

The Declaration of Independence at 250: Between Promise, Power, and Contradiction

Ibtihal Gassem

Each year, over a million people visit the National Archives in Washington, D.C. to view the Declaration of Independence. People stand in silence, taking in a document that has been elevated to something almost sacred. It is presented as the origin of American democracy, a symbol of resistance, freedom, and moral clarity. On its 250th anniversary, however, the significance of the Declaration should not be reduced to admiration. It should be examined critically. For me, the Declaration does not simply represent what the United States is. It represents what the United States claims to be, and more importantly, the distance between that claim and reality.

The document is rooted in the idea that people have the right to govern themselves and to break away from systems of domination. At the same time, the United States has evolved into a global power that shapes, influences, and often limits the autonomy of other nations. This creates a fundamental contradiction. A country founded on the rejection of empire now operates in ways that resemble the very systems it once resisted. Because of this, the Declaration is not just a historical artifact. It is a lens through which the contradictions of American democracy become visible, both domestically and internationally.

The Declaration's most well-known claim, that "all men are created equal" and possess "unalienable Rights," has been central to the American political identity (Jefferson, 1776). It is a statement that has inspired social movements and shaped global ideas of democracy. However, this ideal was never fully realized. At the time it was written, entire groups of people were excluded from its promise. Enslaved individuals, Indigenous communities, women, and those without property were not considered part of the political community. This exclusion was not accidental. It was built into the system itself. As Aziz Rana explains, American freedom historically coexisted with forms of domination, particularly through settler colonialism and racial hierarchy (Rana, 2010).

This reality complicates how I personally relate to the Declaration. I was taught to view it as a symbol of progress and justice. It was presented as evidence that the United States is fundamentally committed to equality and freedom. Over time, through my education and experiences, I have come to understand that this narrative is incomplete. There is a gap between the ideals expressed in the document and the structures that govern political life. Recognizing that gap has been uncomfortable, but also necessary. It forces one to think critically about what democracy actually means and who it serves.

This tension becomes even more pronounced when considering the role of the United States in the global system. The country consistently presents itself as a defender of democracy and a promoter of human rights. The language of the Declaration contributes to this image. It reinforces the idea that American power is rooted in moral principles. However, when scrutinizing U.S. foreign policy, there are clear contradictions between this narrative and actual behavior.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan illustrate this contradiction in a direct way. Both interventions were framed as efforts to promote democracy, stability, and freedom. In reality, these wars led to prolonged conflict, instability, and significant loss of life. The war in Afghanistan lasted for two decades and ended with the return of the Taliban to power. This outcome raises serious questions about whether the goals of democracy and self-determination were ever fully prioritized. Similarly, the invasion of Iraq destabilized the region and contributed to long-term political and social consequences that are still unfolding today (Chomsky, 2003).

These examples are not isolated. More recent forms of U.S. involvement continue to reflect similar patterns. The United States provides military aid, weapons, and political support to allies around the world. These actions are often justified through the language of security and democracy. At the same time, they are deeply influenced by strategic interests, economic considerations, and geopolitical positioning. In conflicts involving the Middle East, for example, U.S. support has been criticized for prioritizing alliances and influence over consistent commitments to human rights. This selective application of democratic values reveals that democracy is often used as a justification rather than a guiding principle.

The contradiction becomes clearer when considering the idea of independence itself. The Declaration is fundamentally about the right of people to determine their own political future without external interference. Yet many countries in the Global South operate within systems where their choices are shaped by external pressures, particularly from powerful countries like the United States. This creates a form of conditional independence. Nations may be formally sovereign, but their economic and political decisions are often constrained.

Economic influence plays a central role in maintaining this system. Through institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, the United States has significant power over global economic policy. These institutions are often framed as tools for development and stability. However, the conditions attached to financial assistance can limit the autonomy of the countries that rely on them. Austerity measures, privatization requirements, and market liberalization policies can reshape economies in ways that prioritize global integration over local needs.

For example, countries that receive IMF loans are often required to reduce public spending, even in areas such as healthcare and education. These policies can have serious social consequences, particularly for already vulnerable populations. They also reinforce a system where countries must align with the economic preferences of powerful states in order to access resources. This creates a cycle of dependency that contradicts the principle of self-determination that the Declaration promotes.

This contradiction is not just theoretical. It has real implications for how people experience governance and development. Countries in the Global South often have to navigate a system where their policy options are limited by external expectations. This can affect everything from economic planning to political stability. The result is a global system where independence exists in form, but not always in substance.

For me, this raises difficult moral and ethical questions. I am interested in working in diplomacy and public policy because I want to contribute to meaningful change. I believe in the importance of justice, equality, and accountability. At the same time, engaging with these systems means confronting their limitations. It means asking whether working within them leads to transformation or simply reinforces existing power structures.

The Declaration represents this tension in a very personal way. On one hand, it is inspiring. It provides a language of rights and equality that continues to motivate movements for change. On the other hand, it reveals how those ideals have been selectively applied and sometimes used to justify inequality. This duality makes it difficult to engage with the document in a simple or purely positive way. Instead, it becomes a point of reflection, forcing me to think about what it means to pursue justice within imperfect systems.

Domestic politics in the United States reflect similar contradictions. The influence of money in the political system challenges the idea of equal representation. The Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010)* expanded the role of corporate and private money in elections, allowing wealthy individuals and organizations to have a disproportionate impact on political outcomes. Research by Gilens and Page (2014) shows that policy decisions are far more responsive to economic elites than to average citizens.

This creates a system where political power is closely tied to wealth. It raises questions about whether democracy is functioning as intended. If all individuals are supposed to have equal political influence, then a system dominated by money contradicts that principle. This internal inequality mirrors the external inequalities created by U.S. foreign policy. In both cases, the ideal of equality is overshadowed by the reality of power.

The ideas of Antonio Gramsci help explain why these contradictions are not always widely acknowledged. Power is maintained not only through force, but also through the creation of narratives that make systems appear natural and legitimate (Gramsci, 1971). The Declaration plays a role in this process by reinforcing the idea that the United States is fundamentally democratic. This makes it more difficult to critically examine its actions without being seen as opposing the values it claims to represent.

Education also contributes to shaping these perceptions. Henry Giroux argues that educational institutions often reproduce dominant ideologies rather than challenge them (Giroux, 2014). In many cases, the Declaration is taught as a symbol of progress without fully addressing its contradictions. This creates a simplified understanding of American democracy that does not reflect its complexity.

Looking toward the future, the relevance of the Declaration depends on how it is understood and applied. If it continues to be treated as a symbol of complete success, it will remain disconnected from reality. However, if it is used as a standard for critique, it can still play an important role in shaping democratic discourse.

For the future of democracy in America, this means addressing both domestic and international contradictions. Domestically, it requires reducing the influence of money in politics, expanding access to political participation, and addressing systemic inequalities. It also requires rethinking how democracy is practiced, moving beyond elections to consider issues such as representation, accountability, and equity.

Internationally, it requires reevaluating the role of the United States in the world and moving away from interventionist policies that create dependency and toward approaches that respect the autonomy of other nations that would align more closely with the principles of the Declaration. This does not mean withdrawing from global engagement but rather rethinking how that engagement is structured.

Personally, the Declaration matters because it forces me to confront the kind of democracy I want to be part of building. It challenges me to think critically about the systems I hope to work within and to consider how they can be improved. It also reminds me that democracy is not something that can be taken for granted. It requires constant effort, reflection, and accountability.

The document's relevance is not in its perfection, but in its potential. It provides a framework for thinking about rights and equality, even if it has not fully delivered on those promises. Its continued importance depends on whether it is used to justify the status quo or to challenge it.

On its 250th anniversary, the Declaration of Independence should be understood as an unfinished project. It represents a set of ideals that have yet to be fully realized. The future of American democracy will depend on whether those ideals are taken seriously enough to drive meaningful change. This includes confronting uncomfortable truths about inequality, power, and hypocrisy. The Declaration matters because it raises a question that has not yet been answered. Can the United States become the democracy it claims to be? The answer will depend not on the words of the document, but on the willingness to act on them.

References

- Alexander, Michelle. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press, 2012.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003.
- Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. "Farewell Radio and Television Address to the American People." In *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1960–61*, 1035–1040. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 12, no. 3 (2014): 564–581.
- Giroux, Henry A. *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2014.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Jefferson, Thomas. "The Declaration of Independence." 1776. In *The Statutes at Large of the United States of America*, vol. 1, 1–3. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1845.
- Rana, Aziz. *The Two Faces of American Freedom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.