

American Principles of Self-Government

Michael Reber

Introduction

We have seen at the beginning of this new millennium a test of the American Experiment. The corruption scandals of companies such as Enron, WorldCom, and their auditors Arthur Anderson, only highlight the greater problem of our Republic in the 21st century—Modern Moral Minimalism.

Modern Moral Minimalism is a moral system grounded in the ethics of *realpolitik* and classical liberalism. The most influential writers of *realpolitik* are Niccolò Machiavelli (1947), Francis Bacon (1952), and Thomas Hobbes (1998). On behalf of classical liberalism, John Locke (1988) is most noted by scholars of political thought. Modern Moral Minimalism holds that we can only expect minimal moral conduct from all people. Machiavelli's moral code for princes in Chapter XVIII of his classic work, *The Prince*, epitomizes this belief system:

A wise leader cannot and should not keep his word when keeping it is not to his advantage or when the reasons that made him give it are no longer valid. If men were good, this would not be a good precept, but since they are wicked and will not keep faith with you, you are not bound to keep faith with them....So a prince need not have all...good qualities, but it is most essential that he appear to have them. Indeed, I should go so far as to say that having them and always practising them is harmful, while seeming to have them is useful. It is good to appear clement, trustworthy, humane, religious, and honest, and also to be so, but always with the mind so disposed that, when the occasion arises not to be so, you can become the opposite.

This representative statement of modern morality stands in stark contrast to the classical Greek and Roman ideal, which states that the best moral conduct should be required of everyone (Euben, Wallach, and Ober, 1996; MacIntyre, 1984; Norton 1991; Ober and Hedrick, 1996; and Taylor, 1989, 1991).

In *Democracy and Moral Development*, philosopher David Norton (1991) challenges the paradigm of Modern Moral Minimalism and juxtaposes it with a post-modern version of Hellenic-Roman ethics, which he refers to as *Noblesse Oblige*. He asserts that the problem with Modern Moral Minimalism is its non-recognition of character growth:

The prevailing modern way of handling exceptional moral conduct is by categorizing it as supererogatory, where this is understood to represent conduct that is morally good to do, but not morally bad not to do. But this means that exceptional moral conduct is not required of anyone, which is to say that moral development is not a moral requirement. Clearly this conception of supererogatory conduct reinforces moral minimalism (p. 42).

However, *noblesse oblige* is grounded in an ethics that Norton terms *eudaimonism* or self-actualization. It holds that each person is unique and each should discover whom one is (the *daimon* within) and actualize one's true potential to live the *good life* within the congeniality and complementarity of excellences of fellow citizens (Norton, 1976). Thus, through the course of self-actualization, a person is obligated to live up to individual expectations and the expectations of the community.

Eudaimonism should be the ethical foundation of our Republic. We should expect the very best from those persons whom we recognize to be at the latter stages of moral development, such as our business, religious, and political leaders. Furthermore, they should expect the very best of themselves and serve as models for those persons who are in the earlier stages of moral development. Hence, character ethics does not exist solely within public life, but, as Jean Yarbrough (1998) contends in *American Virtues: Thomas Jefferson on the Character of a Free People*, within all of life:

Character has to do with the full range of moral and intellectual virtues. To think about character is to think about the duties we owe to ourselves, to others, to God, as well as to our country, and to put them in right relation to each other. For a people that elevates patriotism and love of country above all else will be different from a people that prizes individual freedom and self-development, and both will differ from a people that places service to others or duty to God at the top of the moral hierarchy....To think about character is to think about the role of government in cultivating virtue and enforcing moral obligation. Here again, a people that uses the power of the laws to enforce its conception of the good life will be very different from a people that relies principally on the family, religion, education, and other social institutions to form the character of its citizens (p. xvii-xviii).

It is in ending with Yarbrough's comments that I attend to the topic of this paper, *American Principles of Self-Government*. I revisit Thomas Jefferson's Principles of Government and re-formulate them into four basic principles for life in the 21st century. Next, I state the conditions necessary for these principles to be fostered within a democratic, republican context, most specifically, Jefferson's Ward Republic. Finally, in reference to Jefferson's thesis that the most important way to secure our liberties is via an educated and self-reliant citizenry, I present a new image of public education for an American Republic.

The Roots of Self-Government

Jefferson's (1999) Principles of Self-Government are grounded in the fundamental and self-evident truths that he outlines in his draft of the Declaration of Independence that he submitted to the General Congress of the United States in 1776:

All men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with *inherent and inalienable* [italics added] rights; that among these are life, liberty, & the pursuit of happiness: that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, & to institute new government, laying it's [sic] foundation on such principles, & organizing it's [sic] powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety & happiness (p. 97).

Unfortunately for Americans, Jefferson never wrote a single treatise on his principles of self-government. Instead, these principles are scattered about in his many letters, official documents, notes, and Autobiography. It is in this section that I attempt to piece together these ideas and present them in a systematic form in order to re-fine them into four basic principles for life in the 21st century.

The modern moralist believes that the purpose of government is to protect people from themselves and that they enter into civil society through a compact that is grounded in the ideal of self-preservation. The *eudaimonist*, however, contends that people enter into civil society not on the basis of protecting each other's self-preservation but on the basis of "social or distributive justice." Bills of Rights, laws, and compacts are established to ensure the social good; they are not the basis for it. As Americans, we should not start from mistrust or deceit of others, but from *eros*—the love for oneself to become whom one is potentially as well as the love for one's fellows to actualize their true selves: "nature hath implanted in our breasts a love of others, a sense of duty to them, a moral instinct, in short, which prompts us irresistibly

to feel and to succor their distresses" (Jefferson, 1999, p. 287). Hence, justice has three aspects:

Commutative Justice: It "obliges respect for the rights of the other" (*Catechism*, 1994, p. 885). As Jefferson (1999) contends in his letter to Francis W. Gilmer on June 7, 1816: "No man has a natural right to commit aggression on the equal rights of another" (p. 142). Thus, where a person does not respect the rights of the other, government intervenes to protect the individual whose rights were violated.

Legal Justice: It is concerned with "what the citizen owes to the community" (*Catechism*, 1994, p. 885). As Jefferson (1999) states, "every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of the society" (p. 142).

Distributive or Social Justice: It is the "respect for the human person and the rights which flow from human dignity and guarantee it" (*Catechism*, 1994, p. 899). This is most explicit in Jefferson's (1999) draft of the Declaration of Independence—"All men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with *inherent and inalienable* [italics added] rights; that among these are life, liberty, & the pursuit of happiness" (p. 97). As distributive justice, "society must provide the conditions that allow people to obtain what is their due, according to their nature and their vocation" (*Catechism*, 1994, p. 899). For example, Jefferson (1999) writes in *Notes on Virginia: Query XIV* that the "general objects of [a law for public education] is to provide an education adapted to the years, to the capacity, and the condition of every one, and directed to their freedom and happiness" and that "specific details" of a law for public education—teaching theory, methodology, and application—are not proper since these "must be the business of the visitors [teachers and educational authorities] entrusted with its execution" (p. 257). He recognizes that every person is entitled to an education that is commensurate with one's nature and happiness. More importantly though, he acknowledges that those directly involved with the education of children and youth—teachers, parents, and the learners themselves—should be the only persons concerned with the business of education, not government, school boards, or presidential blue-ribbon committees.

This discussion on justice helps to better conceptualize the purpose of government. Throughout his writings, Jefferson identifies three purposes of government. In both *A Summary View of the Rights of British America, July 1774* and *Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms, July 1775*, Jefferson and his colleagues' ground government in "a Reverence for our great Creator, Principles of Humanity, and the Dictates of Common Sense" (p. 81). They assert that first

and foremost "Government was instituted to promote the Welfare of Mankind, and ought to be administered for the Attainment of that End" (p. 81). Second, the attainment of this End is achieved by people's own initiatives toward enhancing their lives without government constraints: "Our ancestors... possessed a right which nature has given to all men, of departing from the country in which chance, not choice, has placed them, of going in quest of new habitations, and of there establishing new societies, under such laws and regulations as to them shall seem most likely to promote public happiness" (p. 65). Finally, where individuals are unable to provide for the conditions to enhance their lives, it becomes the purpose of government to supply them. In a letter to John Adams dated October 28, 1813, Jefferson outlines a framework for American self-government and lists some of the non-self-suppliable conditions that Ward Republics should provide. The most important of these is education (p. 189, p. 256). The other "portions of self-government for which they [Ward Republics] are best qualified" include "the care of the poor, their roads, police, elections, the nomination of jurors, administration of justice in small cases, elementary exercises of militia" (p. 189).

In alignment with Jefferson, but from a *eudaimonistic* perspective, Norton (1991) elucidates the following purpose of politics and government in a self-actualizing society:

Enhancement of the quality of life of human beings; that the central agency of such enhancement is the initiative to self-development in individuals; and the paramount function of government is to provide the necessary but non-self-suppliable conditions for optimizing opportunities of individual self-discovery and self-development (p. 44).

He clarifies "enhancement of the quality of life" as politics and government helping people to acquire moral virtues, the development of dispositions of good character that are personal utilities, intrinsic goods, and social utilities (p. 81). This is not done by government teaching these directly, but by providing the conditions that assist people in attaining the virtues, such as establishing public educational systems.

Norton's two classifications of virtue are "cardinal" and "distributed." He contends that cardinal virtues are "indispensable to worthy living of every kind" (p. 81). Jefferson has five classifications of cardinal virtues for the American character:

1. *Moral Sense Virtues*: Justice and Benevolence
2. *Agrarian Virtues*: Industry, Self-reliance, Patience, Moderation, and Independence
3. *Civic Virtues*: Vigilance and Spirited Participation
4. *Epicurean Virtues*: Wisdom and Friendship
5. *Secularized Virtues*: Charity, Tolerance, and Hope (Yarbrough, 1998, p. xix)

Distributed virtues, on the other hand, are "indispensable to worthy living of some, but not all, kinds" (Norton, 1991, p. 81). They are those virtues that are identified and developed within one's vocation. Hence, for an American Republic, the virtues are both the roots of the Tree of Liberty and the nutrients for sustaining it. Without these society would either fall into anarchy or give way to despotism.

Jefferson's Principles of Government

In his First Inaugural Address of March 4, 1801, Jefferson (1999) acknowledges the place of the virtues in his Presidency. He also recognizes that he as an executive and his colleagues as federal legislatures cannot rule by virtue alone—"though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and violate which would be oppression" (p. 173).

It is within this framework of virtue and equal rights that I present Jefferson's "Principles of Government," which he explicitly states in his First Inaugural Address:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the *habeas corpus*; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation (p. 175-176).

Other principles that he acknowledges include:

- Freedom of Thought (p. 113, p. 172, p. 189, p. 204, p. 226, p. 257-258);

- Principle of Reciprocity (p. 168);
- Principle of Taxation with Representation (p. 360);
- Principle of Allodial Property (p. 77-78);
- Principle of Enlightenment (p.189, p. 197, p. 251, p. 363);
- Principles of Family, Community, and Political Self-rule (p. 159, p. 170, p. 360);
- Principle of Small and Direct Representative Government (p. 156, p. 219, p. 360);
- Principle of Voluntary and Short-termed Public Service (167);
- Principle of Frugal and Simple Government (p. 167, p. 169, p. 170, p. 214).

*Principles of Self-Government, Revised*²

In this section I reformulate Jefferson's principles into a simplified version for life in the 21st century. The principles of self-actualization, principles of cognitive psychology, and principles of symbolic interactionist social psychology are antecedent to the principles of democratic, self-rule because they provide the foundation from which good self-government rises and the framework within which it operates. For brevity purposes, the perennial thought on self-government as developed by key thinkers such as Aristotle (1958), Thomas Jefferson (1999), Alexis de Tocqueville (2000), John Stewart Mill (1952), and John Dewey (1997) is distilled into the following list of principles and conditions.

PRINCIPLES

First Principle:

Government closest to the people is government best for the people! Jefferson (1999) writes in a letter to William Charles Jarvis, "I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers but the people themselves" (p. 381-382). In alignment with this thinking, it is reasserted that the people are the best source for governing themselves. A direct, participatory, and when needed, representative form of government should be established; and within the cultural sphere the people should govern themselves through their own private and civil associations.

Second Principle:

An enlightened electorate enlightens! Also in his letter to Jarvis, Jefferson writes, "If we think them [the people] not enlightened enough to exercise their control with wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education" (p. 381-382). Every person has a right and an obligation to control one's own mind. As a right, government must protect it in order for society itself to be free and to enlighten. As an obligation, people must do their utmost for themselves and their fellows to

govern their own affairs and not have the State do it for them. Each mature individual should become a productive member of society and participate in its progress. Otherwise, tyranny may take hold in generations to come. As Tocqueville (2000) contends, only a tyrannical form of government likes for its "citizens to enjoy themselves provided that they think only of enjoying themselves" and not to think of anything else (p. 663).

Third Principle:

Equity is most equitable when it's horizontal! Services that are funded by the public require two layers of horizontal equity. The first layer is horizontal equity between taxpayers and the second layer is horizontal equity between users of public services. Vermont at the beginning of its statehood recognized these two layers as well as their relationship to what Vermont identifies as its most important public service, education. In 1777 the Vermont constitutional architects ratified Chapter II, Section 40, which in today's Vermont Constitution is Chapter II, Section 68. It establishes that "Laws for the encouragement of virtue and prevention of vice and immorality ought to be constantly kept in force, and duly executed; and a competent number of schools ought to be maintained in each town." Furthermore, it establishes in Chapter I, Article 7, a common benefits clause so that all individuals have equal access and opportunities to public services. The clause states, "That government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit...of the people, nation, or community, and not for the particular emolument or advantage of any single person, family, or set of persons." The common benefits and education clauses are necessary in any democratic republic so that horizontal equity exists between taxpayers for and users of publicly funded services.

Fourth Principle:

Sustain not what is might, but what is right! Society should be thought of in terms of four spheres—political, cultural, economic, and environmental—that interact synergistically with one another. The political sphere is government. In order to have a sustainable political system, government should do those things that private and civil associations are unable to do, such as levy taxes, incarcerate criminals, declare war, and protect civil liberties and private property. The cultural sphere, which consists of those public institutions that the political body has created to support the cultural sphere and the private and civil associations that have arisen as a result of voluntary association, has an obligation to perform the communal tasks necessary for sustaining the whole society. The economic sphere consists of the "market." Principles of self-actualization and the antecedent principles of self-government guide the market's members. The environment includes the natural environs. Humanity has the

capacity to live in a world without violence to itself and the planet. Therefore, the other three spheres of society should explore ways in creating sustainable functions and components that operate synergistically with the environment.

CONDITIONS

First Condition:

Only self-actualizing individuals can be entrusted to govern the affairs of others. Jefferson (1999) contends that "a pure republic is a state of society in which every member, of mature and sound mind, has an equal right of participation, personally in the direction of the affairs of the society" (p. 224). As I have already asserted, *noblesse oblige* should be the standard for governance (Norton, 1991, p. 150). It implies that those individuals who are capable of governing their own affairs should be entrusted to govern the affairs of the community. This does not mean creating an elite class of citizens with rights and/or privileges above the rest, such as the voting system proposed by Mill in order to guarantee that those in the latter stages of moral development would have a vote worth more than those in the earlier stages (Representative Government, Chapter 10, 395-399), or employing a litmus test for those who wish to serve. It is, as Jefferson states, a society of "mature" individuals. For in a self-actualizing society, all mature members are sufficiently well qualified to govern the affairs of those who are not governing since each member is equal in loving the common good.

Second Condition:

Governance operates in accordance with The Principle of Equal Consideration and The Principle of Equality. Jefferson (1999) declares that "the way to have good and safe government, is not to trust it all to one, but to divide it among the many, distributing to every one exactly the functions he is competent to" (p. 204). In addition to Jefferson, Ian Morris (1996) refers to Robert Dahl's discussion of The Strong Principle of Equality that has two sets of propositions. The first is the Principle of Equal Consideration of Interests which holds that "All members are sufficiently well qualified, taken all around, to participate in making the collective decisions binding on the association that significantly affect their good or interests" (p.20). The second is the Principle of Equality which states that "None are so definitely better qualified than the others that they should be entrusted with making the collective and binding decisions" (p. 20).

Hence, freedom does not spring from equality. People are not first equal and then free, but are free *and* equal. Freedom entitles individuals to develop into self-actualizing persons. Equality entitles them to those goods that assist in achieving their self-actualization; and this gives rise to participation in the affairs of state and collective decision-making within the *polis*. Furthermore, since each mature per-

son is equal in ability to participate in governance, then some persons are able to make some, but not all, decisions for the whole community, which is the basis for Jefferson's "rotational representation."

Third Condition:

Governance is an Obligation; it is neither a Right nor a Compact. Unlike Hobbes (1998) and Locke (1988) who believe that governance is a compact entered upon in agreement or a right guaranteed to all men, under the principles of self-actualization it is an obligation (Jefferson, 1999, p. 205, p. 286-287; Norton, 1991, p. 99-100, p. 150; Yarbrough, 1998, p. 20-26). As a right, people can choose not to exercise it. A right asks very little of individuals in the way of participating as full members of society. However, within the realm of *noblesse oblige*, an obligation asks the very best of all individuals. This implies that all mature members have an obligation to themselves and to others to participate in the governance of the affairs of community as they are proceeding through their own self-actualization. Governance cannot be left to those members who do not yet exhibit the noble qualities of the community.

Fourth Condition:

Self-Government lives in the light of the virtues. People are alike in achieving the virtues of their community, but qualitatively different in the way each does so (Aristotle, Politics, Book II, Section 2 trans. 1958; Hansen, 1996, p. 91-94; Jefferson, 1999, p. 258; Mill, On Liberty, Chapter 3, 1952; Morris, 1996, p. 21-22; Norton, 1991, 48-49; Wallach, 1996, p. 331-332). In governing the affairs of community, individuals should perform those duties that they are best qualified to perform. Within this framework, citizenship is membership in governance as well as service. For the betterment of the individual and his or her community, equality within the *polis* should be distributed in accordance with one's nature and abilities so he or she is able to govern him/herself and others best.

Fifth Condition:

Government should be thought of as a modern "metrioi." Jefferson's (1999) zealous pursuit of "rotational representation" and term limits is based upon his ideal of a purely republican form of government, i.e. a *metrioi* (p. 361-362). A *metrioi* is a community of "middling people" who think of themselves as part of a community of restrained, sensible individuals who are all of the same mind, *homonía*, and whose bonds are kept together through brotherly love, *philia* (Morris, 1996, p. 21-22; Wallach, 1996, p. 331-332). All are alike in loving the greater good of the community but are qualitatively different in achieving it. In a society of *metrioi*, each person spurs on the self-realization of others by doing the

work that is one's to do in the *polis*. Each individual wishes for the best in all people (Aristotle, *Politics*, Book II, Section 2 trans. 1958; Hansen, 1996, p. 91-94; Morris, 1996, p. 21-22; Wallach, 1996, p. 331-332).

The Educational Ideal for an American Republic

One of Jefferson's (1999) crowning achievements was his development of a public educational system for the State of Virginia. In his numerous writings he outlines his vision of a public educational system within the realm of the Ward Republic³ (p. 189, p. 197, p. 204-205, p. 210-217, p. 219, p. 251, p. 252-260) as well as his ideas for the University of Virginia (p. 297-310). His ward system is a framework of self-government that requires special attention because it serves as a model for the educational ideal that I wish to present.

The diffusion of learning is an important aspect of Jefferson's educational vision. He understood that only individuals with an enlightened intellect could govern society best—"If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education" (p. 382). To create an enlightened electorate, he championed the cause for improving "the law for educating common people" (p. 251). As Governor of Virginia, he introduced a bill that would have established not only in law but also in the psyche of the people of his state the notion that the diffusion of knowledge is integral to the sustainability of a democratic and free society (p. 235). As already cited, the State of Vermont established in its constitution education and common benefits clauses. This is the first step in creating the conditions for the educational framework that I advocate.

In keeping with the Principle of Horizontal Equity, government should tax only those things that people consume. Jefferson (1999), too, understood this principle and in his first presidential administration he abolished federal taxes and compensated the loss by increasing tariffs and postal fees (p. 530-535). Within a ward system, public education should be free (p. 240-243) and funded by community consumption taxes, education bonds, and/or private donations, but not property or estate taxes.

Though Jefferson grounds his educational framework in 18th century thought, Americans should heed his advice regarding innovation—"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times" (p. 215). Taking Jefferson's advice, public education in the 21st century should be based upon a set of commensurable principles—principles of self-

actualization, principles of brain-based learning and multiple intelligences theory, principles of learner-centered and learner-directed education, and principles of symbolic interactionist social psychology—as well as two democratic criteria that John Dewey (1997) establishes in, *Democracy and Education*: (1) a numerous and varied amount of interests that are consciously shared amongst members of society and which are relied upon in guiding society and (2) a fuller and freer interplay of various forms of private and civil association that the members can enjoy which in turn effect social habits in the democratic community (p. 86-87). These principles and criteria give rise to the following image of education:

- Education should assist an individual with actualizing [one's] potential.
- Education should be organized around the cognitive abilities of each individual.
- Education should encourage learners to take control of their own learning and focus and reflect upon their own learning processes.
- Education should assist individuals with interacting with the environment within which they live so they can adjust harmoniously to its changes.
- Education should assist learners with becoming competent and able community members who, through participatory democratic measures, systemically design their own social systems.
- Education should strive to maintain the sustainable relationship between the political, cultural, economic, and environmental sectors of society.
- Education should strive to promote democratic values via participatory democracy and free market mechanisms (Reber, 2002, 137).

This new image of education that I propose should be considered in terms of a "learning network." Like the Internet, a community learning network is a web of nodes (p. 165). The largest node in the network is the school board. However, instead of calling it a school board, I prefer to think of it as a Community Learning Network Administrative Office (CLNAO) with a Board of Directors that is elected directly by the residents of the Ward Republic. In alignment with Jefferson (1999), I agree that the education of each person should be "adapted to the years, to the capacity, and the condition of every one, and directed to their freedom and happiness," and that the specific details should be left in the hands of teachers, parents, and their children (p. 257). The Board or CLNAO should not make judgments on what, when, where, or how learning is to occur.

The three social components for implementing a child's education include neighborhood Individualized Curricular Development Offices (ICDOs), Learning Pods, and Commu-

nity Learning Centers (CLCs). An ICDO is established by the CLNAO within walking distance to people's homes for diagnosing and advising learners as well as assisting them with developing curricula and matching them with other learners in the network. A learning pod, which receives a charter from the CLNAO, is a private group of teachers and/or lay-teachers that facilitates the learning of children. It, too, receives a charter from the CLNAO. A CLC replaces the old notion of the school and develops and provides educational services and resources for learners. It is a public or private entity chartered by the CLNAO that is staffed with professional and/or lay-teachers who work with learning pods in developing individualized curricula for learners and assisting in the implementation of the programs.

The funding of these entities includes several sources: public funds, private donations, grants, and/or other income. Public funds are distributed according to a public funding system that is based upon free market principles. The more demand for a learning pod or CLC, the more public funding it will receive. Also, each learning pod and CLC decides how to allocate its funds, such as teacher salaries. However, if a learning pod or CLC allocates too much toward a certain area, it could take away from other areas, which in turn could decrease the quality of the learning experiences for the learners, which in turn could decrease the demand for its services in the following term.

In alignment with the Principles of Self-Government, people monitor the ward's learning network. Private and civil associations use the power of information to rank learning pods and CLCs, provide consumer reports, and help families with finding learning pods or CLCs that best fit each child's learning interests, needs, and inclinations. Government only plays an enforcing role when cases of fraud or abuse are discovered.

Finally, it should be noted that sectarian organizations are able to use a ward's public learning network. For example, if a Catholic school were to establish various learning pods, these pods would be entitled to public services such as libraries, CLCs, and museums. However, a sectarian learning pod would not receive public funds because of the Principle of Separation of Church and State. Unlike the current educational paradigm that places liberties at odds with one another, a community learning network within the framework of a Ward Republic balances liberties such as self-actualization and freedom of religion.

Conclusion

In closing, the Principles of Self-Government that I have proposed are in alignment with the democratic-republican ideals that Jefferson himself championed. Furthermore, it is in recognizing these principles that an educational framework

like the one I have envisioned becomes possible for life in the 21st century. The ward system is an inventive model of democratic self-rule that Jefferson has created. I offer it as an example that we Americans can follow for life in the new millennium if we wish to create a true democracy based on the actualization of sound principles by an enlightened citizenry.

References

- Aristotle. (1958). *Politics*. (Ed. Justin D. Kaplan and Trans. Benjamin Jowett), *The Pocket Aristotle*. New York, New York: Washington Square Press.
- Bacon, Sir Francis. (1952). *Novum organum*. In Robert Maynard Hutchins (Ed.), *Great Books of the Western World: Francis Bacon* (Vol. 30, pp.105-195). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica. (Original work published in 1620)
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. (1994). (2nd ed.). The Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Dewey, John. (1997). *Democracy and Education*. New York, New York: The Free Press.
- Euben, Peter J., Wallach, John, and Ober, Josiah (Eds.). (1996). *Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction of American Democracy*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman. (1996). The ancient Athenian and the modern liberal view of liberty as a democratic ideal. In Josiah Ober and Charles Hedrick (Eds.), *DEMOKRATIA: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern* (pp. 91-104). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. (1998). *On the Citizen: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*. (Richard Tuck and Michael, Trans. & Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1641)
- Jefferson, Thomas. (1999). The Constitutions of Virginia and France: Notes on Virginia: Query XIII. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (V.2, pp. 324-335). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . Moral Sense, Civic Education, and Freedom of the Press: Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge, 1779. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (IV.2, pp. 235-243). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . Moral Sense, Civic Education, and Freedom of the Press: To George Wythe, August 13, 1786. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (IV.5, pp. 249-252). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Moral Sense, Civic Education, and Freedom of the Press: Notes on Virginia: Query XIV. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (IV.7, pp. 256-260). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moral Sense, Civic Education, and Freedom of the Press: To Peter Carr, August 10, 1787. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (IV.6, pp. 252-256). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moral Sense, Civic Education, and Freedom of the Press: Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia, August 4, 1818. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (IV.23, pp. 297-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moral Sense, Civic Education, and Freedom of the Press: To Thomas Law, June 13, 1814. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (IV.19, pp. 285-290). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Native Americans: Second Inaugural Address, March 4, 1805. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (X.9, pp. 530-535). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Natural Law, Natural Right, and Revolution: The Declaration of Independence [as amended and adopted in Congress], July 4, 1776. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (II.6, pp. 102-105). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Natural Law, Natural Right, and Revolution: A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress Assembled [Jefferson's draft]. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (II.5, pp. 96-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Natural Law, Natural Right, and Revolution: Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms [adopted by Congress July 6, 1775]. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (II.2, pp. 80-87). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Natural Law, Natural Right, and Revolution: To David Humphreys, March 18, 1789. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (II.10, pp. 111-114). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Natural Law, Natural Right, and Revolution: To Francis W. Gilmer, June 7, 1816. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (II.14, pp. 142-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Natural Law, Natural Right, and Revolution: To Roger C. Weightman, June 24, 1826. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (II.17, pp. 148-149). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Natural Law, Natural Right, and Revolution: A Summary View of the Rights of British America, July 1774. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (II.1, pp. 64-80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Political Parties: To Dr. Benjamin Rush, January 16, 1811. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (VIII.11, pp. 425-430). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Elbridge Gerry, January 26, 1799. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.6, pp. 167-169). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.9, pp. 172-176). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Gideon Granger, August 13, 1800. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.7, pp. 169-171). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Isaac H. Tiffany, April 4, 1819. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.28, pp. 224-225). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To John Adams, October 28, 1813. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.16, pp. 185-191). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To John Adams, December 10, 1819. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.29, pp. 225-226). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Joseph C. Cabell, January 31, 1814. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of*

- Political Thought* (III.19, pp. 195-197). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Joseph C. Cabell, February 2, 1816. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.21, pp. 202-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: Opinion on Residence Bill, July 15, 1790. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.4, pp. 159-164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Samuel Kercheval, July 12, 1816. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.23, pp. 210-217). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Samuel Kercheval, September 5, 1816. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.25, pp. 218-220). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Self-Government: To Thomas Paine, July 11, 1789. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (III.2, pp. 154-156). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The U.S. Constitution: To James Madison, December 20, 1787. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (VI.4, pp. 360-363). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The U.S. Constitution: To William Charles Jarvis, September 28, 1820. In Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball (Eds.), *Jefferson's Political Writings: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought* (VI.13, pp. 381-382). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locke, John. (1988). *Two Treatises of Government: Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*. (Peter Laslett, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1690)
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. (1947). *The Prince*. (Thomas G. Bergin, Trans. & Ed.). Northbrook, Illinois: AHM Publishing Corporation. (Original work published in 1520)
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. (1984). *After Virtue*. (2nd ed.). Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame.
- Mills, John Stewart. (1952). On liberty. In Robert Maynard Hutchins (Ed.), *Great Books of the Western World*: (Vol. 43, pp. 263-323). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica. (Original work published in 1895)
- (1952). Representative Government. In Robert Maynard Hutchins (Ed.), *Great Books of the Western World*: (Vol. 43, pp. 327-442). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica. (Original work published in 1861)
- Morris, Ian. (1996). The strong principle of equality and the archaic origins of Greek democracy. In Josiah Ober and Charles Hedrick (Eds.), *DEMOKRATIA: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. (pp. 19-48). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Norton, David. (1976). *Personal Destinies: A Philosophy of Ethical Individualism*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- (1991). *Democracy and Moral Development*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ober, Josiah and Hedrick, Charles (Eds.). (1996). *DEMOKRATIA: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Reber, Michael F. (2002). *An Alternative Framework for Community Learning Centers in the 21st Century: A Systemic Design Approach Toward the Creation of a Transformational Learning System*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The International University (TIU) Asia-Pacific Centers of The International University, Independence, Missouri.
- Taylor, Charles. (1989). *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- *The Ethics of Authenticity*. (1991). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. (2000). *Democracy in America*. (Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop, Trans. & Eds.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 1835)
- Vermont Constitution, Chapter I, Article 7.
- Chapter II, Section 68.
- Wallach, John R. (1996). Two democracies and virtue. In J. Peter Euben, John Wallach, and Josiah Ober (Eds.), *Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction of American Democracy* (pp.319-340). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Yarbrough, Jean M. (1998). *American Virtues: Thomas Jefferson and the Character of a Free People*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Notes

¹ Joyce Appleby and Terence Ball write that the Revolutionary Convention of 1774 assigned Jefferson the task of drafting a *Summary View*, which was later revised by the Convention. Similar situations occurred in the Second Continental Congress when he was assigned the task of drafting *Causes and Necessity* as well as *The Declaration of Independence* (xiv-xvi).

² This is an adaptation from "Principles of Self-Government" in my dissertation, *An Alternative Framework for Community Learning Centers in the 21st Century: A Systemic Design Approach Toward the Creation of a Transformational Learning System*, presented to The International University (TIU) Asia-Pacific Centers.

³ For Jefferson, a county is divided into wards of up to six square miles because "if invited by private authority, or county or district meetings, these divisions are so large that few [men] would attend; and their voice will be imperfectly, or falsely pronounced. Here, then, would be the advantages of the ward divisions" (p. 216-217).