

# Prevention of Sovereignty and Political Parties

✉ You are subscribed. [Unsubscribe](#)

🔔 UNRESOLVED



🏷 No tags yet. [+ Add Tag](#)

---

[Dolores Carlson](#) · 16 minutes ago 🔒

Let me state right from the start that I am a very rabid Independent politically.. Having spent many years going back forth between the two major parties, even holding party office in both, I left both with a bad taste in my mouth. In essence, I know too much about both of them.

That brings me to my discussion, concerns, and a question. None of this is in any way directed at one or the other major party but I will give the most recent example as that's the one most people know about.

How are we to prevent a political party from becoming "sovereign"? We have in place the mechanism to prevent an individual from being sovereign, but but what about a party?

There exists the possibility that all three branches of government could be dominated by one party. We like to think the people who are serving in the positions are doing what their constituents wish but I think it's become clear that more and more they are out for their good, not the good of those who serve. Even locally, in a small area, I've seen more than a few who were "on the take" and arrested and voting for bills to position themselves with those higher up.

Consider 2009-2011 and the AHCA. No, I will not debate the merits of that law, that's not my point here, but just as an example much more than half of the American public opposed it (based upon every independent poll, the numbers varied), yet one party in power and in control of the House, Senate, and the White House pushed it through with statements such as, "We can do it because we won." The person happened to third in line to the Presidency. No appropriate, in my opinion.

Now, I account for individual arrogance or lack of political intelligence (parties usually do not stay in power, it goes back and forth) and the best and brightest do not always get elected, but it leaves me now with a question.

What if we were to have one party overwhelming in control of the White House, the Senate, the House, and the Supreme Court (the majority being appointed and confirmed by that one party to suit their agenda). All four bodies. To me, this is something that was not foreseen but the Founding Fathers when they drafted the Constitution. Please put political considerations aside in this, it could always be the party with which you disagree.

I am not a fan at all of the two-party system we have here in the US. I see too many problems that can occur where the majority of the people in the US can be stuck with the sovereignty of one political party. We cannot always rely upon people to do the "right thing" locally when they elect their representatives. They usually base that on local issues. Most don't know about "beltway mentality" but it's very real.

Anyone have any thoughts on this flaw that was unforeseen by the Founders and how it can be amended? We could really end up with a sovereign government with the titular head of a particular party as a "supreme ruler". It's not beyond the realm of possibility, as I see no checks or balances to prevent such a thing. Does it really all boil down to the statement "the people get the government they deserve"?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

New post

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

<b>B</b>	<i>I</i>			Link	<code>&lt;code&gt;</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

