

No agreement on 'compromise'

Written by Neil A. Davis, Gothenburg
Friday, 10 February 2012 14:45 -

I do not have a beef with the "Capital View" commentary in **The Times**, but with two articles by Mary Kay Quinlan of Nebraska News Service. Researching NNS, I read a webpage announcing "UNL journalism college launches state government news service." On the webpage are smiling faces of enthusiastic students ready to accomplish their task. Quinlan is quoted as saying "NNS will not only provide a real-world learning experience for students but will also assist the state's news organizations in covering government decisions made daily at the state capitol."

My concern is how her viewpoint as expressed in "Capital View" fits with the NNS goals and how it affects the student reporters (she is their overseer). I recently wrote about how liberal indoctrination can turn young brains into mush. If she is going to write commentary, maybe it shouldn't be under the auspices of NNS. Quinlan has a fine resumé and has written books about oral history research. The books appear (to me) to be about the mechanics of researching history. Perhaps not necessarily making any judicious use of the information.

In her (01-04-12) article, Quinlan suggested our elected officials would do well to return to American history class and attempted to make the case that since our Constitution was "born in compromise," bi-partisanship should be the preferred vehicle to good government.

The question is, what is Quinlan asking the current Congress to compromise with? Over the last 100 years our law and ethics have been slowly compromised by a relentless progressive movement. With the election of Barack Obama, progressivism boldly gave way to Marxist socialism and fascist tendencies.

The problem is, Obama doesn't have the patience to be a good socialist. When he said, "We are five days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America," he was talking about implementing a system that at best would turn us into Europe and at worst has historically killed millions when taken to its logical conclusion.

Quinlan wrote that "...it takes compromise to make things work." I say, if destroying freedom and the very values our nation was built on is the plan, I don't want to "make things work." Compromise used while crafting the Constitution and compromise that threaten its future existence aren't in the same lexicon. The founders intentionally made the lawmaking process a difficult proposition. They certainly didn't relinquish their values in the "Great Compromise."

No agreement on 'compromise'

Written by Neil A. Davis, Gothenburg
Friday, 10 February 2012 14:45 -

Quinlan asked "When did compromise become a four-letter word?" That would be when President Obama first met with Republican leaders and said "I won. So I think on that one, I trump you." Even with the influx of new Republicans in Congress, their leadership is being played for fools while our debt continues to expand by trillion\$. To go one step further, Obama recently said on the economy, "And where Congress is not willing to act, we're going to go ahead and do it ourselves." Those my friends are the words of a dictator.