

Earn a Verified Certificate for this course!

[Get Started](#)[Forums / Lecture Material](#)[Help](#)

Great article about trying to repeal the 17th amendment

 You are subscribed. [Unsubscribe](#)

UNRESOLVED

 No tags yet. [+ Add Tag](#)Sort replies by: [Oldest first](#) [Newest first](#) [Most popular](#)[Richard Andersen](#) · 4 days ago

Though we're not quite there yet, here is a link to an NPR (National Public Radio) article about a conservative movement to try and repeal the 17th amendment and return to the days when State legislatures voted for Senators.

<http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2014/02/05/271937304/rethinking-the-17th-amendment-an-old-id...>

Discuss...

 2 · [flag](#)[Amanda Fassett](#) · 4 days ago

I just read that article, and it made me glad I am taking this course because I really don't understand why or how repealing the 17th amendment would give more power to the states! I am confused.

 0 · [flag](#)[+ Comment](#)[Melissa Sims](#) · 3 days ago

I read the article and the idea of having the states pick candidates to vote on seems fair but also scary as the incredibly wealthy can still buy their way in by way of being picked as the candidate. Maybe there is some way to keep the 17th exactly like it is but make the Senators that are elected directly accountable to their state and the people. I am not really verse in anything government so there may be something like this. Wouldn't it be better if Senators had more than just the people as their "boss", which let's face it, I don't think they care much about? Maybe making them directly accountable to the Governor? What do you think? Please do not attack my comments, I have already said I don't know the

workings of government in detail. This is just an idea and may already be in place or a bad one.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Matthew Temple · 2 days ago

The wealthy already control our country. Most American's are unwilling to vote for someone the have never heard of. :(

<http://money.cnn.com/2014/01/09/news/economy/congress-millionaires/>

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Sulaiman Basir · 2 days ago

Mathew, name recognition and wealth are very different concepts. Let's put layman theories aside. In politics money has to be spent timely and committed properly. Name recognition only (well, not *only*) requires an endorsement and early voting.

Early voting can beat big spending; spending on cheap radio can beat big ticket TV and an endorsement can kill the momentum of a candidate with a fat purse. At the state level, name recognition has been shown to clear out primaries even when there is a competent contender (some one with monetary resources).

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Sulaiman Basir · 2 days ago

Melissa great question. There are folks from grass roots up to executive and central committees that fathom the ideas you mentioned.

Its cool that you don't know all the workings of government, if you did you would be too jaded to ask good questions.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Dara L. Grieger · 15 minutes ago

I think the idea of repealing the 17th amendment is that, if each state legislature chooses senators directly, it would be less likely that the senators would vote for legislation that gives the Federal

government power over the states. As an example- the limit for legal intoxication for a DUI offense. States were basically forced to adopt a particular standard or the Federal Government would withhold Federal money for state highway projects. There is a surprising amount of this going on. I don't know if it would work in today's environment, but that's what I've understood the issue of repealing the 17th Amendment is intended to address.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Anthony Watkins · 4 minutes ago 🔒

yeah, its really terrible that the federal govt might withhold money if states let drunks plow into us.... considering the states most likely to object are states where the leaders take strong moral positions against drinking to excess, and coincidentally, states where they get back a lot more federal money than they pay in... the word hypocrisy comes to mind. unless states are willing to forgo at least all the money they are getting back from the tax payers in other states, they really should go along with the plan. funny how the same folks are likely to complain about the moochers getting their \$274 per month or whatever it is to keep themselves and their families alive, but dont see the irony that they want to ignore federal policy and still be able to mooch off the other states!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



Anthony Watkins · 9 minutes ago 🔒

Most of our presidents have not been super rich, but most senators have, think about that.

Presidents tend to be famous, more than rich, at least before they serve....

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

New post

To ensure a positive and productive discussion, please read our [forum posting policies](#) before posting.

B	<i>I</i>			Link	<code>	Pic	Math		Edit: Rich ▼	Preview
<div></div>										

☐ Resolve thread

This thread is marked as unresolved. If the problem is fixed, please check the above box and make a post to let staff know that they no longer need to monitor this thread.

☐ Make this post anonymous to other students

☒ Subscribe to this thread at the same time

Add post

Great article about trying to repeal the 17th...

<https://class.coursera.org/conlaw-001/forum/...>