

Letters to the Editor

Updated March 20th, 2009

You are the "Enemy of The People"!

I was once very liberal as an art teacher in California schools. I've witnessed the virtual destruction of real education in our schools at the hands of my college comrades, who do this "For the Children". Really, our tax money is diverted for massively wasteful purposes which amount to a liberal adult employment plan. Screw the kids' education. I've worked in schools where 10th graders were taught at the 3rd grade level, kids from Arkansas were 3 years ahead and foreign exchange students laughed at us and just went home in disgust.

This is all due to you guys. In our so-called "good" school district, one third of all graduates graduated outside of the normal high schools, utilizing charter, religious, private, home schooling, et al, as the people walk away from the increasing failure of Cal Ed. This doesn't take into account the vast, increasing number of dropouts.

You've done the same to our once wildly prosperous and innovative business climate. You've wrecked the 5th strongest economy on earth in your murdering the goose that laid the golden eggs, by your mean-spirited and hateful over-taxing/official harassment of innovators, risk-takers, creators of businesses and jobs. You've driven growing thousands of businesses out of California, and taxed many others into extinction. Each business you've wrecked takes away 5, 10, 30, 500, 10,000 jobs from California's people whose prosperity you've sacrificed. Your actions eliminate your tax base . . . but, hey, for you it's just other peoples' money. Your asses are covered no matter what.

Jobs for the people is the big thing you've blindly ignored as you push your marxist imperatives upon the people and thusly destroy California's unique economy in your bargain with the devil. Wherever on earth your marxist thought has pervaded, failing everywhere it's been tried. human misery is the main product.

You are the "Enemy of The People"!

Name withheld

Paul:

That was a terrific piece you wrote about your visit to New York City and the soon-to-be old Stadium. It brought back memories since I grew up on Lon GUYland (Great Neck) and my dad has season tix at the House for a few years when I was a small boy (until my folks got divorced and he gave up the tix.)

However, later on I went more often to see the Mets play as it was

only a few stops on the Long Island Railroad... and also the world's fair ran in 1964 when I was in high school. So we would go to the fair during the day (the girls liked that) and take them to the ball game at night (they were not thrilled about that but they got fed so it all worked out!) We'd take the train back to Great Neck and get the girls home before curfew (usually midnight or 12:30 am.)

It was a very good piece.

Regards,

Alan N. Canton from Fair Oaks, CA

To the Editor

As the Ringling Brothers Barnum and Bailey circus has recently left the area, I would like to take this opportunity to make a plea within my community that they not be allowed to return.

Life on the road in small, dismal cages, with no freedom to roam is no life for a wild animal. Sadly, the stress of constant travel is not the worst of it. Animals are routinely beaten to force them to perform. Constant chaining of up to 23 hours a day, and use of bull hooks are common practice, while vicious beatings that result in death are not uncommon. Elephants are reportedly so scared of certain trainers that they urinate and defecate on sight when that trainer is near.

Ringling has also been charged by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with violating the federal Animal Welfare Act for improper and abusive handling of elephants, specifically baby animals.

Circuses like to tell communities that by bringing wild animals to town, they are educating the public. In some cases they even claim to be helping endangered species. This is simply not true. Forcing wild animals to perform unnatural tricks does not teach our children about these magnificent creatures. Respect for animals is not gained in a circus arena. In addition, breeding more circus elephants does not help their endangered brethren.

Our community does not need to support this kind of abuse, and it saddens me every time the circus comes to my town.

Sincerely,

Sherry Macias from Sacramento, CA

Dear Editor:

Marriage is a sacrament before God. It is not the role of government to define it through a proposition.

Historically, marriage secured inheritance rights, furthered political alliances, and limited the number of children outside wedlock from becoming wards of the state. It had little to do with religion.

Proposition 8 may project heterosexual insecurities. Affairs by married men and women exceed 30%. Fifty percent of all straight marriages end in divorce. There are now businesses that match individuals with those looking to stray from their traditional marriage.

Straight society wants to avoid personal responsibility for its collective failure. Why don't traditional marriage advocates want to make divorce difficult, support criminalizing infidelity, penalize premarital sex, and mandate lengthy counseling before divorce? Sadly, it is easier to scapegoat the nation's gay and lesbian minority for its perceived threat to traditional marriage than for heterosexuals to take responsibility.

Each spiritual and religious leader answers to God and conscience in their decision to perform a sacramental blessing for a same-sex couple in a loving, committed relationship who come together as a family. In Thomas Paine's republic, government has one role – to guarantee equality for all citizens. Religion defines the marital sacrament, not secular government.

Sincerely,

***Bishop Paul Peter Jesep,
Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and author,
"Crucifying Jesus and Secularizing America – the Republic of Faith without Wisdom."***

Schenectady, NY

Hi Paul,

Just wanted to tell you how much I enjoyed your article "Saying Goodbye in the House that Ruth Built". The personal and baseball background in addition to the trip details came together in a truly enjoyable article! Sounds like the type of adventure many parents talk about with their children, and regret they don't follow through on.

Regards,
Teri

Teri Stevens

Dear Carmichael Times,

I am appalled at the idea that it should be illegal in California for a minority to engage in an activity which is perfectly legal for the majority. Our individual freedoms are guaranteed by our Constitution, one purpose of which is to protect the individual and the minority from the tyranny of the majority.

There are only two requirements for a legal marriage in California: a marriage certificate issued by the state, and a ceremony of some kind. The only thing that was changed by the Supreme Court this year was who the state may give a license to. The state does not regulate what kind of ceremony you have for your marriage. Nor does it interfere with the free practice of any religion to marry or not marry whomever they please. The state cannot regulate the doctrines of a religion, or its practices. If people can't sue the Catholic Church to force it to ordain women priests, they can't sue a church to force it to marry people against its beliefs.

The California Constitution is among a select few in this country that provides the residents of its state with more protections from the government than are provided by the Federal Constitution. The California Supreme Court acted in accordance with the founding principles of our constitution by expanding freedom and protecting the rights of all Californians. Proposition 8 is un-American and un-Californian.

Californians should not be in the business of restricting other peoples' freedoms.

Sincerely,
Jesus Gonzales from Sacramento, CA

Dear Carmichael Times,

If the debate about passing proposition 8 was about religious freedom I would be in support however this is not about an individuals religious right; this is about making laws based on religious beliefs.

Ones sexuality must not determine ones eligibility for equal rights and protection in the eyes of the law? The law and religious belief are two separate issues; discriminating against any individual based on religious belief goes against the very principals of the constitution of the United States of America.

The passing of proposition 8 says that I am not equal under the law, less than another, solely because of religious belief. We would not tolerate an amendment to the constitution barring rights to non-Christians, non-whites or to the disabled; the reason that this is being considered is because religious belief says that homosexuals are less than another. Who is next?

Fear me, hate me, ignore me; do not take away my rights solely for your religious belief.

Sincerely,
Paul Andres of Fair Oaks, CA

Jewish Food Fair

Dear Paul, Thanks so much for the help with our publicity. It seems we had the best fund raiser/food fair ever and all the publicity is to credit for our success. We are glad to let people know that your paper was part of our success.

Cordially, Bob Bennett

This evening I listened in on the Michael Savage Show talking about today being a new Black Monday on Wall Street and very few are paying attention as We The People are losing the economy. He talked about us being bombarded with junk distracting news while going through a financial Tsunami from 9/11 to 9/15. In 2004 investment bankers were allowed to pull out all the stops with very little regulation and plunder the hard working American people through bad loans. His question is who is responsible and shouldn't they be punished?

To listen live <http://michaelsavage.wnd.com/>

It's very informative, causing us to think deeper. We are in dire times. Alan Greenspan the man who's been holding our economy together for many years, called the "U.S. in 'once-in-a-century' financial crisis". The last century was the Great Depression.

For those of us who know God, we can certainly understand Him pulling away His hand of blessings, as our Nation as a whole has told Him to stay out of our public affairs. I suppose now that we've lost much and are ruled by tyrannical laws, we'll cry out to God like the backslidden people of Israel in the Bible, and that is a bright light in this Black cloud, because God always sent Deliverers.

Then the NY Post reported a piece of good news, that many NY Democratic women are throwing their vote to John McCain. As a woman, if I were a Democrat I would also heed Senator Obama's arrogant remark to spare him the phony outrage along with my vote. The unapologetic perceived offensive lipstick comment cost him more than he realizes.

And I'm so glad Democratic women are looking at the Palin Family and seeing their success with quality careers while they get to keep their many children too.

For women it's even more important that we fight to keep America's Christian heritage and fight for the life of our children, born or pre-born. Because the Bible says God hears the blood crying from the land, as He told Cain when he killed his innocent brother Abel.

And if we as women and the men who love us, don't turn around but continue to rebuke God and His laws we will not have anymore laws to protect us. Just as America's mother nation, Great Britain, is now allowing Muslim Sharia Law Courts, which have the legal right to punish women for extreme offenses such as being alone in the company of an unrelated male.

It looks like this may be the deciding year that women will have a real Choice in how we're going to clean up our act. If we don't choose pro-life and family leaders, there may be a time really soon that we'll be forced to, and there will be no more talk of Abortion or Homosexuality which Sharia Law doesn't permit.

Olga Hermann

While big oil companies are raking in the bucks, our small community businesses are suffering. The more folks must spend for gas, the less they can spend elsewhere. We need to think about this when we vote. We must stop letting oil companies run our country's energy policy.

In Congress, Dan Lungren sides consistently with the oil interests, who have given him thousands of dollars. During the past two years, he voted against the Clean Energy Act of 2007, against the Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act, against the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act, against the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act, against the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Lease Act, and against the Saving Energy through Public Transportation Act. In no way do these votes represent our third district residents.

Fortunately, we have Dr. Bill Durston running for Lungren's seat in Congress. Durston is an emergency physician who knows how to listen to people. I have met him and heard him speak. He is a man of integrity and intelligence, a decorated Vietnam veteran who envisions a better future for our country and our planet. Instead of representing Big Oil, he will represent the interests of our people. We need someone of his caliber in Congress.

Helen N. Hanna

Dear Mr. Scholl;

I have not yet read your article about Dan Lundgren's "Honest Abe" award, but if you honestly believe that people are "bashing" Sarah Palin by simply pointing out her obvious shortcomings, then it would be difficult for any thinking person to assume that any other articles you publish are

anything more than propaganda for the "hooray for our side" *Republicrat* politics of veiled racism and/or greed.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter;

Joel Baechle from Jackson, CA

Dear Sir:

I read the article in your paper about Mr. Lungren receiving the "Honest Abe" award. You joke! Mr. Lungren may have led a few investigations into fraud, but to claim that he has "worked on this issue since 1986" is totally unbelievable! Mr. Lungren is a career politician, and can (and does) lie without blinking. He has done little that actually benefits the constituents he is supposed to "represent". He certainly does NOT represent me on any important national issues! I say, "Throw the bum out!" Lungren has had years of opportunity in the public arena to demonstrate his integrity, and he has failed. Dr. Bill Durston, on the other hand, presents an agenda that is refreshingly "Honest Abe"! Consider balancing the matter by printing an article about Bill Durston.

Sincerely,

Joyce Bonner from Volcano, CA

Dear Joyce,

We do not deliver to Volcano, California. I am curious as to how you received a copy.

(Email sent the same day as distribution was completed)

(Her response)

I read the article on the Internet, passed along in an e-mail by a friend who DOES receive your paper. Also, I've been in contact with Mr. Lungren for several years, attempting to get details on his voting decisions and views on national issues. He's sent me boiler-plate responses that never address my specific questions. In person, Lungren is a slick talker, but controls the forum (town hall meetings) with partisan rhetoric and refuses to honestly discuss issues with people of differing views. Unless there has been a new development, Lungren still is refusing to publicly debate with his opponent Bill Durston. I think the people living here in District 3 deserve to hear alternative views, so I hope your newspaper will consider printing them.

Joyce Bonner

(The article was not yet available on the internet.)

Attention Mr. Scholl,

I am out of town but got the news from several people in my neighborhood including my own daughter about your recent article. Have you not see the tv documentary that demonstrates the lack of honesty by our representative?

Please take note that your article calling Dan Lungren "Honest Abe" is not only a slam on Abe Lincoln but rather unjust to the real honest candidate running for congress Bill Durston. I'll cease to read your publication due to this ill advised error.

OR was it perhaps a paid for political announcement?

Sue and Gary Foster from Carmichael

A friend shared your article regarding Dan Lungren receiving the "Honest Abe" award this year. Are they kidding? On June 10, 2008, Lungren stated on his website there was plenty of oil on and off American shores to help ease the gas crisis, and on this basis, he supports drilling in protected areas. However, the Sacramento Bee wrote an article about the such a proposal on June 19, 2008, which specifically quantified how much oil is available. The numbers are not even close to what Lungren represented! Either Lungren knows something that scientists and neutral experts don't (which I doubt), or he is making misstatements in order to further the agenda of the oil and gas industry. (Its lobbyists have made substantial donations to Lungren over the years, and paid for him to go on vacations. Not surprisingly, he then voted against bills in the House of Representatives that could be detrimental to the industry.) With such misrepresentations and conflicts of interest, he is in no position to be receiving an award for honesty. I ask that the American River Messenger retract the article, or print a response with objective facts, giving a more complete picture of Mr. Lungren.

Thank you.

Suzanne from Sacramento

Dear Carmichael Times,

My partner and I married on June 27, 2008. We would not have been able to do so if the state's supreme court had not recognized that the right to marry is inherent in the state's constitution. Now, proponents of Proposition 8 are attempting to eliminate the right of people in loving, committed relationships to marry. All Constitutions are designed to protect the rights of the people within its jurisdiction. The United States' Constitution contains a "Bill of Rights" because the founders of this country wanted to ensure that the Constitution was clearly not a mechanism for removing rights. In fact, the Constitution encountered serious opposition because the individual states felt it necessary that the United States Constitution contain a Bill of Rights to protect the rights of individuals, especially those individuals who are in the minority of the voting

population. But now the people of the State of California have been asked to amend their constitution to REMOVE rights. Regardless how you feel about marriage, we should not allow this precedent. If we begin using the Constitution of the State of California to deny rights to same-sex couples based simply on a majority vote, what's next?

Sincerely,
Patricia Eichar from Rancho Cordova, CA

Dear Mr. Scholl

I was reading your paper this morning while eating breakfast at a restaurant in Sacramento and was amazed with your article for two reasons that compelled me to write to you about it.

First of all, ironically my two sons Joe Jr., Jason and I just returned from the very same trip to New York to see the Yankees play at the old stadium. We came back on Monday night 15th. We were there for four days beginning on Friday the 12th. We also visited Shea Stadium and came away with the same negative impression about it. In fact my son Jason says he is more impressed with Raley Field. On the other hand, Yankee Stadium was awe inspiring. We were there on Sunday to see A-Rod hit a grand slam and Derek Jeter hit a homer and tie Lou Gerrig's record for the most hits by a player at Yankee Stadium.

The second reason that I was delighted with your article is how you captured the essence of the visit. Being a native New Yorker myself, (Washington Heights in its hay day) I also had my sons walking my old neighborhood following my childhood footsteps. In addition, we visited all the wonderful places like the Empire State Building and Ellis Island which I proudly showed off to them as if I had something to do with their grandeur. You captured the spirit, joys and uniqueness of the city in a wonderful way and I just wanted to say thank you for a delightful article that I read over the phone to both my sons. They enjoyed it as much as I did.

Well done sir. Keep up the good work and say hi to Gabe for us.

Sincerely,

Joey Mitchell
Mornings
KHITS 92.1 FM