

The Passy Press®

Letter to the Editor

From: "Pinckney, Cotes" <cotes.pinckney@undisclosed.com>

To: Nick Gardiner "enpg@thepassypress.com"

Date: Saturday, November 2, 2013 at 3:45 PM

Subject: Replying to John Cogswell's essay.

Dear Sir,

John Cogswell hits the nail right on the head. Many, if not all, of the liberals have convinced themselves not only that a bigger, more liberal government is the best system for our country, but that such a government may be achieved only by members of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. Hence, each liberal incumbent must be reelected. They seem to have convinced themselves that in pushing for their own reelection, they are acting for the common good and not out of any self---interest. They probably can argue that Congressmen (must I say Congress persons?) should be afforded special privileges so that the system will continue to attract the brightest and best. Unfortunately in that respect they can probably point to the system of stock options and executive compensation prevalent in American business these days.

This is one of the worst forms of sophistry. Having polls on every conceivable issue compounds it. We acknowledge that much of America is poorly educated and does not understand how the government is designed to operate, and then we poll them on issues and use the results as some sort of compass. Our president is a master of this practice. Somehow in studying and teaching constitutional law, he overlooked the concept of checks and balances. Because the Republicans control the House of Representatives, he can state with a straight face that the House is "obstructive." I know at least one graduate of Harvard Law School that would like to see the president's law degree revoked.

I suppose Mr. Obama convinced himself that to accomplish the great common good in health care it was appropriate to misrepresent the continued availability of some types of insurance policies. When asked about his misrepresentation, his press secretary replied that those Insureds were going to receive better coverage, and that because of the government subsidy; in many cases the premium would be lower.

In the last couple of days, it has been suggested that earmarks are good, maybe even valuable, because they resulted in a consensus on legislative proposals that might not be otherwise reached. We cannot pay money to a congressman to vote a certain way, but liberals in Congress can obtain his or her vote by adopting special interest legislation that will appeal to his or her constituents. Of course it is for the common good for Congress to adopt certain legislation, so we should not get hung up with moral issues. Please stick to the practical. Also, a prominent columnist pointed out last week that our current administration is "progressive" rather than "liberal." I suppose that is because the term "liberal" now has some unpopular connotations, probably as determined by one of those polls.

I hope you do not think I am unduly cynical. One of the few benefits of growing older is the realization that I will not have to put up with this drift too much longer.

Cheers.

A graduate of Yale University, Pinckney served as an officer in the US Navy for three years before attending University of Virginia Law School. He practiced law in Richmond, Virginia.