

WILL THE ELECTION CHANGE ANYTHING?

Editor's Note: These authors are not necessarily endorsed by the Constitution Party of Ohio, but they make valid points.



Changing Who Runs the Senate Won't Fix Washington

By Ron Fournier

Five reasons why things won't fundamentally change:

1. **Obama can't or won't compromise.** Hemmed in by his liberal base and a hostage to his own limitations as a leader, Obama has not moved beyond the lip service of his brand. In 2012, he predicted that his reelection would "break the fever" of Washington gridlock. How has that worked out? Now he says a better-than-expected showing for Democrats on Tuesday would be the antidote. "I think what it does is to send a message to Republicans that people want to get stuff done," We know how this movie ends.
2. **Republicans can't or won't compromise.** Hemmed in by his conservative base and a hostage to his limitations as a leader, the GOP's top man in the Senate, Mitch McConnell, let ideology and self-preservation intensify dysfunction in Washington. Why would it be any different with McConnell in charge? My colleague Molly Ball of *The Atlantic* points to an oxymoron in the GOP message: Republicans say that if they win Tuesday, they'll stop gridlock *and* stop Obama's agenda. That's a lie: They know they can't do both. "You can't 'get things done' in Washington without the president's signature, and no matter what happens in this year's elections, he's not going anywhere for another two years," she wrote.
3. **There are no mandates on Election Day.** The night Obama won reelection, I argued that a small-bore and brutish campaign guaranteed the president a shallow victory, one without a mandate. "Mandates are rarely won on election night," I wrote Nov. 6, 2012. "They are earned after Inauguration Day by leaders who spend their political capital wisely, taking advantage of events without overreaching." Ditto, now, for the GOP. Two years ago, I thought Obama was capable of building a mandate through good governing. I was wrong. My new prediction: Republicans will misread this election as badly as Obama did his reelection.
4. **Any GOP gains will be short-lived.** Even if you dismiss my pessimism about the GOP, there is the inconvenient fact that six first-term Republican senators will face reelection in states Obama won in both 2008 and 2012. *Politico* reporter Burgess Everett called 2016 a "mirror image" of this year's Senate campaign. Furthermore, even a wave election in 2014 won't automatically fix the structural and image problems that many GOP strategists worry will block their road to the White House.
5. **Politics will still be broken.** History will consider the 2014 midterms a referendum against the status quo, against Washington, against the political establishment, and against incumbency. While nothing about the election suggests growing support for the GOP brand, multiple signs point toward a rise of populism that might transform—even radically disrupt—the institutions of politics and government.

Citizen's Courier

More at Source:

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/changing-who-runs-the-senate-won-t-fix-washington-20141103>



“US midterm elections won’t change political climate.”

Ron Paul

Former US congressman and two-time Republican presidential candidate, Ron Paul, has warned that last week’s midterm elections in the United States will not change the country’s political climate.

Paul, who is also a physician and an author, said on Monday that the November 4 elections mean “very little” despite the fact that it resulted in Republicans taking control of both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“Yes, power shifted,” Paul said. “But the philosophy on Capitol Hill changed very little.”

During his four-minute-long speech broadcast through his weekly telephone address, Paul stated that having more Republicans in the Senate won’t change the way Washington will conduct business.

“Some were critical of my comment that, Republican control of the Senate equals expanded neo-con wars in Syria

and Iraq. Boots on the ground are coming,” Paul said.

“But unfortunately my fears were confirmed even sooner than I thought. Shortly after the vote, President Obama announced that he would double the number of US troops on the ground in Iraq and request another \$5.6 billion to fight his war in the Middle East.”

On Friday, Obama authorized the deployment of up to 1,500 troops to Iraq, approximately doubling the force the Pentagon has built up in the country since June.

Political observers say the rise of the Republican Party is mostly because of widespread dissatisfaction with the performance of the Obama administration in his second term in office.

Some Democrats also blame Obama for their losses in the Senate, saying they were beleaguered by a deeply unpopular White House.

Political commentators say that the US political system is designed to prevent any substantial change, and that the US democracy is dominated by dollar and lacks the essential features of a real democracy.

Source:

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2014/11/11/385559/us-elections-wont-change-anything-paul/>



How to Lose a Constitution

By Larry Reed

There is an exceptionally beneficial and fruitful advantage to be derived from the study of the past. There you see, set in the clear light of historical truth, examples of every possible type. From these you can select for yourself and your country what to imitate, and also what, as being mischievous in its inception and disastrous in its consequences, you should avoid.

The history of ancient Rome spans a thousand years—roughly 500 as a republic and 500 as an imperial autocracy, with the birth of Christ occurring almost precisely in the middle. The closest parallels between Roman and American civilizations are to be found in Rome’s first half-millennium as a republic. We in our day can derive the most instructive lessons from that period. The tyranny of the empire came *after* the republic was destroyed and *that’s* the truly awful consequence of decay that America can yet avoid.

Both Rome and America were born in revolt against monarchy—Americans against the British and Romans against the Etruscans. Wary of concentrated authority, both established republics with checks and balances, separation of powers and protection of certain

Citizen's Courier

rights of at least many people, if not all. Despite shortcomings, the establishment of the Roman Republic in the sixth century B.C. and the American Republic in the eighteenth century A.D. represented the greatest advances for individual liberty in the history of the world. Unparalleled prosperity and influence resulted in both cases. Both established constitutions intended to preserve the liberties bestowed on large numbers of people—the Americans a written one, the Romans, like the British, an unwritten one that was nonetheless revered for centuries as precedent not to be violated and definitely worth fighting and even dying for.

Upon winning their freedom, Romans split the top position of power between two men—the consuls. One was to be a check upon the other and neither, except in emergency situations, was to serve more than one year. Legislative bodies—the Senate and assemblies of elected representatives—were established. Incidentally, the Senate was retained in name, though not in power, for the entire thousand years of Roman history. Even as freedom vanished, the later tyrants couldn't quite bring themselves to abolish the symbols of republicanism. So if America ever loses its Republic, it wouldn't be

surprising if it kept its House and Senate. As in the case of Rome, our legislative bodies may even formally ratify the final extinction of the freedom they've been voting against for decades.

Let me share with you what I call, "The Three Most Stubborn Lessons of History," and then I'll go back and briefly relate each to the Roman Republic:

Number One: No people who lost their character kept their liberties.

Number Two: Power that is shackled and dispersed is preferable to power that is unrestrained and centralized.

Number Three: The here-and-now is rarely as important as tomorrow.

Now to the first of the three: *No people who lost their character kept their liberties.*

Character, as I am using the term, embodies the trait of virtue, which is

from the Latin *virtus*, meaning courageous honesty. Above all, it was esteemed by the early Romans of the republic. It was routinely taught in the home by mothers and fathers. Indeed, all formal education took place in the home in the first two and a half centuries of the republic. Schools didn't appear until the third century B.C. and even they did not receive government funding until well after the Republic faded.

I guess the lesson there is that government funding is not necessary for civilizational decline, but it can sure help it along.....

Rest of Article Continued Here:

http://fee.org/the_freeman/detail/how-to-lose-a-constitutionlessons-from-roman-history

