

Gov't shouldn't pick winners/losers

Written by Neil A. Davis, Gothenburg

Thursday, 06 October 2011 14:51 - Last Updated Monday, 12 December 2011 16:39

Penny Fattig wrote about using subsidies for the ethanol industry to "...help it get going." I think it is now "going." Why continue the subsidies? In a Brownfield Ag News article, I read that Gov. Heineman said "...all of us are going to have to take some reductions in federal spending." Heineman (trying to appease everyone) suggested subsidies should be phased out over several years, not ended abruptly.

Penny wrote that "many" have benefited from the program, failing to mention that "all" are forced to contribute, because this is socialism. She may be among those in agri-business, who profit from farmers having more money to spend. That is how capitalism works.

But when using subsidies, consider those not benefiting from the program, even though they help pay for the success of the recipients ("many"). Does the American dream now include the belief that one's success can't be achieved without first taking the property of others? Government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. We just lost over half a billion taxpayer dollars, because Obama backed Solyndra, a (now bankrupt) solar energy company/money laundering scheme.

Penny wrote "Neil Davis has stated that he does not believe in entitlements..." This is not true. You will not find that statement anywhere. Santa Claus would be something I no longer believe in. I also didn't write about anyone being "against the Constitution." Penny was taking sides against "...Tea Party propaganda..." I wrote about the beliefs of (those) citizens who are simply exercising their 1st Amendment right "...to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

I've never written about opposing student aid either. I oppose how Obama has perverted the student loan program (just like everything else he touches).

Penny cited a statement from an article in Time magazine by editor Richard Stengel. He wrote "The Constitution serves the nation; the nation does not serve the Constitution." Who would disagree with that statement? Well, Stengel for one. He doesn't believe the Constitution serves the nation. Stengel is one of many liberals who thinks that the Constitution should reflect however he feels when he wakes up on any given day. The other half of the statement, the premise that we would somehow be under duress for having to comply with the "law of the land," is just stupid.

Gov't shouldn't pick winners/losers

Written by Neil A. Davis, Gothenburg

Thursday, 06 October 2011 14:51 - Last Updated Monday, 12 December 2011 16:39

Hoping that anything good for the country is going to come out of the "Super Committee" is as laughable as hoping something about job creation will be found in Obama's new "American Jobs Act."

Penny thinks my Dr. (D)eath reference is nonsense and slinging mud? Let's see if there will be an honest assessment by Democrats, of their behavior after what promises to be the dirtiest election we've ever seen.

Neil A. Davis, Gothenburg