

From: [\\_Gww1210@aol.com](mailto:_Gww1210@aol.com) (mailto:[Gww1210@aol.com](mailto:Gww1210@aol.com)) [mailto:[Gww1210@aol.com](mailto:Gww1210@aol.com)]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2013 10:27 PM  
To: Marston, Glenn  
Cc: Voice, Lakeland; Voice, Lakeland; Rufty, Bill  
Subject: [Caution: Message contains Suspicious URL content] 298-word letter -oh, and it's a '1-subject' letter like u prefer :)

I don't know what to suggest as a title: May by 'Cyber bullying' or simply 'Dennis Ross'?? ---but anyhow -- My letter submission below is 298 words -and, is (more or less, except the 'segue' intro) a "one-subject" letter, as you prefer.

Alright -- I'm "pulling my weight" but the weight's a bit heavy - can I get some help over here ;D

Re: "Ross: Spending Cuts Needed to Reduce Deficit" (Jan. 2)

Your article claims "Rep. Dennis Ross would have voted against legislation to stop from going over the fiscal cliff even if it meant going over it."

Although I agree with his "Fiscal Cliff" 'no' vote, THIS time, The Ledger's claim, here, is canard: Since he voted 'yes' on 4 of 6 pork-laden appropriations bills in his tenure, Ross is NOT conservative: appropriation bills are huge & 'dwarf' all other spending.

However, when I tried to express my views on this and other political matters on his Facebook, he deleted all my comments and blocked me posting.

Were this his 'personal' Facebook or Twitter, this would be immoral, but not illegal. However, so long as I don't threaten, harass, or use vulgar language, I have a right to post on his 'Public' page, distinct from a private or 'personal' page. He's violating Free Speech rights, and by extension First Amendment rights of Redress here.

Most readers know that while I have strong opinions, I've NEVER gotten banned from The Ledger's forums, so I'm clearly not a troublemaker.

Furthermore, if it were "just Gordon" complaining, you might give Ross the benefit of the doubt. However, since many people are now making complaints Ross unjustly blocked them from these social networks, it's apparent that it's not just an "imagined" problem: Strong allegations, but I've carefully documented them all in my email to John Boehner: [www.GordonWatts.com/email-boehner.html](http://www.GordonWatts.com/email-boehner.html) or: [www.GordonWayneWatts.com/email-boehner.html](http://www.GordonWayneWatts.com/email-boehner.html) and mentioned as front-page news on my blogs.

This many people are NOT going to make up a story, but that begs the question: If Ross is not justified in this, then why is he doing it? To silence those who disagree with legislative requests of rich campaign contributors?

Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register  
[www.GordonWayneWatts.com](http://www.GordonWayneWatts.com) / [www.GordonWatts.com](http://www.GordonWatts.com)