

IN RESPONSE TO 'ANYBODY BUT OBAMA'

By Don Shrader

Constitution Party of Ohio

June 7, 2012



In response to my announcement that I am now the chairman of the Constitution Party of Ohio and our upcoming statewide meeting, I received replies such as the ones below.

"So, let me get this straight. We throw away a vote for Goode when there has never been a time where we needed to work together to get rid of this socialist, anti-Christ bastard Obama. We vote for Goode and Obama wins by just the few votes Goode would get? get real. WE NEED TO GET RID OF OBAMA. We CANNOT afford to throw a vote away. If Obama wins, America as we know it will cease to exist and the Constitution Party will be outlawed. Wake up. There is just too much at stake to not be united to get rid of him.

Will it serve to inadvertently help the left in the end? I fear so.

You remember that Ohio gave Ross Perot enough votes to elect Bill Clinton. Romney must win Ohio to defeat BHO."

So, here are my questions regarding their Presidential candidate, the one that we must sacrifice all principle, in my mind, to elect under the 'Anybody but Obama' mantra. The one even the TEA Party and supposedly conservative constitutional Republicans are now backing. Mitt Romney is now the guy to preserve the nation?!?!

You mean the guy who while claiming to defend marriage as between a man and a woman at the same time stated that he thinks it is OK for gay couples to adopt children, and said in an earlier campaign that he would do more for the gays than Ted Kennedy, the guy who signed the first gay marriage act in the nation as the Governor of Massachusetts? You mean the guy who recently appointed an openly gay advocate as his national security and foreign policy advisor?

You mean the guy who said, "We do have tough gun laws in Massachusetts; I support them. I won't chip away at them; I believe they protect us and provide for our safety." Do you think this guy will do anything to reverse any of the anti-freedom, anti-personal liberties of U.S. citizens infringed upon by the Department of Homeland Security or the ever expanding powers and actions of the its TSA arm? Most likely he will strengthen them, and will likely promote signing the UN Arms Trade Treaty that is intended to take away most all of our guns including and especially handguns and assault rifles, i.e. anything but certain shotguns and small calibre-ammunition rifles . for now. Romney, as a supporter of the Brady Campaign, definitely opposes handguns in the hands of the public so don't believe that the UN Treaty is dead. While currently dead in the Senate, it is still alive and well in the UN and can be reinvigorated within the U.S. for ratification at any point in the future. As I understand it, if ratified by 40 countries, with or without the U.S., it becomes international law. Then it is just a matter of what an Obama or Romney or whoever follows one of them will do under the threat of international law as ratified by the majority of nations in the UN.

You mean the guy who was the direct architect of Obamacare and still defends it even though Massachusetts healthcare is in ruins? (And whose staff actually participated in the development of the Federal legislation? And who included Senator Scott Brown who was the actual nuts & bolts designer of Romneycare but was against Obamacare before he was for it?) You mean the guy who hired former Utah governor Michael Leavitt to head his White House transition team should Mitt Romney win and who suggested earlier this year that "Obamacare empowers the HHS secretary to do certain things that are clearly aimed at trying to move us in the right direction."

You mean the guy who was "pro-choice" before he was "pro-life," however he defines pro-life? As far as I know, he has never defended the pro-life position from a Constitutional standpoint or by stating unequivocally that life begins at conception and all life from that point forward is completely protected by the Constitution.

You mean the guy who believes in global warming and thereby will do nothing to reign in the EPA and their egregious rules and regulations destroying our freedoms, our liberties, and our economy?

Romney says he believes in limited Government at the Federal level. Which unconstitutional agencies is he going to eliminate? Will he do anything to reign in, much less eliminate, the Department of Education, the Dept. of Health and Human Services, or any of the other myriad of agencies destroying our freedoms and liberties including the despicable Department of Homeland Security (addressed above)?

Do you truly believe he will advocate fundamental changes to our tax laws much less advocate for repealing the 16th Amendment which our founding fathers warned us time and again against giving any such power to the Federal Government?

Do you believe this ~~W~~Wall Street insider+will take any action to dismantle the power of the Federal Reserve along with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, those agencies that have done more to destroy our financial health as a nation than any other agency, save for the IRS. Of course many, if not most, people do not realize that the Federal Reserve is not a Federal Government agency but is a private institution owned by the nation's largest banking institutions. Do you really believe Romney is going to threaten elimination of the Federal interest payments currently enjoyed by his banking friends who benefit by the billions of dollars paid to their institutions every time the Federal Government makes an interest payment on the Federal debt? Is there really any hope for this highly successful businessman to see the wisdom of returning us to the gold standard which would once again impinge upon the profits of his banking buddies?

This is your guy to save us from Obama?!?! And you believe he is also going to appoint constitutionally conservative judges that would uphold the Constitution against all the positions stated above?

Even though Obama will continue to try to destroy this country as we know it, he may be the best solution to saving it . other than electing Virgil Goode to be President.

In 1980 Reagan won in a landslide in reaction to the incompetence of Jimmy Carter. Reagan promised limited Government and balanced budgets. I have the letter I sent to his office complaining about his increased federal spending. I paid more in taxes after the Reagan income tax reduction (it was not a tax reduction, it was a tax restructuring promoted as tax reduction). It made manageable short term debt unmanageable because overnight it eliminated many of the associated tax breaks. His tax reform even went to the point of backdating some of the regulations regarding withdrawal of IRA funds and the like. And there were no fundamental changes that stopped or in any way inhibited future Presidents from reinstating the taxes (Bush 1 and his famous %Read my Lips! No new taxes!+)

In 1994, the Republicans won back Congress in a %conservative+landside in reaction to the liberal proposals of Bill and Hillary Clinton, including %HillaryCare,+the forerunner of %ObamaCare,+but nothing really changed. None of the promised changes, like doing away with the Dept. of Education ever came about. We continued the downhill slide under Newt Gingrich who ultimately resigned his seat when the going got tough. Why did nothing ultimately change? Because the Republicans in power are fundamentally not that much different than the Democrats!

Then, along came Bush 2, defeating Mr. Global Warming who sold his soul to Satan, Bill Clinton, and the ultra-liberal Democrats for a shot at power. What did we get? Bigger Government, more debt, the Patriot Act and its Department of Homeland Security along with the TSA, the greatest attack on our personal liberties and freedoms in U.S. history via organized Government oversight . all in the name of increased national security . devised and designed by %conservative+Republicans. Oh, by the way, did the Republicans in any of those times secure our borders? No, they went to Mexico and retrieved a drug smuggler that was wounded by one of our Border Security Guards and prosecuted the two guards who attempted to stop this known illegal alien drug smuggler. Those two remain in jail today where they have to be protected from the other inmates who have already beaten and persecuted them. Why? Because Mr. Compassionate Conservative, George Bush, would not pardon those two border security guards who were merely doing their

duty to protect our borders. Do you think Mitt Romney is going to pardon them, or do anything substantial to secure our borders?

After the 2008 election of Obama, the TEA Party rose up in opposition to Obamacare and other Obama economic actions, like the Stimulus spending and Government bailouts of the large financial institutions and automakers (all begun under Bush 2 and the Republicans). The TEA Party backed numerous %conservative+Congressional candidates. Republican leaders like John Boehner attended major TEA Party rallies and promised change when Republicans got control of the Congress. Thus far, even though they gained control of the House and Boehner is now the Speaker, nothing has changed. To date, none of the TEA Party candidates hold a single position of leadership in the House or head any major committees. They have been totally shut out by the %conservative+Republican leadership. And thus far the Republicans in the House have done virtually nothing but wring their hands and exclaim how they can't do anything because it will be blocked by the Senate and the President. What a bunch of hogwash!! All Boehner and his ilk, including those in the Senate like Mitch McConnell, want to do is %reach across the aisle.+ As defeated long-time Senator Richard Lugar warned regarding TEA Party backed Richard Mourdock's %unrelenting partisan mind-set,+i.e. a TEA Party conservative mentality, %he will achieve little as a legislator unless he changes his strict conservatism on governing.+ This warning to Mourdock regarding his effectiveness is with respect to dealing with the established Republican Party more than any concern about his interactions with the Democrats.

So, help me understand how the election of Mitt Romney is going to straighten all this out? Nothing I have seen in the last 5 or 50 years, or last 5 months, indicates to me that Romney is the answer to our prayers or the preservation of our nation. Maybe, on the other hand, with the election of Obama for another term, the true conservatives and neoconservatives will rally larger than the first TEA Party revolution and finally demand that we reinstitute true constitutional government. In my mind it is our only hope.

The election of Mitt Romney will not stop the madness. It will only sustain it and ultimately allow it to become even worse. As stated in the paper entitled %voting for the Lesser of

Two Evils is still an Evil,+The argument that the lesser of two evils will buy us time to get our act together and field better candidates is wishful thinking. What invariably happens is people again become apathetic, and the greater evil makes an even stronger comeback.+ (Carter .> Reagan & Bush 1 .> Clinton .> Bush 2 .> Obama! .> Romney .> then WHO?!?!)

There is a philosophical proposition on social change, often attributed to Hegel (probably erroneously), but still thus referred to as the Hegelian dialectic, which describes the downhill nature of human social standards. It states that there is an initial high standard of moral code (in this case our founding Constitutional Government) called the %Thesis.+ Then there is a moral reaction/rebellion to those strict standards, called the %Antithesis.+ The resolution to the Thesis-Antithesis dialectic is a mediated %each across the aisle+%Synthesis.+ At this point, the %ynthesis+becomes the new %thesis.+ Of course today we are a far cry from the original %thesis+ of constitutional government given to us by our founding fathers. But for illustration\$ sake in today's political spectrum, consider that Clinton was the Antithesis to Reagan. (Actually Bush 1 was more aligned politically with Clinton than Reagan.) Bush2 was the %Synthesis+ between the Reagan and Clinton dialectic. Bush2 then became the new %Thesis.+ Obama is undoubtedly the current %Antithesis.+ Romney, if elected, will be elected because he is the new %Synthesis+ and thus will ultimately become the new %Thesis.+ As noted by the conclusion to the paper regarding voting for the lesser of two evils, %he greater evil makes an even stronger comeback+ as evidenced by history over and over again. The only time the madness stops is when society makes a fundamental structural change to an original Thesis, in this case, true fundamental constitutional government. IF that change is not made, then society continues its downhill slide, as again evidenced over and over again by history, to a totalitarian government. Will we wake up in time?

Is Obama the catalyst for us to reinstitute true constitutional government? Certainly Mitt Romney is not! Like ignoring a cancer and hoping it will go away, ignoring the truth will not make things get better. How long are we going to ignore the cancer of bigger and bigger government infringing our liberties, our freedoms, and controlling every aspect of our lives for the sake of some supposed security?