

Republican Election Wave? Cancel the Midterms!



Tomorrow is election day, and if the polls and early ballot returns are of any indication, it appears it will be a good night for the Republican Party. National media outlets are estimating that there's a very good likelihood that the GOP will take control of the U.S. Senate. *The Washington Post* puts those chances at 96%. *CNN* puts them at 95%. *The New York Times* isn't quite as convinced, but still gives

Republicans a 70% chance of a takeover, which is pretty good.

Understandably, there are a lot of Democrats panicking right now. You can hear it in all the eye-rolling, outrageous, last-minute narratives being put forth in new political ads, and tossed out as Hail May passes to the few remaining undecided voters.

The most entertaining one I've heard in my home state of Colorado was just released last week by a group called *NARAL Pro-Choice Colorado*. The one-minute radio spot depicts a futuristic scenario in which a Colorado man can no longer find any condoms to purchase so he can have safe-sex with his girlfriend. How did this become a problem? Well, it had to do with the *2014 midterm*, where Republican, U.S. Senate candidate Cory Gardner was elected into office. According to the ad, *Future Gardner* somehow managed to use his new-found power to ban Colorado women from using birth control pills. This, of course, increased the demand for condoms in the state so sharply that no one can find them anymore! The shelves are bare, people!

No, I'm not joking, and the ad was *not* a parody.

The liberal media is panicking too, as evidenced by an op-ed printed just yesterday in the *New York Times*. The piece's authors, David Schanzer and Jay Sullivan, are worried that the results of Tuesday's election will *almost certainly* "create greater partisan divisions, increase gridlock and render governance of our complex nation even more difficult."

That sounds pretty bad, doesn't it? Lucky for us, Schanzer and Sullivan have a solution to the problem: Cancel the midterms.

Yes, when the Democratic process just isn't going your way, the only logical recourse is to scrap the election all together and start holding the contests every *four* years.

It makes perfect sense according to Schanzer and Sullivan, who recognize the country's growing lack of confidence in the ability of the federal government to "address pressing concerns." They claim that by extending the term length of U.S. congressional seats, and thus having fewer election cycles, that public's confidence will most certainly return.

How will the public hold their elected representatives accountable during those four, long years? Schanzer and Sullivan have that figured out as well: Twitter, video cameras, and 24-hour cable news.

You see, they contend that in our modern technological era, the only form of accountability politicians require is better communication from their constituents. Because that's the problem, after all; our leaders just don't understand what we want. If they did, they'd obviously do everything differently and cater to our desires. Right?

Wrong.

The notion, for example, that politicians simply didn't understand how wildly unpopular Obamacare was with the public,

at the time it was very narrowly passed by congress in 2009, is totally absurd. And if you don't believe all the national polls and angry town hall meetings from back then, just ask any phone receptionist who worked for a Democratic congressman or congresswoman. If you *still* don't believe me, look at the results of the 2010 election. *That's* the form of *accountability* that Schanzer and Sullivan absolutely *do not* want – especially come this Tuesday.

While I give the two writers credit for at least attempting to sound like they were trying to put forth an idea that they believed would benefit voters, the op-ed was obviously a farce. Beyond the first paragraph, where they stated that more Republicans in Washington would be a bad thing, I don't think they believed a single word of what they wrote. It's clear to me that they were merely venting their frustrations over the likelihood of the Democratic Party losing the U.S. Senate.

Would they have proposed this goofy idea if Republicans owned the Senate and the Democrats were on the verge of taking it over, like in 2006? Would they have suggested that *retweets* make government more responsive and efficient than casting ballots? Of course not. And if someone *had* written such a piece back then, you can rest assured that the *New York Times* wouldn't have run it.

Hang in there, everyone. The *silly season* is almost over. At that time, the country will get back to more traditional forms of political hyperbole and media bias.