberty will grow as an unyielding force; a tenacious spectre of truth.

In the framing of the Constitution, the Founding Fathers accomplished a feat unparalleled by any other political convention in history. They miraculously avoided the pestilential influence of deliberative parties and bodies who would contaminate the Constitution. Miraculously, all 39 people present at the Convention signed. Those who were not satisfied, were inclined to accede because of their zeal and conviction to sacrifice their own partiality for the efficiency of government, and the public good of the people. Such a testament to its greatness *must* not be understated. The Framers of the Constitution surpassed unequivocally the pragmatic expectations set by the people. As we have seen, within the *first sentence* the rights of the people and the responsibilities of the government were unobjectionably enumerated. Through the fires of revolution, and the ice of re-establishment, the calamity undertaken by our Founders was overcome. Upon conclusion of these several paragraphs defending the Constitution, I am left with no argument profound enough to warrant any significant response, and thus see fit to present *my* central argument against the bipartisan system.

### **The Bipartisan System as it is Injuring our Constitutional Freedoms**

Over the course of the previous section, I have to the best of my ability defended the United States Constitution, and with confidence demonstrated its relevancy and practicality to the protection of our rights. It now seems admissible to present the greatest ailment which has come from our disregard of the Constitution: The Bipartisan system. As I observe the animosity created by the party dissension of our time, I see a widespread societal deficiency in truth based principle. I am nevertheless conscious of the individuality that is antidotal to the correction of such

defects, and do not see myself endowed with the particular genius required to propose amendatory systems. I find myself guided by the principle of group dynamic as outlined by Hume: “to balance a large state or society whether monarchical or republican, on general laws, is a work of so great difficulty, that no human genius, however comprehensive, is able by the mere dint of reason and reflection, to effect it. The judgements of *many* must unite in the work: *Experience* must guide their labour: *Time* must bring it to perfection: and the *feeling*

*of* inconveniences must correct the mistakes which they *inevitably* fall into, in their first trials and experiments.” There is no man sensible enough to truly derive a restorative system to bipartisanship. The minds and experience of many must unite in the task. Even for the minds of many, it will be a burdensome undertaking. Thus, it is yet essential that we understand the bipartisan system, and the overt methods it has taken to injure our Constitutional freedoms.

Consider the following:

## **The Allegory of the Garden and the Ravens**

There was once a very prosperous little garden; kept in the corner of a kind old gardeners yard. It was surrounded by a wooden frame, to keep the plants safe from harsh weather and rodents. This garden box was built by that kindly old gardener, for he knew how to keep his garden safe. In the garden were plants of all shapes, sizes, and colors. There were tomato and pepper plants, carrot and cabbage plants. There were squash and pumpkin plants, cucumber and zucchini plants. On the far end of the garden box there was a single sunflower. None of the plants quite knew why he was there, but they did not mind him. He kept to himself mostly, gazing at the sun.

The plants lived together very peacefully, protected by the garden box, with a very reasonable set of rules: Live, and let live; Grow, and let grow; Produce, and let produce. It was to be expected that these rules may be broken occasionally, and if that was the case, the plants were very quick to learn and forgive. Sometimes, mistakes were made: maybe a vine being wrapped around a neighboring plant, or a particularly thirsty plant taking more than his fair share of water. The kindly old gardener was quick to correct these mishaps, unwrapping

the daydreaming vine, spending more time watering the thirsty plant, and giving unconditional care to *all* of the plants in the garden equally.

The plants in the garden loved the old gardener, and especially loved to work hard to give him their fruits. In return, he kept very good care of them. If any greedy weeds were to grow, he would remove them. If any wild animals got closer than need be, he would scare them away. If the sturdy garden box he had built for them grew weak, he would repair it. There seemed to be nothing that could harm the plants under the watchful care of their loving gardener. He would often sing, whistle playful melodies, or talk to the plants. They never could quite understand what he was saying, but they knew from the warm feeling they got that he was indeed looking out for each of them. Maybe, they thought, he would say, "Good evening Mr. tomato plant, I can see you have been working hard, thank you for being so diligent." The gardener even gave special attention to the beautiful sunflower, always watching the sun, head turned up proudly.

After a long and fruitful summer, the time was drawing near for the plants to hibernate through the cold winter. Even in the fall, the gardener kept constant care of his little garden, gathering up the last

pumpkins from the pumpkin plant, and preparing the garden for the cold winter that lie ahead. The days got shorter, the weather grew colder, and the plants felt content with the summers work, and excited for the coming summer. Eventually, the world grew dark, and the sky opened, the first snowfall of the winter drifting lazily to the earth. The plants knew that it was time to enter into a long, dark sleep.

As spring cleared the snow from the ground and the darkness from the sky, the plants began to wake from their winter slumber. It had been an especially harsh winter, but the plants were resilient and proud of it. "Helloooo Mr. Carrot!" said the cucumber plant from across the garden. "Good morning to you, sir!" The carrot plant said in return. "I trust you all slept well?" He continued, opening the conversation up to the rest of the plants in the garden. Many enthusiastic replies followed. The chatter in the garden was abuzz with anticipation for the return of the gardener. Even the sunflower had not quite turned his head up to the sun, and instead had it turned outward, awaiting the old gardeners return. A day passed, and then two, and the gardener was nowhere to be seen. The plants assured themselves that it *was* still the very beginning of the season, and did not fret over



the absence of their dear protector. Days turned into weeks, and still the gardener had not appeared. The plants really did begin to worry now, not only for the well-being of their beloved gardener; but summer was fast approaching, and soon the spring showers would not provide them water. As the cool, wet spring days faded into the arid summer days, the sun seemed to bare down on them harder than ever. Without the gardener to resolve quarrels, the tensions in the garden ran high. The plants constantly argued with each other. One day, the zucchini plant was quite ornery, "Mr. Cabbage seems to be looking especially green today! Is he keeping a secret reserve of water without telling us?" An eruption of accusations and voices filled the air, until finally the sunflower spoke, breaking through the buzz of angry voices. "There is no need for accusation or argument," he said, "None of us are better off than the next. I suggest we all calm down and decide what may be the best course of action- so long as we are within the walls of our garden box, we should have little to fear! Our gardener would not leave us without the means to keep ourselves safe and productive." The little garden was silent for a long while. In the air was a feeling of unsurety and fear. "We are all

going to die!" The pepper plant yelled, breaking into sobs. Again the garden broke into a rabble of voices, some comforting, most frightened.

In the commotion, the plants did not notice two new arrivals: ravens, perched on two corners of their wooden garden box. One spoke, "Now, Now my friends! Control your emotions, for all is not beyond hope." The plants quieted, noticing the two birds for the first time. The other raven spoke, "Indeed, my brother here speaks truth! We come with great news, and a proposition." Still the plants remained silent, until the sunflower spoke, knowing of the craftiness of ravens. "We are greatly distressed from the loss of our gardener; and on the verge of death for want of water. We do not want to be caught up in any of your wily schemes." At once, the squash plant spoke, "Wait, Mr. Sunflower! For what if they can bring us water, or some hopeful news? Ravens, tell us first your names, and then of your proposition." The ravens looked first at the sunflower, and then at each other before one spoke. "I am Marcus, and here is my proposition. All you in need of water, follow my direction and I will teach you to extend your roots deep into the ground. There are hidden aquifers filled with all of the water you could wish for! It will be hard work, but I see in your

eyes a spirit of determination that will be fit for the job. All that I will require of you is half of the fruit that you bear, the rest to do with as you wish. " Before any plants could speak, the second raven spoke. "I am Edward, and here is my proposition. All you in need of water, follow my direction in giving up *all* of the fruit you bear, and I will bring you all the water you could wish for."

The sunflower saw immediately the danger in the conniving scheme of the ravens, but before he could speak the garden erupted yet again into a whirlwind of voices. This went on for some time before Marcus spoke a final time. "We understand the importance of such a decision, and will be back on the morrow to hear your answer. For now, we will leave you with enough water to keep you in comfort for the next day." The ravens left briefly, returned with water, and departed.

Seeing an opportune moment to speak, the sunflower began. "My dear friends, do not let your distressed emotions inhibit your ability to make rational decisions. I know of the craftiness of ravens, and can see the danger in their proposal already. Before we make such decisions, let us discuss the possibility of any other options. With my height, I can see a flowing river not far off from our little garden-" He

was cut off by the pumpkin plant. In his booming voice the pumpkin plant spoke. "Mr. Sunflower, for all this time I had expected you to be wise, gazing off at the sun all day, but now I see- you truly are an imbecile! When salvation presents itself you would turn it away, and kill us all! To you I say 'Live, and let live!'" Throughout the garden there were several grunts of disapproval for the sunflower. "Now, my fellow plants!" Continued the pumpkin plant, "This is our only option for being saved! Choose you which raven you will. Live, and let live! Grow, and let grow! Produce, and let produce!" The garden was intoxicated with newfound hope, everyone except one. The sunflower turned his head to the sun as it set over the little garden, and he shed a silent tear.

The next morning came quickly, and soon after sunrise came the ravens. The plants cheered and cried for joy. Overnight, the ravens had been all but deified in the minds of the plants. They landed, perched on their respective corners and Edward opened his mouth to speak, quieting the excited plants. "Hello, hello my dear friends. I sincerely hope you have enjoyed yourselves since we last met. Now is the time to decide upon our proposition!" The garden cheered yet again, and this time it was Marcus who spoke.

"All you who will follow my direction, and be taught to extend your roots deep into the ground to find water say 'I!'" The squash, pumpkin, cucumber, and zucchini plants proudly yelled, "I!" The pumpkin plant then spoke in his booming voice. "We, the westward facing side of the garden have chosen to work hard in extending our roots, to find underground aquifers. We agree on the set price of half of all of our produce to be given to Marcus the raven, and the rest to do with as we will. As the more astute plants in the garden, we choose this path to give our fair share of work. We will work our hardest to keep the garden prosperous, and to support the welfare of *all* of the plants in the garden." Again the garden broke out in cheers. Next, Edward spoke. "All you who will follow my direction, in giving up *all* of the fruits you bare, in exchange for all of the water you could wish for, say 'I!'" The tomato, pepper, carrot, and cabbage plants yelled, "I!" The tomato plant declared as loudly as he could, "We, the eastward facing side of the garden have chosen to live as we once did, giving away all of our produce in exchange for the simple pleasures of a simple life. With the surplus of time we will have (contrary to the westward side) we will work hard to think of the best ways to better the overall welfare, and ease of the

garden." Again, there were cheers all around, excepting one of the plants. Marcus cut the cheering short, "What will you do, Mr. Sunflower?", he said with the edges of a sneer forming on his beak. The Sunflower did not speak, he simply gazed at the sun.

As quickly as the gardener had disappeared, the garden was factionalized. The plants rather disliked being named after their location in the garden, so, with the help of the ravens they named themselves: The westward side and the eastward side; the workers party, and the thinkers party, respectively. The workers party worked hard, getting their water from the underground aquifers. The thinkers party lived easily, spending their free time thinking of ways to better the garden. As promised, they had all the water that they could wish for. Days went by, and slowly they forgot about their grief; The loss of their beloved gardener was all but forgotten after the first month of the summer.

After the first week of Marcus teaching and Edward bringing water, the ravens stopped most conversation. Edward would bring his promised water, and Marcus would make sure that the workers party were finding theirs. One day, however, on a hot July afternoon, Edward swooped down and landed on

his corner of the garden box. He called over to the thinkers party. "My friends! May I have a word?" the carrot plant responded, "Indeed! It certainly has been a while since we have spoken, what seems to be on your mind?" Edwards face showed a grave look. "The river which I collect your water from has run dry, and I have a sneaking suspicion about why." The plants from the thinkers party grew worried. "Here is what I suspect has happened to your precious water source: The aquifers from which the workers party obtain their water are fed directly from the river where I collect yours. Do you know what this means? I shudder to say it, but your greedy friends in the workers party are taking more water than they need." The air in the garden grew heavy. "Now, I wouldn't act too rash, we don't want to start a conflict. I will talk to Marcus about this and see what I can do. For now, ration what water you do have." Edward flew away as suddenly as he had come.

On the side of the workers party, Marcus glided into his place on the corner of the garden box. "Friends," he said, gathering their attention, "I have some sorry news. Soon, the aquifers from where you drink will dry up." The cucumber plant gasped. Marcus continued, "I think I know why, and this is the worst

part of my news: The river that feeds into your aquifers is the exact river where your friends from the thinkers party obtain their water. Do you know what this means? It means that they have been taking more than their fair share of water." The workers party collectively sighed in disbelief. Then, the zucchini plant spoke. "There is and always has been a simple solution to this, all we need to do is talk to them- and remember our simple rules: Live, and let live; Grow and let grow; Produce and let produce. I am certain we can come to a compromise." Marcus's face grew grave. "I am not so sure that will work this time, just look at your friends from the thinkers party." They looked across the garden and saw their friends. The thinkers party was staring at them with contempt. Marcus assured them he would speak to Edward on the matter and flew away. Never before had there been such an air of anger, not in all of the years in their prosperous little garden.

It was not long before the ravens returned to their respective corners on the garden box. Edward spoke to the thinkers party quietly. "I have talked with Marcus, it's worse than I had originally thought. Not only has the workers party depleted *your* water source, they have now petitioned Marcus to be given *your* produce as it is collected

from you. They say that they deserve it, because of all of the hard work they do. They even had the audacity to call the thinkers party a good-for-nothing waste of soil!" Edward concluded this last statement with such a ferocious tone that immediately the passions of the thinkers party were inflamed. It was all the cabbage plant could do to keep himself from yelling, "Those horrible plants in the workers party! Why, I remember at the start of this all, *Mr. Zucchini* accusing ME of stealing water, and now it is them who are the culprits. I should not wish to talk to them ever again!" The carrot, tomato, and pepper plants all nodded in agreement. From that moment, a pact was made within the thinkers party: to never speak to the workers party again.

Marcus landed on the garden box and began informing the workers party of the latest news. "The thinkers party has now not only refused to give you your fair share of water, they have blamed *the workers party* for the disappearance of your kindly old gardener all those months ago." This enraged the workers party, for they had always worked the hardest for their old gardener. The squash was particularly hurt by this, and yelled. "Should I ever get within distance of any of the members of the thinkers party, my vines shall not stop

squeezing until they are no more than a dried pulp!" His words echoed, heard by every plant in the garden. Even the sunflower, fixated on the sun, could not help but flinch.

The words of the squash plant sliced through the air. Edward still stood on the corner of the garden box, the thinkers party gathered around him. He made momentary eye contact with Marcus, still perched on the other side. "It is settled then," he started, "All that has been said about the workers party is true: They only wish for the demise of the thinkers party." There was momentary silence, and then the tomato plant spoke up, "I propose that we tear down the wooden frame of this desecrated old garden box, so that we can put as much distance between us and the workers party as possible!" The

other members of the thinkers party yelled in agreement. "I think," spoke Edward, "that is a genius idea. The most prudent idea if we want to keep this garden safe from dangerous plants." The thinkers party started to work.

On the other side of the garden box, the workers party was heavy with anger. "If they will accuse us of committing every crime conceivable," said the cucumber plant, "then there is no other way to survive than to completely separate ourselves from them." They sat in silence for a moment until the pumpkin provided just the solution they needed, "We must tear down the wooden frame that connects us to them, so that we can begin a new garden, without the horrendous thinkers party." Marcus smiled, he needn't

speak. The workers party had started to think.

The Sunflower stood tall. From his position he could see the ravens, circling each other victoriously in the distance. He could see the river, flowing stronger than ever. He could see the broken up remnants of the garden box. He could see the soil, spread thin by a powerful windstorm. He could see the plants, dead on the ground, no longer protected by the garden box made for them by the kindly old gardener. What could the sunflower not see? He could not see the workers party, or the thinkers party. He could not see the reason for things to end this way. He could not see the prosperous little garden. The wise sunflower wondered, "Were the plants really so different, in the end?"

Shown here is the demise of civil society as orchestrated by a bipartisan system. Immediately upon adoption of their two party system, the plants began to lose sight of their simple rules. As the public medium of civil discourse was disregarded, the surreptitious nature of the bipartisan system took hold, escalating to the point of violence. Without interpreting the entire allegory, there is one point that I would like to focus on, in more specific detail: As the plants grew further from each other in defense of their parties, they grew further from the very principles they claimed to defend. Their mental apathy led them to cease communication, giving way to the belligerent spirit harbored by a two-party system. They grew so disunited that they tore down the only thing keeping their prosperous little garden safe: The framework laid by their gardener; their Constitution. Seeing this we must wonder, in the pursuit of our own bipartisan system, how have *we* torn down the garden box of America?

Having previously proven the efficacy of the Constitution to the protecting of our inalienable rights, we can begin to uncover how the bipartisan system is endangering those rights. Forthrightly, this divisive system is not only fueled by a disregard for the Constitution, in nearly all cases it *endangers* it. As stated prior, while we stray further from each other in pursuit of a party, we stray further from the principles we claim to defend. I can see, to every clause of the preamble to the Constitution, injuries that have been created by the destructiveness of the bipartisan system.

First, to the protection of *a more perfect union*. I see immediately three injuries to this clause which have been provoked: Disunity of the people, Disunity of the states, Disunity of the Government. Firstly, to the disunity of the people: There will never be a time in which the people of America are united in opinion, nor should there be! We all have different beliefs, reconciled by the mediums of civil discourse.

To divide the people along a median, however, creates an unbalanced scale constantly teetering this way or that. There is no civil provision for the ideas of many, only a funneling of the people into two parties, who cannot act but in hatred to each other. Secondly, to the disunity of the states: Geographically, we see areas tending toward one political party or the other, and thus we classify states under party affiliation in our congress, and in our elections. This only further tends to create a rift between people of opposing viewpoints in states; the forty-nine percent minority to be disregarded over the fifty-one percent majority. Thirdly, to the disunity within the government: To preface: The government is supposed to be a figurative battleground, teeming with the opposing ideas of many different viewpoints. If it were not that way, we would not need it; but that is not the problem here. The injuries of disunity come from the fact that there are only two parties. This perpetuates the winner-takes-all ideal by only proving two solutions to issues, forcing congress to disengage themselves from productive discussion. What could be a civil discourse degenerates quickly into a partisan argument! This pits each branch against each other in the political battlefield. No longer do we see productive discourse within congress, we see an infinitely expounding argument. No longer do we see the people coming to compromise, we see two countries, fighting endlessly for their holy land. Forgotten is the basic truth that the enemy is not an opposing party; for the true enemy is only that which would endanger the people and the government of America.

Second, to *establish justice*. The dangers of the encroachments on the justice system in America by partisan jealousies can not be understated. The people are now more than ever stoked in defensiveness and belligerence toward the Judicial branch of the government; and rightly so! The influence of partisan

agendas in our Judiciary is among the greatest dangers done to our government. As the interpreters of the Constitution, an Independent Judiciary is imperative to the protection of the rights of the people. The Judicial Department is by definition a branch specifically created to avoid the dangers of partisan wiles, yet we see regularly a betrayal of the trust of the people as the third branch of government becomes an independent legislator, driven by partisan prejudices and agendas.

Third, to *insure domestic tranquility*. The right of the people to *peaceably* assemble, petition, and speak is infringed upon by the belligerence inherent to the party spirit. Regularly now is seen on a small scale violent actions against partisan opposites, and on a large scale impassioned assemblies; grown violent through a factious mob mentality. Inflamed against political figures, government leaders or others, the emotionally driven people of America have, through the medium of the bipartisan system, endangered the domestic tranquility of our nation. There is no peace where there is no unity.

Fourth, to *provide for the common defense*. In this clause, I see the least immediate dangers from the bipartisan system. What I do see is the impending danger against us by the injurious partisan spirit. The ravenous appetite of partisan wiles could in a moment endanger our rights to foreign, domestic, and individual protection. To the ends of advancing the platform of a party, the 51 percent majority could control the movements of the military. Against the will of the people and the well-being of the country, agendized politicians wield the power to endanger the people on a party platform.

Fifth, to *promote the general welfare*. As agendized partisan leaders become more prevalent in our government, our inalienable rights, and the general welfare of our country is threatened. Government officers,

empowered by the mob rule of democracy and the oligarchical schemes of despots, seek to make legislation that would encroach upon our rights. As the winner takes all, the minutely larger majority then legislates against the will of nearly half of the citizens in America. The overt democratic principle adopted by our government in the present day would see an impassioned factious majority endangering the rights of the entire country.

Sixth, to *Secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity*. Partisan driven programs and legislation threaten to expunge the great flame of Liberty that has built and sustained this country. A push for perfect equality draws near to the encroachment on our Liberty. No longer is it prudent that we must work hard to make ourselves valuable to society, or to better ourselves for any other purpose! Social programs, pushed forward by a factious spirit, *encourage* the diminution of Liberty. Not only this, but our federal rights have been all but destroyed. No longer do the states have voice in the government, no longer do we enjoy the Liberties granted us by the partial sovereignty of the states. The overt, excessive use of Democratic principle has destroyed federalism in America! We no longer live in a representative, federal government, we live in a large scale Nationalist Democracy. If anything has encroached on the right of the people to the Blessings of Liberty, it is this.

Through the mediums of Allegory, and an exploration of the specific Constitutional rights endangered by the bipartisan system, I have now to the best of my ability exposed the creeping nature of the system which America has so blindly adopted. Should there be any remaining doubts against the Constitution, any further reading of this treatise will be a waste of both the readers time, and the authors time.

It is yet essential that we understand the bipartisan system and its history to understand principally how a cure to its processes may be

determined. It may also be useful to have understanding of why we have adopted such a system in the first place. This I will endeavor to do in the forthcoming section.

## **A History and Inquiry on the Bipartisan System**

Human nature has throughout history formed factious political bodies. Dating back to ancient Rome, we see the Patricians and the Plebeians, who were divided due to class differences. In 18th century England, there were the Whigs and Tories. Though not similar in motive to American political parties, in principle we see that they are analogous.

America was founded with the intent to avoid political parties. James Monroe stated, "all political parties are, by their very nature, incompatible with free government."

Due to the introduction of the United States Constitution in the late 1700's, two parties were formed: The Federalist Party and the Anti-Federalist party. On the topic of the Constitution, these two parties were divided. The Federalists fought for the Constitution, its speedy adoption, and in many cases, the national centralization of the government. The Anti-Federalists were mostly statesmen, and argued that the Constitution would encroach too far on the rights of the states, and abridge the rights of the people; pushing that it was too nationalist in nature. They also called for a slower adoption of the Constitution, in order to work out any faults that may be within. After much dispute, the Bill of Rights was the compromise that these parties made.

In the beginnings of Constitutional America, we did not have a two party system. George Washington, an Independent, may have been the reason for this. In the late 1790's, within Washington's cabinet, a rivalry formed between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. In the election of 1800, Jefferson challenged Adams under the label of 'Democratic-

Republican', thus creating the catalyst party for the two parties we see in present day America. The Democratic-Republican party was founded on two beliefs: The rule of the people, and the rule of law.

The Democratic-Republicans held presidential office until 1828, when Andrew Jackson won office under the newfound Democratic party. The Democratic party was founded due to controversies between Jackson and John Adams, on the idea that the people did not have enough say in the government: Truly, 'The Party of the People.' The Democrats held office until 1860, excepting one term, when the Whig party took office.

In 1856, The Northern Abolitionist Movement created our second modern day party: The Republicans. By 1860 Abraham Lincoln was the first of the Republicans to win office, supported by his views against slavery and his push for business. The Republicans held office (with the exception of Grover Cleveland's two non-consecutive terms) until 1912.

With this knowledge, we can rightly pin the 1860's as being the beginning of the two party system we see today. The parties, born during especially divided times in history, never dissolved as the Federalist and Anti-Federalist parties did. Knowing now a summary of this history, the questions must be asked: What can we learn from this history? Should there even be political parties? Why have we adopted so permanently the parties that we have?

To attempt to answer the first question, I would like to use the example of the Federalists and Anti-federalists. The most important and outstanding characteristic of these two parties was the effect that resulted from them. Rather than dividing into parties permanently, there was a specific purpose behind the partisanship: to resolve disputes and problems within the Constitution. Culminating from this was arguably the

greatest partisan compromise America has ever seen: The Bill of Rights. The adoption of the Bill of Rights sufficiently resolved this partisan dispute, and set an important example that America has failed to adhere to: Parties should not be permanent. The Founders understood the importance of the democratic principle in government and used it efficiently by coagulating into these two parties. The men forming these parties were not separated in principle, merely in application. All had a zeal for Liberty, for the efficiency of government, and for the common good. Thus we see the efficacy in temporary parties especially as to their short term effect for encouraging discussion: Men are not so easily swayed on their principles, and so the medium of civil discourse has the power to show even the most biased man that people are not so different as they vainly believe.

I shall now attempt to answer the next questions. Empirically, we see an ineludible human instinct to form into distinct coalitions. It seems impossible for humans *not* to form parties, political or otherwise. Madison gives us his supposition for where political parties are born, “A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government.” Within Madison’s supposition seems to be the suggestion that parties are *inherent* to any form of civil society and government.

I can see two reasons for Madison’s suggestion: First, the self-perpetuation of the system. Some have reasoned that the stability and self-perpetuation in the two party system comes from the winner-takes-all ideal. This

ideal is balanced on the theory of having a “wasted vote” thus encouraging more strategic voting and pushing the people not to vote based on *principle* but to vote based on *party*. Created by the self-perpetuation is likely the greatest virtue of the bipartisan system: Stability. As the two party system perpetuates itself, it becomes seemingly more intrinsic to our politics, and consequently more stable. Throughout the slow adoption of the bipartisan system, faults were overlooked because of the seemingly apposite balance that was created. Members of a family advocate for family, members of a religion advocate for religion. Members of partisan political groups advocate for their specific group. Thus we see the problem: Within a two-party system, each side continually advocates and vindicates itself. As they do, the people bisect themselves, and the primary beliefs that America was founded on dissipate. *E Pluribus Unum* becomes *E Pluribus Duo*.

The second reason I can see is spoken better by George Washington than I could say it, “This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.”

So, should there be political parties? Tangible evidence of the abominable beast that is partisanism would scream for the dissolution of all parties, and for free belief, undictated by the despotic wiles of politicians. What may be the solution then? James Madison outlines it well, “Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life, because it imparts to fire its destructive



agency.” Having seen this, we must unfortunately understand that to control the causes of anything so inherent to *human nature* is not only implausible, it is an unfathomable danger to Liberty. So, truly, there *must* be parties. There would be no civil way to completely remove party politics from our government. Doing so would only be possible temporarily, and the only course which could be taken to do so is revolution. Again, Madison touches on this with enlightened words, “The inference to which we are brought is, that the *causes* of faction cannot be removed, and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its *effects*.” With this understanding, we can seek to revise our current systems and direct them away from the tyranny which lurks so ravenously around the imperfections of our country.

### **The Proposed Antidote and Its Benefits**

We are now come to the great determining question of the protection of our Constitutional rights: Why should we disavow the bipartisan system, and how is it plausible?

Strenuous examination has now shown with explicit, categorical evidence the injuries done to the Constitutional rights afforded us. The few conveniences presented by the system portray callow irresponsibility within the people, for the continual adherence to a scheme within which *only* stability is advantageous. Among its numerous defects, each acts as an addend for the capital dilemma: The positive furthering of our country is hindered by the very operations that have been put in place to promote it. This grievance alone is substantiated completely by the Constitution and the writings of our founders, and is *indisputably* fair ground for the reestablishment of our party system.

To restate what has already been said in so many words: the governmental defects are not the only offenses of the system. More than

it has destroyed the efficiency of government, it also has divided the people of America, turned brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor, and state against state. We The People have the power to direct our government toward its true course, and must not hesitate to do so when the need arises. The torch lit by our God and extended to our aid by our Founding Fathers is now our responsibility to carry.

In order to execute such a considerable task, the question must be asked: What is the great solution? How may we carry the torch of Liberty with an upright zeal toward the efficiency of government and the protection of our Constitutional freedoms? That which I have said before, I will say again: I do not see myself fit to propose any systems that would replace the current one. What I can hope to do is provide hints, based on the words of our founders, that may hopefully give rise to a better system than any one man could provide. My wish from this point forward is that any faults in my ability may be overlooked, and that the bits of truth that hopefully lie within my words may be used by any ardent patriots for the betterment of America.

It may be, that the greatest security afforded by a republic, to its country, is that of *numerous political parties*. Madison understands this to be: “a greater variety of parties, against the event of any one party being able to outnumber and oppress the rest.” Of further securities to the public good, Jefferson states, “I am no believer in the amalgamation of parties, nor do I consider it as either desirable or useful for the public; but only that, like religious differences, a difference in politics should never be permitted to enter into social intercourse or to disturb its friendships, its charities or justice.” Related in these several quotations is a call for *numerous political parties*. Madison asserts the importance that one party should not be able to outnumber the other. When applied to a two party system, we

see daily the dangers of the alternate domination of faction. When applied to a system with numerous political parties, it is plain to see that no one party could outnumber a factious majority, it would take the agreement of the different views of many to become a majority. Jefferson expresses his worry of “the amalgamation of parties.” As I see it, a two party system is an amalgamation of parties for this reason: There are not, and never should be, only two paths of opinion and thought anywhere in humanity. To say so is to pit every man against his neighbor- to destroy a society. The greatest danger of the bipartisan system is that very ideal.

Actuated, but not limited to the reasons previously stated, I hold it true that America *must* repudiate the bipartisan system. I see through candid observation of the writings of our founders, an understanding that the principle to follow must be that of numerous political parties. Over the course of this treatise I first proved the ultimate design of our Constitution: to protect our rights. I then delineated how those rights have been encroached upon by the bipartisan system. Now, I see it auspicious to prove how a system supporting numerous political parties will cure all encroachments, and benefit the protection of our foundational rights.

First, to the ends of *keeping and forming a more perfect union*. What can be more obvious to this cause than the propensity of numerous parties to the unifying of our country? E Pluribus Unum: Out of *many*, one. America was built with the intention and inclination toward an equal opportunity for *all* opinions, faiths, nationalities, and people. Never were we meant to only support two. As we begin to become genuine to our true beliefs, and not those of specious, general parties, the protection of our union will be stronger than ever before.

Second, to the ends of *restoring and establishing justice*. With numerous political parties, the bipartisan wiles within the

Judiciary may very well be diminished. No longer will there be any fear of a ‘tipping of the scale’ toward one side or the other; there will be no scale! Potentially cured by this also will be the usurpations of the Judiciary on the Legislature. Without a scale to tip, there is a much smaller chance of the Judiciary having the factious support needed to encroach upon the powers of the Legislative.

Third, to the ends of *insuring domestic tranquility*. No longer might brother be against brother; state against state. Encouraged by a wider system will be the productive medium of civil discourse; within our country will be once again an equal allowance for the beliefs of all. Seen regularly is the generalization of people, groups, and even states into one party or the other, often with a negative connotation. Though hatred will never be cured, the inclination of such hard feelings toward one another might be greatly diminished under such a system.

Fourth, to the ends of *providing for the common defense*. As stated prior, in this clause I see the least danger from the two party system, and as such see the least that may be cured. I do, however, see the efficiency that such a system may afford to this clause in a time where it may be scrutinized or endangered under the public eye.

Fifth, to the ends of *promoting the general welfare*. If not anything else, the expediency of such a system to this clause is almost unequivocal. Provided for by numerous political parties would be an *exponential* heightening of the general welfare of the people. The widened representation in government could very well diminish the winner-takes-all ideal, and allow for a more genuine vote. Effectually, the majority of people would vote based on what they truly believe as opposed to the party they subject themselves to. With this widened vote, truer representation of the people would be seen in all elected branches of government. Not only

this, but the slightly larger majority would no longer have such immediate platform, and the true majority would be represented. The actual wills of the people would have a more secure voice, thus shrinking the distance between the people and their government, and allowing for the merits of representative legislation to be more clearly seen.

Sixth, to the ends of *securing the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity*. The last of these several rights which will be supported by numerous political parties is truly the most important. All of the aforementioned rights compound upon each other to benefit this one. The blessings of a diverse system upon Liberty are several: Namely, the freedom to act undictated by a party that does not represent truly who you are and what you believe; and the freedom to run for political office supported by those very same advantages. The advantage of just laws under a representative government is not to be overlooked. To the ends of Liberty, the last advantage of a new system that I can see is this: that we will finally rid ourselves of this deplorable system which we have subject ourselves to. With that initial change, all else follows. "The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us. We ought, for so dear a stake, to sacrifice every attachment and every enmity."- Thomas Jefferson

The propensity of numerous political parties to the well-being of our country cannot be understated; and though I cannot hope to mend the disunity in our country single handedly, my hope is that the minds of many may unite in the task; that the candid citizen will not only be inspired to protect their rights, but to exercise them. I do not claim that this will be a cure to the strife and hatred between the people of America, but I wish that it may be a start. The deeper problem- the great disease of apathy that has woven itself into the fabric of humanity can only truly be cured within oneself. So I say: Read great books, write about great ideas, and speak with the people around

you. To do these things is to become- become genuine, educated, and sensible to what you believe, and to what the people around you believe. Only then may the shackles of duality be broken and may we be let free to exercise the Liberty that we enjoy in our wonderful country. Any further elaboration on these words might confuse the message shared, so I now will proceed to conclude my case in favor of the Constitution, and against the bipartisan system.

If one idea will be taken from this analysis, it should be this: That we are not so different as we are led to think. In the story, the wise Sunflower wondered, "Were they really so different after all?" I boldly say now that *we* aren't. As James Madison so consciously states, "Hearken not to the unnatural voice which tells you that the people of America, knit together as they are by so many cords of affection, can no longer live together as members of the same family; can no longer continue the mutual guardians of their mutual happiness[...]. No, my countrymen, shut your ears against this unhallowed language. Shut your hearts against the poison which it conveys; the kindred blood which flows in the veins of American citizens, the mingled blood which they have shed in defense of their sacred rights, consecrate their Union, and excite horror at the idea of their becoming aliens, rivals, enemies." I say now: that 'kindred blood' has not run stale. To say that people *do not* have differences would be absurd; but it is on an equal level of absurdity to say that there are only two classes of humans! No longer can *We The People* adhere to this deplorable system! No longer can we fear the differences in opinion of our fellow citizens. No longer should the world look at America and see a nation divided, torn down a centerline. I am certain of the capacity of Americans to unite in the just cause of Liberty; and with that surety I know I do not stand alone in stating that I truly wish to see an America

where *E Pluribus Duo* becomes *E Pluribus Unum* once more.

### **America**

As the dusk of a dying age paints the sky, darkness begins to outline our country in a patina of turmoil. This darkness slowly permeates the evening, and nature inevitably succumbs to a plutonian twilight. We are drawn like moths to the flame of ignorance as its placebic light temporarily expunges the darkness of this ever waning night. With malicious embrace, it beckons us. Each of us carries it willingly! There is no escape save exercising the right of Liberty bestowed upon us by our God in heaven! As the flame of ignorance extends its arms to every place, our eyes are clouded as the world propagates its smoke. To make any change, we must close our eyes, and open our hearts- for the heart sees with love, not as the eye sees- The eye sees the hatred that blinds the heart. Thus, only with open heart will the facade of the world be lifted, and if only for a moment will we be vignettted in our beautiful reality: All is not as dark as it seems, for we are not alone in this journey, nor is it a futile cause. An inspired blueprint was

laid for us by our founders, ingrained within the rights of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. Change will not be made idly, however; for as we continue to bask in our vanity, the adversarial flame will grow ever more merciless. It is the obligation of The People to create a reciprocal flame: A flame of Liberty. Though small, the candles of Liberty lit within ourselves can ignite a causal sequence, and like a great conflagration, the ripple effect of Liberty may spread through America. The responsibility lies within us, to light our candles, and touch wicks with every vigilant American. The new day begins, and as it does, We the People will be lifted up by unseen angels, who will assist in the conflagration of our flame. We cry for recompense, as though we did not do this to ourselves! It is our responsibility to unite as Americans, to break the fetters of that amphibious stockade; to derive that specious antidote to our duality. What then, is the cure? Where may it be found? I say this now to any who will listen: The great and elusive antidote we seek has been within us all along! This antidote lies in the discipline to learn, and the courage to act.

*Nos Populus*

## Works Cited

*A Brief History of the Two Party System,*

[www.davidkabraham.com/OldWeb/Beliefs/America/twopartysystem.htm](http://www.davidkabraham.com/OldWeb/Beliefs/America/twopartysystem.htm).

*Avalon Project - Patrick Henry - Give Me Liberty Or Give Me Death,*

[avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/patrick.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/patrick.asp).

“The American Two Party System Is Actually Pretty Great.” *Benjamin Studebaker*, 29 July 2018,

[benjaminstudebaker.com/2018/07/29/the-american-two-party-system-is-actually-pretty-great/](http://benjaminstudebaker.com/2018/07/29/the-american-two-party-system-is-actually-pretty-great/).

Ammon, Harry. *James Monroe: the Quest for National Identity*. American Political Biography Press, 2008.

Baltzell, George W. “Constitution of the United States - We the People.” *Constitution for the United States - We the People*, [constitutionus.com/](http://constitutionus.com/).

“The Founding Fathers on Party Strife (Quotes).” *Satyagraha*, 22 Apr. 2019,

[satyagraha.wordpress.com/2012/11/02/party-strife-founding-fathers/](http://satyagraha.wordpress.com/2012/11/02/party-strife-founding-fathers/).

Hamilton, Madison, Jay. *The Federalist Papers*.

Locke, John. *Of Civil Government; Second Treatise*.

“The Origins of the United States Two-Party System.” *History Hit*, [www.historyhit.com/the-origins-of-the-united-states-two-party-system/](http://www.historyhit.com/the-origins-of-the-united-states-two-party-system/).

Paine, Thomas. *Common Sense*.

Washington, George. *Washington's Farewell Address to the People of the United States, September, 1796*.