

The founders made it difficult to change our structure

February 15, 2018

by [Randy Bright](#)

In light of the recent deadlock in Congress, none of us should have been surprised when almost four years ago Obama complained about the “structural” problems with Congress.

According to an article from the *Washington Times* in 2014, Obama took a “swipe at the Founding Fathers, blaming his inability to move his agenda on the ‘disadvantage’ of having each state equally represented in the Senate.”

Fearful that the Democrats could lose control of the Senate, Obama claimed that one of the problems was “the apportionment of two Senate seats to each state regardless of population.”

Obama was quoted to have said to a group of wealthy supporters at a Democratic fundraiser in Chicago, “Obviously, the nature of the Senate means that California has the same number of Senate seats as Wyoming. That puts us at a disadvantage...So there are some structural reasons why, despite the fact that Republican ideas are largely rejected by the public, it’s still hard for us to break through.”

The truth about the Constitution is that the Founders intended to make it difficult to pass laws and to make it even more difficult to change its structure. The reason we have a Senate at all is due to the “Great Compromise” in 1787, when some states refused to condone a system of representatives (where the most populous states would have the most power) without some means of counterbalancing the power they would hold.

The Senate was a way to expand the debate on proposed legislation under a separate set of circumstances, one in which a bill was considered by states represented by a number of Representatives in proportion to each state’s population, and another where all states had an equal number of votes. This not only had a chilling effect on the tendency for the states with the most voting power to lord over the other states, but it also evened the playing field between states. Without it, the Constitution might never have been completed, nor would it have performed as it should have.

Mr. Obama considered the Senate to be an obstruction to his agenda, and if not for the power of the Constitution, we would likely have seen this country slip into a monarchy already, even more so than it already has. This is the arrogance of allowing too much power to be invested in one person, becoming a master over a population rather than being a servant. It has been repeated time and again over history and the United States would be no different except for the Constitution placing that power into the people instead of a single person.

However, even the Constitution would not work except for one thing – and that is the integrity of the people.

Skousen wrote in the book *The 5000 Year Leap* that “A free people cannot survive under a Republican Constitution unless they remain virtuous and morally strong.”

Modern Americans, “he continued, “have long since forgotten the heated and sometimes violent debates which took place in the thirteen colonies between 1775 and 1776 over the issue of morality. For many thousands of Americans the big question of independence hung precariously on the single, slender thread of whether or not the people were sufficiently “virtuous and moral” to govern themselves. Self-government was generally referred to as “republicanism” and it was universally acknowledged that a corrupt and selfish people could never make the principles of republicanism operate successfully. As Franklin wrote, “Only a virtuous people are capable of freedom. As nations become corrupt and vicious, they have more need of masters”

As a nation, Mr. Obama et al have come to believe that the American people are no longer virtuous enough to see the importance of our Constitution, and therefore would not find a hint that the Senate be eliminated to be any more shocking than a Supreme Court that says it is lawful to take property from one person and give it to another; or to instigate environmental rules that violates property rights; or to use a government agency to suppress political speech; or to create departmental armed militias to enforce laws created outside of the legislative process.

And it is all possible because of a systemic rejection of God, the church and the Judeo-Christian principles that are the foundation of the Constitution.

Skousen wrote, “The Founders looked to the home, the school, and the churches to fuel the fires of virtue from generation to generation.” All three have been under systemic assault, with disastrous affect.

In view of the situation four years ago, let’s not lose sight of how much progress we have made in the last year.

This article was adapted from an article originally written in May of 2014.



Randy W. Bright, AIA, NCARB, is an architect who specializes in church and church-related projects. You may contact him at 918-582-3972, rwbrightchurcharch@sbcglobal.net or www.churcharchitect.net.
©2018 Randy W. Bright