

A Republic, Not a Democracy

The collapse of our American Republic, whose creation was a political pinnacle of human history, into the chaotic, money-grubbing democratic mess which now characterizes the United States, is no laughing matter. Here we are, as a nation and a human race, facing the worst physical-economic crisis in recorded history, and there is *not a single qualified Presidential candidate* visible for the upcoming elections in the world's most powerful nation.

Is there any citizen who actually believes there is a principle being expressed by any of the candidates in this Presidential election, either Republican or Democratic? What can you say about a so-called Republican who wants to eliminate the Constitutional role of the Federal government to provide for the general welfare of the population? Or a so-called Democrat such as Barack Obama, who is violating the Constitution, left and right, in the interests of ramming through the fascist policies of the British Empire by dictatorial means?

Most U.S. citizens, of course, agree that the leading candidates are inadequate, if not disgusting. If they get involved in the election process at all, they do it from the lowest possible standpoint, gambling on who is most likely to be the "winner," and what can be done for their own short-term particular interests. It's each against all, in direct contravention of the very concept of republican government.

Let's be clear about what that concept is, as our Founding Fathers George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, among others, definitely were. *Res publica* is literally the "public business," but stands for concept of the public good. Contrary to the oligarchical principle, adherents of the republic believe, and some know, that there are princi-

pled policies which can and must be applied to achieve the welfare of the population. In the United States, contrary to almost every other form of government on the planet, these are presented in the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution.

So where does this democracy idea come from?

It has two aspects. On the positive side, democracy calls for the involvement of the people (demos) in determining their government, an idea best expressed in the concept of the "consent of the governed" which is enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. The American Founding Fathers recognized the validity of that concept, and the need for a process of education to make that an *informed* consent. That process probably reached its height under President Franklin Roosevelt's administration, with his Fireside Chats.

But when democracy is defined as simply a government based on the "will of the people," it represents the very antithesis of a republic. Popular will is a matter of public opinion, which can be manipulated and changed like the wind, based on the momentary, often base emotions of the population. From Plato onward, republicans understood democracy of this sort as a pathway to tyranny, because the cacophony of "my opinion" will lead to chaos, and the demand for imposed order.

The imminent danger of such a process should certainly be obvious to most thinking citizens today.

The solution lies, of course, with the American citizens themselves. Will they respond to the presentation of principle, as Lyndon LaRouche and the LaRouche candidate slate are laying it out today, and act accordingly? Or will they take the "democratic" road to dictatorship, as the British Empire so fervently hopes?