

Alternative info needed

Written by Neil A. Davis, Gothenburg
Thursday, 01 March 2012 15:00 -

Joe Knoedler's letter (02-22-12) is a good representation of one reason I write letters myself. Having an informed electorate would be impossible if letters like his were the only reading material available to the public. He feels "...there are some people that try very hard to ignore change and forget what this country was built upon." I don't know why anyone would think those two actions belong together. It seems to me that someone who resists change might do so to retain what worked in the past and someone who espouses change might do so in spite of history. Is change always a good thing?

Knoedler wrote that he has been reading a lot of me and that my very biased viewpoints make it apparent that I like to scare people into believing being a Democrat is unpatriotic. I have written about the differences I see between traditional Democrats, liberals and socialists. Perhaps he missed reading that. I would welcome a return of the Democratic Party. It would bring a balance back to Congress that has been missing since the socialist insanity took hold. That is why I have always voted for Ben Nelson. Knoedler is wrong about so many things that I think it would be safe to say he doesn't know what being a Democrat is.

He wrote that the Republican party refuses "...to let women have the right to choose, let people choose who they should marry..." If that is their goal they certainly haven't been very successful. Abortion isn't a right, but it is permissible by law. Because we live in a free country, people can oppose being forced to fund those who "choose." So, who is under duress in this matter? The voters in his state of California (who believe marriage should be between one man and one woman) have repeatedly passed laws like the Defense of Marriage Act. These laws have been overturned by liberal activist judges. Republicans are not the ones who are interfering in the democratic process.

Personally, I don't think someone's choice of a partner is any of my business. I also don't think it is any of the federal government's business. I recently heard that the origin of marriage license in the U.S. was to keep track of inter-racial marriage. Once government gets it's foot in the door, personal freedom always suffers. I think gay rights activists would have better luck lobbying to get government out of their lives than trying to change the convictions of religious people. Government thinks a piece of paper gives them the power to dictate who a person can include as a family member and how it would benefit them. Show me that power in the Constitution. Read and learn your Constitution people.

There is so much misinformation in Knoedler's letter that it will take more than one letter to respond to it all.

Alternative info needed

Written by Neil A. Davis, Gothenburg
Thursday, 01 March 2012 15:00 -
