**No Kings Day, yes there is a King**

By Andy F. Nazario Ph.D.

Criminal Justice

On Saturday October 18, 2025 The Democrats along with ANTIFA and a host of sponsors are planning a “No Thrones, No Crowns, No Kings” day of protest.” They offer training, tool kits, and locations of protests. They state in part.

Now, President Trump has doubled down. His administration is sending masked agents into our streets, terrorizing our communities. They are targeting immigrant families, profiling, arresting and detaining people without warrants. Threatening to overtake elections. Gutting healthcare, environmental protections, and education when families need them most. (Retrieved October 16, 2025 from [No Kings](https://www.nokings.org/))

# First let us look at the accusations. They say President Trump is sending masked agents into our streets, to terrorize communities. This is referring to the ICE agents going to arrest illegal immigrants who broke our laws in the way they entered this country. So the issue is really the illegal immigrants being arrest and sent back to their country of origin. The masks are to protect the agent and their families. Many of the ones arrested have committed other crimes and some are members of violent drug cartels. There was a recent news story reported a reward for information on ICE, Boarder Patrol, and officers as well as their families so they can kill them. (Cartels issuing bounties up to $50,000 for hits on ICE, CBP agents: DHS

# Retrieved October 16, 2025 from [Cartels issuing bounties up to $50,000 for hits on ICE, CBP agents: DHS - ABC News](https://abcnews.go.com/US/cartels-issuing-bounties-50000-hits-ice-cbp-agents/story?id=126521867))

# Mask have been worn by special units long before Trump came into office, my experience going back to the early 1980’s. An arrest does not have to have a warrant. If an officer has probable cause he may initiate an arrest. Arrest warrants are for those not in custody or being held for other charges. An officer may detain an individual while doing an investigation. A simple traffic stop is an example of all this. There is not an effort to control the elections by taking over the process in this country, except by the those who vote illegally or create false ballots to turn in.

The real issues is not that President Trump wants to be a king. It is that some, Democrats, George Soros’s Open Society Foundation, World Health Organization, and others with a one world ideologies are pushing for their own agendas. Why did our founders go in this direction for developing this nation?

First, did the United States ever consider having a king over the people? Matthew Spalding, Ph.D. Vice President of American Studies at The Heritage Foundation wrote in “The Man who would not be king”

After the war, there were calls for Washington to claim formal political power. Indeed, seven months after the victory at Yorktown, one of his officers suggested what many thought only reasonable in the context of the 18th century: that America should establish a monarchy and that Washington should become king. A shocked Washington immediately rejected the offer out of hand as both inappropriate and dishonorable, and demanded the topic never be raised again. (see Appendix 1, The Man Who Would Not Be King)

This nation chose to become a Republic not a monarchy, or even a democracy. In the founders consideration of how to form the government.

Benjamin Franklin, ever the optimist even at the age of 81, gave what was for him a remarkably restrained assessment in his final speech before the Constitutional Convention: "…when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men, all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views." He thought it impossible to expect a "perfect production" from such a gathering, but he believed that the Constitution they had just drafted, "with all its faults," was better than any alternative that was likely to emerge.

Nearly all of the delegates harbored objections, but persuaded by Franklin's logic, they put aside their misgivings and affixed their signatures to it. Their over-riding concern was the tendency in nearly all parts of the young country toward disorder and disintegration. Americans had used the doctrine of popular sovereignty--"democracy"--as the rationale for their successful rebellion against English authority in 1776. But they had not yet worked out fully the question that has plagued all nations aspiring to democratic government ever since: how to implement principles of popular majority rule while at the same time preserving stable governments that protect the rights and liberties of all citizens. (Appendix 2, National Constitution Center, Perspectives on the Constitution: A Republic, If You Can Keep It, By Richard R. Beeman, Ph.D.)

A Republic was developed. In Britanica’s definition of, Republic, it states.

**Republic**, form of [government](https://www.britannica.com/topic/government) in which a [state](https://www.britannica.com/topic/state-sovereign-political-entity) is ruled by representatives of the [citizen](https://www.britannica.com/topic/citizenship) body. Modern republics are founded on the idea that [sovereignty](https://www.britannica.com/topic/sovereignty) rests with the people, though who is included and excluded from the category of the people has varied across history. Because citizens do not govern the state themselves but through representatives, republics may be distinguished from [direct democracy](https://www.britannica.com/topic/direct-democracy), though modern representative [democracies](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democracies) are by and large republics. The term republic may also be applied to any form of government in which the [head of state](https://www.britannica.com/topic/head-of-state) is not a hereditary [monarch](https://www.britannica.com/topic/monarchy). (Retrieved October 16, 2025 from [Republic | Definition, History, & Facts | Britannica](https://www.britannica.com/topic/republic-government))

If we became a democracy, the majority of people would rule the country, thus a form of monarchy ruled by one party represented in the large cities and states. As most of the population lives in large cities, those ideas would rule the country, and states with less population would have no voice. Instead, a more just form of equal representation was developed to make sure the rural farms and communities would have some voice in their representation. The founders came up with a form of government with a House of Representatives, Senate, An Executive, the President. They also separated the powers to keep one from ruling over the others. These would be decided by regular elections and an Electoral College instead of majority rule.

But kings have too often fallen into greed and power temptations. Thus the founders came up with a Republic. One Nation Under God.

 [God warned of a kings temptation in Deuteronomy 17:14 When thou art come unto the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me;](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Deuteronomy-17-14/)

Deuteronomy 17:[15 Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the LORD thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Deuteronomy-17-15/)

Deuteronomy 17:[16 But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the LORD hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Deuteronomy-17-16/)

Deuteronomy 17:[17 Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Deuteronomy-17-17/)

President Trump is not a king, nor is he sitting on a throne. He does not have a crown on his head. He is just doing and saying what evil people don’t want to hear him say. He says and does things differently than the politicians do, and they do not want to hear or see it. They want to live in a Communist, Socialist, Marxist, Fascist country, were they silence the opposition. They protest and force their will on others, as the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

There is one who would be king over us.

Who is this person? Many who believe and follow will be persecuted for just saying His words of peace and love. As in.

  [Mark 1: 14 Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God,](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Mark-1-14/)

Mark 1: [15 And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Mark-1-15/)

  [Luke 1:30 And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-1-30/)

Luke 1:[31 And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-1-31/)

Luke 1:[32 He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-1-32/)

Luke 1:[33 And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-1-33/)

 [Luke 2: 9 And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-2-9/)

Luke 2: [10 And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-2-10/)

Luke 2: [11 For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-2-11/)

Luke 2: [12 And this *shall be* a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-2-12/)

Luke 2: [13 And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying,](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-2-13/)

Luke 2: [14 Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Luke-2-14/)

 [Matthew 1: 21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-1-21/)

Matthew 1: [22 Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-1-22/)

Matthew 1: [23 Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-1-23/)

Matthew 1: [24 Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife:](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-1-24/)

Matthew 2:1 [Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem,](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-2-1/)

Matthew 2:[2 Saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-2-2/)

 [Revelation 19: 11 And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-19-11/)

Revelation 19: [12 His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-19-12/)

Revelation 19: [13 And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-19-13/)

Revelation 19: [14 And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-19-14/)

Revelation 19: [15 And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-19-15/)

Revelation 19: [16 And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-19-16/)

 [Revelation 20:11 And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-20-11/)

Revelation 20:[12 And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.](https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Revelation-20-12/)

There is one who is King over us, HIS NAME IS JESUS.

***Reference***

Hebrew – Greek Key Word Study Bible, Key insights into God’s Word, King James Version, 2nd Revised Edition, AMG Publishers ISBN 978-0-89957-745-6

# Cartels issuing bounties up to $50,000 for hits on ICE, CBP agents: DHS

# Retrieved October 16, 2025 from [Cartels issuing bounties up to $50,000 for hits on ICE, CBP agents: DHS - ABC News](https://abcnews.go.com/US/cartels-issuing-bounties-50000-hits-ice-cbp-agents/story?id=126521867)

***Appendix***

**Appendix 1**

**The Heritage Foundatio**

**The Man Who Would Not Be king**

Feb 5, 2007, Matthew Spalding, Ph.D. Vice President of American Studies

George Washington is one of the most recognized figures in U.S. history. But familiarity breeds contempt. More often than not, Washington is an old painting on the wall - solemn, impersonal and distant - or the subject of childhood stories and nursery rhymes. We all know that he chopped down a cherry tree and had wooden teeth.

The actual Washington is much more compelling. We can all see the brilliant flourishes of Jefferson's pen, Madison's constitutional handiwork or the success of Hamilton's economic policies, and that can cause us to overlook or underestimate the magnitude of Washington's achievement. Yet he really was, as Washington's greatest biographer, James Flexner, put it, the "indispensable man" of the American founding.

Remember that we look at history with the luxury of knowing what happened. What might seem inevitable or obvious in hindsight was more often than not a bold course, the outcome of which was uncertain at best. We must recapture this sense of contingency and daring if we are to understand Washington.

A soldier by profession and a surveyor by trade, Washington was first and foremost a man of action. He was at every important intersection of the American founding; his decisions and practical wisdom were crucial to the success of the effort at every stage. And at every moment - from the time he became commander in chief to his death - his project was to found a self-governing nation, a constitutional republic. It is here that we see the brilliance of Washington's statesmanship, his hand on the political pulse of the nation, all the while urging, counseling, warning, bolstering and leading his fellow patriots in their common efforts.

From 1775 onward, when the Continental Congress appointed him military commander of continental forces, Washington personified the American Revolution and was the de-facto leader of the colonial struggle. For eight years, Gen. Washington led his small army through the rigors of war, from the defeats in New York and the risky crossing of the Delaware River to the hardships of Valley Forge and the ultimate triumph at Yorktown.

Through force of character and great leadership, Washington transformed an underfunded militia into a capable force that, although never able to take the British army head-on, outwitted and defeated the mightiest military power in the world. Washington lost many more battles than he won, but his defensive strategy achieved his political objective: an independent and unified nation.

After the war, Washington was the central hub of correspondence among the most thoughtful men of the day, leading the effort in nation-building. He was instrumental in bringing about the Constitutional Convention, and his widely publicized participation gave the resulting document a credibility and legitimacy it would otherwise have lacked. Having been immediately and unanimously elected president of the convention, he worked actively throughout the proceedings to create the new Constitution. "Be assured," James Monroe once reminded Thomas Jefferson, "his influence carried this government."

As our first president, he set the precedents that define what it means to be a constitutional executive: strong and energetic, aware of the limits of authority but guarding the prerogatives of office. The vast powers of the presidency, as one Convention delegate wrote, would not have been made as great "had not many of the members cast their eyes towards General Washington as president; and shaped their ideas of the powers to be given to a president by their opinions of his virtue."

And the key ingredient in all of these things was moral character, something that Washington took very seriously and which gave to his decision-making a deeply prudential quality and to his authority an unmatched magnanimity. "His integrity was pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives of interest or consanguinity, of friendship or hatred, being able to bias his decision," Jefferson later observed. "He was, indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man."

It is no coincidence, then, that Washington's most important legacy comes during moments of temptation, when the lure of power was before him. Twice during the Revolution, in 1776 and again in 1777 when Congress was forced to abandon Philadelphia in the face of advancing British troops, Gen. Washington was granted virtually unlimited powers to maintain the war effort and preserve civil society, powers not unlike those assumed in an earlier era by Roman dictators. He shouldered the responsibility but gave the authority back as soon as possible.

After the war, there were calls for Washington to claim formal political power. Indeed, seven months after the victory at Yorktown, one of his officers suggested what many thought only reasonable in the context of the 18th century: that America should establish a monarchy and that Washington should become king. A shocked Washington immediately rejected the offer out of hand as both inappropriate and dishonorable, and demanded the topic never be raised again.

More subtle and problematic was a move by a group of officers in 1783 to use the military, with or without Washington's participation, to threaten the Continental Congress in order to ensure their payment of the army. The Newburgh Conspiracy placed Washington in a critical and delicate position. Had he either ignored the discontent or tacitly approved it, the political outcome would have been different and the possibility of a peaceful resolution of constitutional questions less likely.

On top of that, several political leaders welcomed the army's pressure, and wanted to use the threat as a way of strengthening their call for a stronger national government. Congressman Alexander Hamilton recommended that Washington "take the direction of them" and lead the effort.

But Washington would have none of it. "The Army," he rebuked young Hamilton, "is a dangerous instrument to play with." Instead, he responded to the unsigned papers calling for the army to stand up against the political leadership, by holding a meeting of his officers for March 15 - the Ides of March - 1783. There, Washington denounced the move as destructive of the very ground of republican government, and expressed his "utmost horror and detestation" of those who would "open the flood Gates of Civil discord, and deluge our rising Empire in Blood."

After the speech, Washington drew a letter from his pocket expressing Congress' intention to redress the army. He hesitated, pulled out a pair of glasses and remarked, "Gentlemen, you will permit me to put on my spectacles, for I have not only grown gray, but almost blind, in the service of my country." Many of the officers were in tears. If the speech had not already destroyed the movement, this remark assured its demise.

"On other occasions he had been supported by the exertions of the army and the countenance of his friends," wrote Capt. Samuel Shaw of the episode, "but in this he stood single and alone."

By year's end, Washington, victorious in war, proceeded voluntarily to resign his military commission. When he stepped down again, after his second term as president, a dumbfounded King George III proclaimed him "the greatest character of the age." His peaceful transfer of the presidency to John Adams in 1797 inaugurated one of America's greatest democratic traditions.

Without Washington, America would never have won its war of independence; he was the catalyst of the American founding. Even more significant, he proved that republican government was not only possible but indeed noble. Defeated and exiled, Napoleon lamented the significance of it all: "They wanted me to be another Washington."

No one did more to put the United States on the path to success than Washington. No one did more to assure a government with sufficient power to function but sufficient limits to allow freedom to flourish. No one walked away from power with more dignity or did more to assure the prosperous society we enjoy today. This is why Washington and Washington alone - not Jefferson, not Madison, not Hamilton - is the father of this country.

Celebrated as early as 1778, Washington's Birthday was by the early 18th century second only to the Fourth of July as a patriotic holiday. It was officially recognized by Congress as a national holiday in 1870. The Monday Holiday Law in 1968 moved it from Feb. 22 to the third Monday in February. Contrary to popular opinion, though, no act of Congress or order by any president has changed Washington's Birthday to "Presidents Day."

If Americans wish to honor George Washington, they should recall his deeds, recollect his advice, and once again call the holiday celebrating him what it is, in fact: Washington's Birthday.

[Matthew Spalding, Ph.D.](https://www.heritage.org/about/staff/matthewspalding.cfm), is Director of the B. Kenneth Simon Center for American Studies.

Retrieved October 16, 2025 from [The Man Who Would Not Be King | The Heritage Foundation](https://www.heritage.org/commentary/the-man-who-would-not-be-king)

**Appendix 2**

**National Constitution Center**

**Perspectives on the Constitution: A Republic, If You Can Keep It**

By Richard R. Beeman, Ph.D.

While today we marvel at the extraordinary accomplishment of our Founding Fathers, their own reaction to the US Constitution when it was presented to them for their signatures was considerably less enthusiastic. Benjamin Franklin, ever the optimist even at the age of 81, gave what was for him a remarkably restrained assessment in his final speech before the Constitutional Convention: "…when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men, all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views." He thought it impossible to expect a "perfect production" from such a gathering, but he believed that the Constitution they had just drafted, "with all its faults," was better than any alternative that was likely to emerge.

Nearly all of the delegates harbored objections, but persuaded by Franklin's logic, they put aside their misgivings and affixed their signatures to it. Their over-riding concern was the tendency in nearly all parts of the young country toward disorder and disintegration. Americans had used the doctrine of popular sovereignty--"democracy"--as the rationale for their successful rebellion against English authority in 1776. But they had not yet worked out fully the question that has plagued all nations aspiring to democratic government ever since: how to implement principles of popular majority rule while at the same time preserving stable governments that protect the rights and liberties of all citizens.

Few believed that a new federal constitution alone would be sufficient to create a unified nation out of a collection of independent republics spread out over a vast physical space, extraordinarily diverse in their economic interests, regional loyalties, and ethnic and religious attachments. And there would be new signs of disorder after 1787 that would remind Americans what an incomplete and unstable national structure they had created: settlers in western Pennsylvania rebelled in 1794 because of taxes on their locally distilled whiskey; in western North Carolina there were abortive attempts to create an independent republic of "Franklin" which would ally itself with Spain to insure its independence from the United States; there was continued conflict with Indians across the whole western frontier and increased fear of slave unrest, particularly when news of the slave-led revolution in Haiti reached American shores.

But as fragile as America's federal edifice was at the time of the founding, there was much in the culture and environment that contributed to a national consensus and cohesion: a common language; a solid belief in the principles of English common law and constitutionalism; a widespread commitment (albeit in diverse forms) to the Protestant religion; a shared revolutionary experience; and, perhaps most important, an economic environment which promised most free, white Americans if not great wealth, at least an independent sufficiency.

The American statesmen who succeeded those of the founding generation served their country with a self-conscious sense that the challenges of maintaining a democratic union were every bit as great after 1787 as they were before. Some aspects of their nation-building program--their continuing toleration of slavery and genocidal policies toward American Indians--are fit objects of national shame, not honor. But statesmen of succeeding generations--Lincoln foremost among them--would continue the quest for a "more perfect union."

Such has been our success in building a powerful and cohesive democratic nation-state in post-Civil War America that most Americans today assume that principles of democracy and national harmony somehow naturally go hand-in-hand. But as we look around the rest of the world in the post-Soviet era, we find ample evidence that democratic revolutions do not inevitably lead to national harmony or universal justice. We see that the expression of the "popular will" can create a cacophony of discordant voices, leaving many baffled about the true meaning of majority rule. In far too many places around the world today, the expression of the "popular will" is nothing more than the unleashing of primordial forces of tribal and religious identity which further confound the goal of building stable and consensual governments.

As we look at the state of our federal union 211 years after the Founders completed their work, there is cause for satisfaction that we have avoided many of the plagues afflicting so many other societies, but this is hardly cause for complacency. To be sure, the US Constitution itself has not only survived the crises confronting it in the past, but in so doing, it has in itself become our nation's most powerful symbol of unity--a far preferable alternative to a monarch or a national religion, the institutions on which most nations around the world have relied. Moreover, our Constitution is a stronger, better document than it was when it initially emerged from the Philadelphia Convention. Through the amendment process (in particular, through the 13th, 14th, 15th and 19th Amendments), it has become the protector of the rights of all the people, not just some of the people.

On the other hand, the challenges to national unity under our Constitution are, if anything, far greater than those confronting the infant nation in 1787. Although the new nation was a pluralistic one by the standards of the 18th century, the face of America in 1998 looks very different from the original: we are no longer a people united by a common language, religion or culture; and while our overall level of material prosperity is staggering by the standards of any age, the widening gulf between rich and poor is perhaps the most serious threat to a common definition of the "pursuit of happiness."

The conditions that threaten to undermine our sense of nationhood, bound up in the debate over slavery and manifested in intense sectional conflict during the pre-Civil War era, are today both more complex and diffuse. Some of today's conditions are part of the tragic legacy of slavery--a racial climate marked too often by mutual mistrust and misunderstanding and a condition of desperate poverty within our inner cities that has left many young people so alienated that any standard definition of citizenship becomes meaningless. More commonly, but in the long run perhaps just as alarming, tens of millions of Americans have been turned-off by the corrupting effects of money on the political system. Bombarded with negative advertising about their candidates, they express their feelings of alienation by staying home on election day.

If there is a lesson in all of this it is that our Constitution is neither a self-actuating nor a self-correcting document. It requires the constant attention and devotion of all citizens. There is a story, often told, that upon exiting the Constitutional Convention Benjamin Franklin was approached by a group of citizens asking what sort of government the delegates had created. His answer was: "A republic, if you can keep it." The brevity of that response should not cause us to under-value its essential meaning: democratic republics are not merely founded upon the consent of the people, they are also absolutely dependent upon the active and informed involvement of the people for their continued good health.

Dr. Richard Beeman is professor of history and dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. The University is NCC's academic partner, and for the year 1997 – 98. Dr. Beeman serves as vice chair of our Distinguished Scholars Advisory Panel.

Retrieved October 16, 2025 from [Primary and Secondary Sources - Perspectives on the Constitution: A Republic, If You Can Keep It | Constitution Center](https://constitutioncenter.org/education/classroom-resource-library/classroom/perspectives-on-the-constitution-a-republic-if-you-can-keep-it)