

## Quick History Lesson

The original [U.S. Constitution](#) was ratified after 9 states voted in favor of it; NH was the ninth state – thus it was ratified on June 21, 1788 (12 years after 1776 and the revolutionary war and a lot of debate and compromise that took place in PA, etc.). The original capital city was New York City as well.

Originally, the U.S. Constitution left the method of selecting “electors” (the people who actually voted in presidential elections) up to each state. This meant that [state legislatures had the power to decide how their electors were chosen](#); and that is supposed to be true today, per the Constitution.

In many states, the legislatures simply appointed the electors themselves. In other states the method for placing elector candidates on a state ballot varied... In many cases, state legislatures would nominate electors directly. In other states, the citizens were allowed to vote for electors directly from a pool of people; for example, after 1790, political parties would nominate a slate of electors at state conventions or central committee meetings. The voters would then choose from these nominated slates during the general election.

The first political party in the United States was the Federalist Party. It was founded in the early 1790s by Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, and other supporters of a strong **central government**. The Federalists were opposed by the Democratic-Republican Party, formed in 1792 and led by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison.

Thus the “electoral college” system and all facets of government evolved over time, and by the mid-1800s, most states had moved to a popular vote system for selecting electors. The citizens never have voted for a given president or vice president.

Originally, the electors were never forced to vote based on any “popular vote of the people” within a given state either. Once a given elector was selected they had the right to vote their mind for a given president and vice president candidate; without being coerced by any given state laws. Thus, electors were “free agents” who could cast their votes for president and vice president **according to their own judgment**. Over time, unfortunately, many states passed laws to bind (and gag) electors to the outcome of the state's popular vote. But, initially, **electors had the autonomy to vote for whoever they thought best suited for the offices**. Only in case of ties did congress take up the task of breaking the tie (which has happened a couple times). [This created a bit of a safeguard against uninformed or unpredictable decisions by the electorate... or uneducated citizenry.](#)

Technically the original system was a sort of democratic republic at the state level and a [Constitutional Republic](#) at the federal level; keeping in mind that the U.S. Constitution itself primarily outlines or [limits the powers](#) to be exercised at the federal level while any and all other powers default to state or local level governance or to the people.

The U.S. system blended elements of democracy, where citizens voted for federal level representatives from their states (republicanism) and within their states, where those representatives, **including the short term electors**, made decisions on behalf of the people. It was designed to balance popular sovereignty with a structured system of governance. And, keep in mind, the state legislatures also selected the federal level senators themselves; not the citizens via a “popular vote”. The founders had quite a task balancing direct democracy – at the local level where voters might have some chance to best determine whom to vote for – with the complexities of a diverse nation and the system they devised was much better than the one implemented today.

### **Fast forward to the present day...**

Thanks to political party power struggles of modern times and their ability to manufacture Constitutional amendments which undermined the original system, in some cases, while assuring certain rights for the citizens, in some cases (such as the [Bill of Rights](#)), and attempts at limiting “the powers” of selected representatives, in other cases, we now have candidates running around using more and more propaganda to retain power in D.C., etc.

The result is that when you ask people what form of government exists in the USA, more often than not they will say, “It’s a democracy.” People who say this are usually clueless and should never be allowed to vote to begin with. A democracy (a pure democracy) is, in reality, a form of “mob rule” (at least many would say).

The term “mob rule” usually implies a lack of checks and balances, where decisions are driven purely by majority opinion without regard for minority rights or broader stability. In a pure, direct democracy, there’s a huge risk of this because every decision is made directly by the populace. And most voters have neither the time, education nor wisdom to know who or what they are voting for. This is the main reason their votes for a given president and/or vice president candidate is subject to such poor judgement. The same goes for their votes, at the federal level, for their state representatives and senators.

Most modern democracies fail, given enough time, for these very reasons. The USA is no exception, even though the U.S. federal government incorporates elements of republicanism (such as the Electoral College, a bicameral legislature, and an independent judiciary) to balance majority rule with protections against the potential tyranny of the majority.

The concern about “mob rule” is often raised to highlight the importance of these balancing mechanisms to ensure a fair and just governance system. It’s a nuanced topic with valid points on both sides. But, when people say “a democracy is just one step away from chaos” or “tyranny,” they are almost always correct, depending on their perspective. This idea usually emphasizes the fragile balance of a democratic system and the potential risks if checks and balances aren’t maintained. Once you undermine the checks and take away the balances and remove the rights of the people (usually because they vote to give those rights away) and allow the politicians to gain enough

power which they should never have then you are well on your way to a demon-ocracy run by a demon-crap party and the very tyranny such people invariably exercise to retain their power over the general public.

And that's the long way around the barn leading us back to [our founding document](#) and the following logic...

...whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experiences have shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, **while evils are sufferable**, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, **it is their duty**, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.

In other words it is high time to get rid of those promoting "democracy" while attempting to abolish the original form of government accurately referred to as a Constitutional Republic. Indeed, Lincoln was correct. The USA will be – indeed has been – destroyed from within (if at all).