

Obama opinion article riles reader

Editor's note: The following letter was written in response to Chris Novak's opinion piece "Reaction to Obama's first year in office," in the Feb. 5 issue of The Clarion.

Wow. I just want to begin by "thanking" you for your contribution to The Clarion. I know it doesn't have many readers, even here on campus, but I in particular value my fellow students taking the time to put their "complex" "thoughts" into words.

Specifically, I'm referring to your "insightful" piece about President Obama. I can tell you've really "done your homework." I don't know you that well, but if I may take a guess, are you a Political

Science major? No? That's Ok, you don't have to be well informed in America to have your opinion heard. Just look at Glenn Beck!

It took me a minute to decipher your "clever" phrase, "Obamateur." Then I got it. "Oh! I get it!" I said. "It's like Obama and amateur all in one word! Bummer it requires mispronouncing his name, but why care when it's nonsense anyway?" Wow. Again, if you're not a Political Science major you should really look into our department here and consider declaring as one.

Ignoring that Barack Obama's life is anything but the record of an amateur,

it really saved you a lot of time to just throw a half-baked insult at the man. Let's also ignore that he is professionally the President. That also kind of negates calling an esteemed man with degrees from Harvard and Columbia an amateur, doesn't it?

Last, but certainly not least, thank you so much for not forgetting to put the "icing" on your "cake." When you compared President Obama to the beloved television character Steve Urkel, I just thought, "Wow. That is so racist, so unbelievably ignorant and racist."

"Thanks," Freshman Chris Novak.

Will Byers

Reader responds to 'Don't ask, don't tell'

Editor's note: The following letter was written in response to Carter Stevens' response to John Climer's Feb. 5 article "Battlefield Politics."

Dear Clarion Readers,

I was shocked and outraged this morning when I picked up an issue of our dear Clarion to find an article in support of the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy. First I would like to bring some education to the Brevard College campus. The Don't Ask Don't Tell policy brought about during the Clinton administration states the following,

"The policy bans gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender people from serving in the military and prevents military officials from asking probing questions or pursuing investigations of soldiers suspected of being homosexuals. Any service-member that openly reveals their homosexuality through words or actions are discharged from service."

Now in referencing the article that was published in the Clarion this morning, I really don't see how this is a "blanket statement". Also how can anyone possibly argue that this policy isn't "Biased either way." This policy is depriving the individuals who bravely fight for our freedom their civil rights! This policy prevents homosexuals serving in the military from openly discussing their relationships with their peers, as their

counter heterosexual peers are able to do. Even worse it creates a stigma around homosexuality that festers discrimination, prejudice, and hate crimes.

I am totally and completely against the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy, and while I will admit it is a positive step away from the previous policy that banned gays from serving in the military at all, it is still an outrage and crime against basic civil rights. While military officials are prevented from conducting investigations, there have still been several cases where "actions" that could be perceived as a homosexual act in anyway shape or form were investigated, sometimes wrongly, that ended with individuals being discharged from the military. When you are discharged from the military for homosexuality you receive a dishonorable discharge, the same discharge given to drug addicts. How is this justice?

While I looked for the exact changes President Obama was planning to make on Don't ask Don't Tell I came up empty. I do know however that the original promise was as follows, "This year, I will work with Congress and our military to finally repeal the law that denies gay Americans the right to serve the country they love because of who they are,"

To me this is a message of hope, that someday gay Americans who lay their lives on the line for our freedom will enjoy the same civil rights as their hetero

counterparts.

Whether the writer of the article that appeared in the paper understood the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy is still unclear to me, since he contradicted himself by adding a quote about equality in the last paragraph. Even with that said it pains me that such an openly offensive article to homosexuals was published in the Clarion. The article was openly prejudice and discriminatory to the gay and lesbian students of Brevard College. I openly encourage constructive dialogue between people of differing views, with that said I felt I must do my part to speak for the lesbians and gays of this community. I don't think that granting our military civil rights would "distract our military from their primary job of conducting warfare." In fact they would probably do their job better knowing they were fighting for a country where they really could be completely free and enjoy civil rights. I think it is important we discuss these issues on our campus, and that we talk about and fight for social justice in our country. I hope that this article has brought light and education to those who were previously misinformed. I do agree in a certain context with the quote by Ron Paul, that we all should be treated equally. That is all I am asking for,