

**THE 2025 CONSTITUTION DAY LECTURE**

**WHY WE SHOULD CELEBRATE CONSTITUTION DAY**

*Hon. William H. Pryor Jr.*

## WHY WE SHOULD CELEBRATE CONSTITUTION DAY

*Hon. William H. Pryor Jr.\**

Two hundred thirty-eight years ago, on September 17, 1787, thirty-nine of the fifty-five delegates to the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia for the last time to sign the Constitution that they would propose to the American people for ratification.<sup>1</sup> When adopted, that Constitution became, in its words, “the supreme Law of the Land.”<sup>2</sup> It is fitting that we celebrate Constitution Day at a law school—with an assembly of judges, lawyers, law professors, and law students.

You could say that the Constitutional Convention served as a lawyers’ revolution. Most of the delegates, including a majority of those who signed the Constitution, were lawyers.<sup>3</sup> Some later served on the federal bench and even on the Supreme Court, including John Rutledge and Oliver Ellsworth, who later became our second and third chief justices.<sup>4</sup> Two of the lawyer delegates to the Convention, Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, teamed with a lawyer who would become the first chief justice, John Jay,<sup>5</sup> to explain, defend, and propagate the case for ratifying the Constitution in writings that political scientists, historians, and lawyers still study and debate.<sup>6</sup>

That brief overview covers the who, what, when, and where of the occasion we commemorate each year. Those details are important. But I want to talk about something even more important: I want to talk about *why* we should celebrate the day.

We should celebrate Constitution Day because of its importance in the history of constitutionalism and the development of the rule of law. Constitution Day does not mark the beginning of constitutionalism or the rule of law. But our Constitution advanced those related principles in ways that nothing else had ever done.

\* Chief Judge William H. Pryor Jr., U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

1. See JOHN R. VILE, *THE MEN WHO MADE THE CONSTITUTION: LIVES OF THE DELEGATES TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION* xix (Scarecrow Press 2013); THE HERITAGE FOUND., *THE FOUNDERS’ ALMANAC 20* (Matthew Spalding ed., 2002).

2. U.S. CONST. art. VI, cl. 2.

3. VILE, *supra* note 1, at xx.

4. *John Rutledge, 1795*, SUP. CT. HIST. SOC’Y, <https://supremecourthistory.org/chief-justices/john-rutledge-1795/> [<https://perma.cc/TUR2-LXEJ>] (last visited Jan. 6, 2026); *Oliver Ellsworth, 1796-1800*, SUP. CT. HIST. SOC’Y, <https://supremecourthistory.org/chief-justices/oliver-ellsworth-1796-1800/> [<https://perma.cc/R878-KFZE>] (last visited Jan. 6, 2026).

5. *John Jay, 1789-1795*, SUP. CT. HIST. SOC’Y, <https://supremecourthistory.org/chief-justices/john-jay-1789-1795/> [<https://perma.cc/W7BN-GLPT>] (last visited Jan. 6, 2026).

6. See generally THE FEDERALIST NOS. 1–85 (addressing concerns and promoting the ratification of the Constitution).

When we celebrate the historical importance of the Constitution, we celebrate more than the original text. We also celebrate the intergenerational Constitution of today—the Founders’ Constitution as amended by the American people twenty-seven times.<sup>7</sup> We celebrate the Constitution that secures the liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.<sup>8</sup> We celebrate the Constitution that preserves the separate sovereignty of the states.<sup>9</sup> We celebrate the Constitution that abolished slavery and established national citizenship for all born here.<sup>10</sup> We celebrate the Constitution that abolished the poll tax.<sup>11</sup> We celebrate the Constitution that prohibits denials of the right to vote on account of race<sup>12</sup> and sex<sup>13</sup> and denials on account of age for any citizen eighteen or older.<sup>14</sup> We celebrate the Constitution that enables Americans to enjoy its enduring benefits and, when necessary, to correct its fundamental flaws.<sup>15</sup>

When we celebrate the historical importance of the Constitution, we also celebrate how we have liquidated its meaning through custom and experience. Some call the Constitution a “living document,”<sup>16</sup> but it is *not* an organism that consumes nourishment or reproduces.<sup>17</sup> It is instead organic because it serves as the foundation for our government, and it is living only insofar as it must be settled through practice and experience and changed through amendment by a process that it defines.<sup>18</sup> For example, the Constitution does not expressly mention the power of judicial review.<sup>19</sup> But the founding generation understood, long before *Marbury v. Madison*<sup>20</sup> and other precedents liquidated the practice, that the Constitution would serve as the supreme law for all branches of government and that the judiciary, no less than the executive and legislative branches, would have to interpret and apply it in matters within its jurisdiction.<sup>21</sup>

7. U.S. CONST. amends. I–XXVII.

8. *Id.* amends. I–X.

9. *Id.* amend. X.

10. *Id.* amends. XIII, § 1, XIV, § 1.

11. *Id.* amend. XXIV, § 1.

12. *Id.* amend. XV, § 1.

13. *Id.* amend. XIX.

14. *Id.* amend. XXVI, § 1.

15. *See id.* art. V.

16. Thurgood Marshall, *The Constitution’s Bicentennial: Commemorating the Wrong Document?*, 40 VAND. L. REV. 1337, 1342 (1987).

17. *See Life*, MERRIAM-WEBSTER, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/life> [<https://perma.cc/BHM6-7VEL>] (last visited Jan. 16, 2026) (defining “life” as having the capacity to metabolize, grow, and reproduce).

18. U.S. CONST. art. V.

19. *See generally id.* art. III, § 1 (outlining the positions and purposes of the judicial system without explicitly invoking “judicial review”).

20. 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177–78 (1803).

21. *See* THE FEDERALIST NO. 78, at 467 (Alexander Hamilton) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961) (“The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges as, a fundamental law. It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning

Nevertheless, we should not pretend that the history of constitutionalism started in 1787. Constitutionalism is an ancient project that started in Greece and Rome as philosophers first thought about how to prevent arbitrary rule.<sup>22</sup> The ancients understood that a king could be benevolent or a tyrant, an aristocracy could be noble or an oligarchy, and a democracy could be just or just a mob.<sup>23</sup> The Romans contributed ideas of popular sovereignty and of higher or natural law.<sup>24</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas taught that a mixed government was the best form to prevent tyranny<sup>25</sup> and that any human law that violated the natural law was no law at all.<sup>26</sup> And the English contributed the idea of the supremacy of law administered by a mix of king, lords, and commoners, with Parliament supreme in its exposition of their *unwritten* constitution.<sup>27</sup> On Constitution Day, we celebrate how Americans fundamentally changed the project of constitutionalism.

Americans broke with the British tradition by reducing our Constitution to writing, but the federal Constitution was not the first written one. The thirteen states were the innovators.<sup>28</sup> As Gordon Wood, the great historian of the Founding Era, has explained, “[t]he office of our governors, the bicameral legislatures, tripartite separation of powers, bills of rights, and the unique use of constitutional conventions were all born during the state constitution-making period between 1775 and the early 1780s, well before the federal Constitution of 1787 was created.”<sup>29</sup> Consider that the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of 1780, written by John Adams, separated the powers of its government with these memorable words:

---

as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative body. If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, that which has the superior obligation and validity ought, of course, to be preferred; or, in other words, the Constitution ought to be preferred to the statute, the intention of the people to the intention of their agents.”)

22. See RAYMOND POLIN, *PLATO AND ARISTOTLE ON CONSTITUTIONALISM* 167–81 (Routledge 2018) (1988) (expressing the Aristotelian perspective on the rule of law and its influence on the Athenian constitution); see also Rafael Domingo, *Roman Law and Global Constitutionalism*, S.D. INT’L L.J. 217, 222 (2019) (describing the lasting impact of Greek political philosophy on Roman lawmakers).

23. Domingo, *supra* note 22, at 224.

24. See generally MICHAEL C. HAWLEY, *NATURAL LAW REPUBLICANISM* (2022) (examining how Cicero’s ideas of popular sovereignty and natural law influenced the American founding).

25. 1 THOMAS AQUINAS, *SUMMA THEOLOGICA* pt. I, q. 105, art. 1.

26. *Id.* pt. I, q. 96, art. 4.

27. GORDON S. WOOD, *THE IDEA OF AMERICA: REFLECTIONS ON THE BIRTH OF THE UNITED STATES* 173, 175–76 (2011).

28. The constitutions of the first thirteen states all preceded the ratification of the United States Constitution. See U.S. CONST. (ratified in 1788); CONN. CONST. (adopted in 1639); N.H. CONST. (adopted in 1776); PENN. CONST. (adopted in 1776); N.J. CONST. (adopted in 1776); DEL. CONST. (adopted in 1776); MD. CONST. (adopted in 1776); VA. CONST. (adopted in 1776); N.C. CONST. (adopted in 1776); S.C. CONST. (adopted in 1776); N.Y. CONST. (adopted in 1777); GA. CONST. (adopted in 1777); MASS. CONST. (adopted in 1780).

29. Gordon S. Wood, *Foreword: State Constitution-Making in the American Revolution*, 24 RUTGERS L.J. 911, 911 (1993).

In the government of this commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them: the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them: the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them: to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men.<sup>30</sup>

We know that phrase—“a government of laws and not of men”<sup>31</sup>—because of that state constitution.

The federal Constitution followed these state innovations. The Constitutional Convention proposed a new government of three separate branches, with legislative power vested in a bicameral Congress, executive power vested in a president, and judicial power vested in one Supreme Court and any inferior courts that Congress would create.<sup>32</sup> Although the original Constitution did not include a bill of rights, it guaranteed an accused the right to trial by jury<sup>33</sup> and prohibited ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and impairments of the obligations of contracts.<sup>34</sup>

The Federalist proponents of the Constitution thought that a bill of rights would be unnecessary—perhaps even dangerous. They decried “parchment barriers” and feared that people would come to think that a list of fundamental rights would mean that others do not exist.<sup>35</sup> But ratification eventually came with the understanding that a bill of rights would soon follow as a necessary feature. And it would include an important rule of construction to counter the Federalists’ fears: “The enumeration . . . of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”<sup>36</sup>

The Convention advanced the American experiment of *written* constitutions. Indeed, it proposed a constitution that repeatedly refers to itself as a written text situated at a fixed time in history and to be interpreted accordingly.<sup>37</sup> The Preamble promises to “ordain and establish *this* Constitution for the United States of America.”<sup>38</sup> Article II declares that “[n]o Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, *at the time of the Adoption of this* Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President.”<sup>39</sup> Article III vests the judicial power in a judiciary for “all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising

30. MASS. CONST. art. XXX.

31. *Id.*

32. See THE FOUNDERS’ CONSTITUTION 311–13 (Philip B. Kurland & Ralph Lerner eds., 1987), <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/> [<https://perma.cc/6EDD-2CKP>].

33. U.S. CONST. art. III, § 2, cl. 3.

34. *Id.* art. I, § 9, cl. 3, § 10, cl. 1.

35. See Letter from James Madison to Thomas Jefferson (Oct. 17, 1788), reprinted by NAT’L ARCHIVES: FOUNDERS ONLINE, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/01-11-02-0218> [<https://perma.cc/J932-Q38H>].

36. U.S. CONST. amend. IX.

37. See *id.* arts. V–VII.

38. *Id.* pmbl. (emphasis added).

39. *Id.* art. II, § 1, cl. 5 (emphasis added).

under *this* Constitution.”<sup>40</sup> Article VI distinguishes “[*this* Constitution” from the statutes and treaties that together compose “the supreme Law of the Land.”<sup>41</sup> And it requires that state judicial officers be bound by oath to “support *this* Constitution.”<sup>42</sup> By emphatically rejecting the British tradition of an unwritten constitution, the founding generation sought to fix the meaning of this written Constitution and to allow the people to amend it when a new written rule was needed.

Although the state constitutions provided models, the federal Constitution changed the game. “We the people” created a constitutional, federal democratic republic, the first of its kind, to govern a vast and expanding territory. The Convention departed from the Greek philosophy that a republic had to be kept small for it to endure.<sup>43</sup> And the text did not begin with the words, “We the states.” It did not describe a compact, alliance, or confederacy. To be sure, it was ratified state-by-state, but the people directly elected the delegates to the state ratifying conventions.<sup>44</sup> And they did so to form a Union.<sup>45</sup> Professor Akhil Amar has explained that Gouverneur Morris, draftsman of the Constitution, might have borrowed language from the act that united the kingdoms of England and Scotland, “rendring the union of the two kingdoms more intire and compleat,” blended with language from Queen Anne’s letter to the Scottish Parliament, which referred to “an entire and perfect union.”<sup>46</sup> What began with the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, on behalf of the “unanimous” and “united States of America”<sup>47</sup> would become “a more perfect Union.”<sup>48</sup> And that Union secured the foundation for our Nation when its future was in doubt.

Unlike anything before it, this Union would be federal—a compound republic with a federal sovereign and separate state sovereigns. The founders, as the Supreme Court later described it, “split the atom of sovereignty.”<sup>49</sup> In *Federalist 51*, James Madison explained “[i]f men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.”<sup>50</sup> He described the challenge of constitutionalism this way: “In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first

---

40. *Id.* art. III, § 2, cl. 1 (emphasis added).

41. *Id.* art. VI, cl. 2 (emphasis added).

42. *Id.* art. VI, cl. 3 (emphasis added).

43. WOOD, *supra* note 27, at 190–91.

44. *See The Constitution: How Did it Happen?* NAT’L ARCHIVES, <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution/how-did-it-happen> [<https://perma.cc/SPL7-5ZYU>] (last visited Jan. 16, 2026).

45. *See* THE FEDERALIST NO. 9 (Alexander Hamilton).

46. AKHIL REED AMAR, AMERICA’S CONSTITUTION: A BIOGRAPHY 36 (2006) (emphasis omitted).

47. THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE para. 1 (U.S. 1776).

48. U.S. CONST. pmbi.

49. *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 838 (1995) (Kennedy, J., concurring).

50. THE FEDERALIST NO. 51, at 322 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961).

enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.”<sup>51</sup> This Constitution of 1787 offered, in Madison’s words, “a double security” for “the rights of the people”—horizontally through separated powers and vertically through federalism—“[t]he different governments will control each other, at the same time that each will be controlled by itself.”<sup>52</sup> This sound structure of separated powers and federalism would ensure that the Bill of Rights would not become a parchment guarantee.

Because the republic is federal, the Constitution enumerates its powers. Unlike the states, the federal republic lacks the general police power to protect the health, safety, and morals of the citizens.<sup>53</sup> State constitutions, by their nature, are longer texts that deny powers that general governments would otherwise have.<sup>54</sup> The federal republic, in contrast, has only those powers expressly granted by the Constitution. Article I vests only the legislative powers “herein granted.”<sup>55</sup> Article II defines the powers of the President.<sup>56</sup> Article III, section 2, defines the limited jurisdiction of the courts.<sup>57</sup> And the last provision of the Bill of Rights drives the point home that “[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”<sup>58</sup>

Although it does not borrow the language of the Massachusetts Constitution about “a government of laws and not of men,”<sup>59</sup> the federal Constitution nevertheless ensures the rule of law. It separates the powers of the federal republic by vesting them in separate branches defined in the first three articles.<sup>60</sup> And it does so for the same reason as the Massachusetts Constitution: by dividing power, it makes the Constitution supreme, not any branch created by it, so that it may be a government of laws.<sup>61</sup>

Some wrongly equate the rule of law with the maintenance of a legal system—that is, with law and order. But every government on earth has a system of laws. A police state has law and order; both the Soviet Union and

51. *Id.*

52. *Id.* at 323.

53. *See* *United States v. Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549, 566 (1995) (“The Constitution . . . withhold[s] from Congress a plenary police power that would authorize enactment of every type of legislation.”).

54. *See* Nina Neff, *Popular Sovereignty and the Doctrine of Plenary State Legislative Power*, 62 WM. & MARY L. REV. ONLINE (2020) 1, 4 (“[S]tate legislatures are presumed in constitutional law to have broad plenary power, except insofar as they are limited (explicitly or impliedly) by the state and federal constitutions.”).

55. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 1.

56. *Id.* art. II, § 2.

57. *Id.* art. III, § 2.

58. *Id.* amend. X.

59. MASS. CONST. pt. 1, art. III.

60. U.S. CONST. arts. I–III.

61. THE FEDERALIST NO. 51, at 321–22 (James Madison) (Clinton Rossiter ed., 1961) (“[T]he great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others.”).

Nazi Germany had a legal system.<sup>62</sup> Neither had the rule of law. Communist China has a legal system.<sup>63</sup> It does not have the rule of law. Properly understood, the rule of law means that both the government and its citizens are bound by law promulgated beforehand, enforced equally, and adjudicated independently through fair notice and procedures.<sup>64</sup> Thomas Paine put it this way in *Common Sense*: “[I]n absolute governments the king is law,” but “in America *the law is king*.”<sup>65</sup>

Under the Constitution, every official, no matter how high or low, is a creature of the law and is bound by it. No official or person is above the law. All officials take oaths to adhere to the Constitution.<sup>66</sup> The Constitution defines and limits the power of Congress to make law.<sup>67</sup> It requires of the President faithful execution of the law.<sup>68</sup> And it vests the judicial power in courts created by law and defines their jurisdiction for all cases and controversies arising under the law.<sup>69</sup> Our Constitution is not a code for private conduct. It is a law that limits government premised on the idea that the state exists to preserve individual liberty.

Our Constitution, the supreme law, must be understood foremost as a legal instrument—not as an aspirational statement of political principles. Consider how the delegates wrote the text in the precise language of law. It grants Congress, for example, the power “[t]o define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations.”<sup>70</sup> It states that “[t]he Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended.”<sup>71</sup> As I have already mentioned, it prohibits bills of attainder and ex post facto laws, whether by Congress or by the states.<sup>72</sup> It extends the judicial power to all cases, in law and equity, arising under federal law, and to all cases

62. See generally Richard Thornburgh, *The Soviet Union and the Rule of Law*, 69 FOREIGN AFFAIRS 13 (1990) (describing, among other things, the Soviet Union’s totalitarianism); Richard D. Fybel, *Judges, Lawyers, Legal Theorists, and the Law in Nazi Germany (1933–1938): Kristallnacht; and My Parents’ Escapes from the Nazis*, 70 UCLA L. REV. ONLINE 4 (2022) (explaining how Nazi consolidation of power occurred in part through the Weimar Constitution).

63. Nongji Zhang, *People’s Republic of China Legal Research*, HARV. L. SCH. LIBR. <https://guides.library.harvard.edu/ChineseLegalResearch> [<https://perma.cc/8SCX-MP4X>] (last visited Jan. 12, 2026).

64. U.N. Secretary-General, *The Rule of Law and Transitional Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies*, ¶ 6, U.N. Doc. S/2004/616 (Aug. 23, 2004) (“The ‘rule of law’ . . . refers to a principle of governance in which all persons, institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards.”).

65. THOMAS PAINE, COMMON SENSE 40 (Fall River Press 1995).

66. U.S. CONST. art. VI (“[A]ll executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution . . .”).

67. *Id.* art. I, § 8.

68. *Id.* art. II, § 1, cl. 8.

69. *Id.* art. III, §§ 1–2.

70. *Id.* art. I, § 8, cl. 10.

71. *Id.* art. I, § 9, cl. 2.

72. *Id.* art. I, § 9, cl. 3, § 10, cl. 1.

of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction.<sup>73</sup> It defines the original and appellate jurisdictions of the Supreme Court.<sup>74</sup> It preserves trial by jury for crimes.<sup>75</sup> It addresses treason,<sup>76</sup> impeachments for high crimes and misdemeanors,<sup>77</sup> and extraditions.<sup>78</sup> The 1787 Constitution entitles the citizens of each state the privileges and immunities of citizens of other states.<sup>79</sup> The Bill of Rights adds more with guarantees of warrants based only on probable cause,<sup>80</sup> indictment by grand jury,<sup>81</sup> due process of law,<sup>82</sup> just compensation for takings of property,<sup>83</sup> speedy trial,<sup>84</sup> the right to confront witnesses and to compulsory process for them,<sup>85</sup> the assistance of counsel,<sup>86</sup> and trial by jury in suits at common law.<sup>87</sup> It prohibits double jeopardy,<sup>88</sup> excessive bail and fines,<sup>89</sup> and cruel and unusual punishments.<sup>90</sup> The Fourteenth Amendment defines national citizenship and prohibits abridgements of the privileges or immunities of that citizenship.<sup>91</sup> It prohibits state deprivations of due process of law and of equal protection of the laws.<sup>92</sup> All this technical language and more can be understood only by reference to law—both the common law and the law of nations.

When we celebrate Constitution Day, we rightly celebrate its guarantees of civil liberties and protections of voting rights. But we must remain vigilant. The freedom of speech and of the press and of the free exercise of religion are not popular everywhere or with all Americans. We remain exceptional in our protections of these basic rights.

The rule of law is not always popular. Nor is judicial independence. Treating all people equally regardless of race or sex remains controversial. The Constitution protects private property and freedom of contract and prohibits

---

73. *Id.* art. III, § 2, cl. 1.

74. *Id.* art. III, § 2, cl. 2.

75. *Id.* art. III, § 2, cl. 3.

76. *Id.* art. III, § 3.

77. *Id.* art. II, § 4.

78. *Id.* art. IV, § 2, cl. 2.

79. *Id.* art. IV, § 2, cl. 1.

80. *Id.* amend. IV.

81. *Id.* amend. V.

82. *Id.*

83. *Id.*

84. *Id.* amend. VI.

85. *Id.*

86. *Id.*

87. *Id.* amend. VII.

88. *Id.* amend. V.

89. *Id.* amend. VIII.

90. *Id.*

91. *Id.* amend. XIV, § 1.

92. *Id.*

state barriers to commerce so well and successfully that it has made us the most prosperous nation on earth.<sup>93</sup> Yet our continued prosperity is not guaranteed.

We celebrate Constitution Day because this experiment in constitutionalism and the rule of law worked and continues to work. It enabled Americans to broaden the definition of citizenship and to extend its protections to all born here and to all who came here to be naturalized. Its lone provision that regulates private conduct—the Thirteenth Amendment—abolished the original sin of slavery, after our bloody civil war.<sup>94</sup> Our Constitution later inspired other countries around the world to adopt written constitutions, to separate their government powers with checks and balances, and to protect fundamental human rights.<sup>95</sup>

We celebrate Constitution Day because the work of constitutionalism and the rule of law continues. It is never finished. What has worked so far will not work tomorrow if we do not understand its history and lessons. We should not deceive ourselves by presuming that history will always lead to justice. Our Constitution remains an experiment in law based on the founding principle that we are created equal and endowed by our Creator with inalienable rights. We must renew our commitment to that founding principle and work to maintain a government based on the rule of law.

May God save the United States and its Constitution!

---

93. *Id.* art. I, § 8, cl. 3, § 10, cl. 1; *see also* James Pethokoukis, *10 Reasons Why America Is So Much Richer Than Other Nations*, AM. ENTER. INSTITUTE: AEIDEAS BLOG (March 13, 2017), <https://www.aei.org/economics/10-reasons-why-america-is-so-much-richer-than-other-rich-nations/> [<https://perma.cc/48A5-AAKC>] (listing possible reasons why America is so much richer than other countries around the world).

94. *Id.* amend. XIII, § 1.

95. *See generally id.* art. I–III (creating checks and balances by dividing power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches); Jessie Kratz, *Global Influence of the U.S. Constitution*, NAT'L ARCHIVES: PIECES OF HISTORY (Sept. 17, 2021), <https://prologue.blogs.archives.gov/2021/09/17/global-influence-of-the-u-s-constitution/> [<https://perma.cc/J58T-A3N2>] (describing how the American Constitution has influenced the drafting and amending of other constitutions around the world).