

Why Favor The Constitution Party Over The Republican or Democratic Party?

By Don Shrader

Constitution Party of Ohio



A major reason, in my mind, why someone would favor the Constitution Party over the two major parties has both long and short answers. The short answer is that the Constitution Party is the ONLY political party standing for, and advocating a true return to limited Federal Government in accordance with the principles of government given to us by our founding fathers and embodied in our Constitution as well as the Declaration of Independence, keeping in mind that the Declaration is a principal guiding document while the Constitution is supposed to be the law of the land. Some parties, like the Libertarians and other similar parties, want limited Government - and the Constitution Party even agrees with them on many issues, however we also believe some moral limits need to be codified whereas the Libertarians basically believe in virtually no government restrictions, especially regarding the choices of the individual. That is why there can be pro-life people in the Libertarian Party, because that is their personal choice; they just are not at liberty to enforce their views on others. They must be fully accepting under the Libertarian banner to be accepting of those who hold to any form of abortion - both are personal choices under liberty and neither should condemn the other for their view. The Constitution Party believes there are some moral absolutes that are guaranteed by the Constitution, and one of them is that no State or entity may "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." This includes the unborn because we believe that life begins at conception.

There are, of course, many major third parties, but at their core, most of them have a particular cause (like the Green Party) that becomes their primary platform as opposed to the Constitution Party primary motivation being a return to limited government in accordance with the governmental principles established by our founding fathers and embodied in the Constitution. While the TEA Party endorses various candidates, remember they are NOT an official Party and derive their "power" solely by endorsing candidates of their choosing in the actual political parties, which in some cases have been Constitution Party candidates. However, for the most part, the majority of the TEA Parties have been infiltrated by the Republican Party and have essentially and unfortunately, become an arm of the Republican Party.

To borrow a cliché, "I did not leave the Republican Party, it left me." While I was a registered Republican for many years, I told Party leaders over and over that I was not a Republican; I was a conservative holding to principle over party. I also wrote to them time and again that being a conservative was not being against the Democrats, it was about being for a set of inviolate principles. Unfortunately, today the term "conservative" has been usurped by the mainstream media talking heads, like Mark Levine, Rush, and Sean Hannity, who claim to be conservatives but are basically only fiscal conservative libertarians at heart. Today, I more appropriately label myself as a Constitutionalist, or a Conservative Constitutionalist. I am no longer a Republican.

At the national level, today's Republican Party has totally abandoned their conservative roots. Oh yes, there are those in the bowels of the Republican Party trying to reform it and return it to what they see as a conservative basis. However, for the most part, the use of the term "conservative" has come to be synonymous with fiscal conservative, not Constitutional Conservative. While there were many in the last election, particularly on the Republican side - even Mitt Romney - that claimed they supported a Constitutionally limited federal government, none of them articulated a position publically that supported their claim. It was not reality, it was just political rhetoric. The Republican candidate that came the closest, besides Ron Paul, to even beginning to espouse a return to a limited federal government in accord with the Constitution, was Rick Perry - and he did not last a breakfast spell. It was not the Democrats that torched him for his gaffs early in his campaign; it was the mainstream Republicans, happy to see him politically castrate himself.

If John F. Kennedy were alive today with the political positions he held in 1960, I believe he would be the Presidential candidate for the Republican Party, as evidenced by the nomination of John McCain and even more so by Michigan born, but Massachusetts bred, Mitt Romney. As for the Democrats, many mainstream socially liberal Democrats like Zell Miller of Georgia, or Joe Lieberman of Connecticut, have noted how the Democratic Party has gone so far to the left that it left them, and they have since endorsed some Republican candidates, like McCain and Romney. Even the vanguard of today's political "conservatives," Ronald Reagan, while espousing great rhetoric as "The Great Communicator" allowed the federal government to grow under his Administration and he did not truly champion the dissolution of one unconstitutional federal agency. And it was the Republicans, under the leadership of "The Compassionate Conservative," George Bush, that gave us the most onerous threat to our personal liberties in our lifetime, The Patriot Act along with the subsequent establishment of the totally unconstitutional Department of Homeland Security. While many would say it was Obamacare (the badly mislabeled, in true political fashion, The Affordable Care Act), it is the Department of Homeland Security that will ultimately enable its enforcement upon an unwilling population. And, if you have been following

the political blogs lately, my own Congressman, House Speaker John Boehner has already capitulated on things like opposing Obamacare and has even begun purging some of the more conservative (i.e. TEA Party backed) Republicans from what minimal positions of power they had. Note, that after the 2010 elections when the Republicans regained control of the House, not one "TEA Party" backed candidate, including Michelle Bachmann, the self-proclaimed originator of the TEA Party movement, received one position of authority or major influence within the Party. And it looks like that will be even more the case in the next session under Speaker Boehner.

We often refer to the Republicans and Democrats as a "duopoly." The only difference between a duopoly and a monopoly is that a duopoly still restricts competition; they just do it under the guise of competition between the two major entities. In reality, they are more in collusion to retain their position of prominence while engaging in mock competition rather than engaging in true competition.

If your government class really wants to study how this duopoly unfairly restricts true competition, conduct a study on what is termed "ballot access" within the states. While ballot access rules are regulated at the state level, if one studies ballot access within each of the various states, one will find that in most states ballot access rules are severely lopsided in favor of the duopoly of the two major parties. In Ohio, we currently enjoy extremely favorable ballot access because a Federal Judge ruled Ohio's ballot access laws unconstitutional. The ruling first struck down the ballot access rules put in place by the Democrats and a subsequent ruling then struck down the ballot access rules passed by the Republicans when they returned to power in 2010. No doubt they will try again to pass ballot access rules/legislation that severely restricts third party access to the election ballots. I do not believe it is a matter of if, but when. And Ohio's previous ballot access legislation was not as onerous as is the case in many other states; the other states just have not been able to get judges in their judicial districts to follow the rulings of the judge in the Ohio case to declare their ballot access laws to be unconstitutional. I wonder why? Could it be that the judges, like each of the associated state legislatures, are beholden to the duopoly of power held by the two major Parties? And those judges know they will have a difficult time holding onto their nice well-compensated positions, or being appointed to the next higher level, if they do not have the backing of their major party when it is in power.

I liken the whole duopoly to professional "wrestlin." Out in public, you see two professional wrestlers or wrestling teams taking to the microphones and yelling at and threatening the competition with great bodily harm and ultimate defeat. However, anybody who has been around professional "wrestlin" will tell you that away from the public in private, after the show, they are drinking buddies at the bar. Oh, every

so often they bring in a "newbie" to beat up and show their prowess, but they do not let that newbie gain any notoriety that might displace the mainstream players. How else would wrasslers like Hulk Hogan and Rick Flair last so long. Yes, as they get older, new mainstream players come along to take their place, but believe me it is all orchestrated by the Party boss, er power broker, Vince McMahon.

I could continue but you get the picture. Thus, back to the short answer, the Constitution Party is currently the only national political party fighting to return our nation's governments to true constitutional principles as provided to us by our founding fathers. While there are areas where we may agree with the Republicans or Democrats, though they seem to be few and far between in the mainstream, and may even align on certain issues with some of the other third parties, I contend that currently the Constitution Party is the only political party seeking a total return to constitutional government in accordance with the constitutional principles and ideals so painstakingly handed down to us by our founding fathers. "What kind of government are you giving us Mr. Franklin" "A republic, ma'am, IF YOU CAN KEEP IT." Both of the major parties have failed to keep it, in my view, and have been failing faster and faster for more than a century now.