

---

Subject: Re: Cindy's single soon

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 16 Aug 2005 14:27:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well; thats the point and I never denied that. Of course it is a media event and that is how she wanted it. And the sacrifice of her son grants her the legitamicy to persue her opposition to the war in any way she chooses. If she chooses to shine a light on this to maybe help end the war that is an honest approach to fulfilling her responsibilities as a mother. I don't get the concept that there is a proper way to express your anger at the useless death of your child. You express that as forcefully and noticeably as possible. And if the media wants to join in and support her anger so much the better. She has every right to do this any way she chooses because she made the sacrifice that gives her that right. Your contention that somehow she should behave in a special way that doesn't put light on the issue is just unbeleivable to me. Allow me an indiscretion; I think if it was my son and people told me how I should act and who I should associate with so as not to violate some phanthom code of ethics they made up, I would explain to them firmly to shut the fuck up and stay out of my business. As apparently she has done. I just don't get people thinking they have some standing that permitts them telling her how she should have treated his death and why she is behaving improperly. And that scares me that anyone would appropriate that right for themselves. I say this forcefully because I am absolutely unable to understand where she loses her rights because cameras follow her and Micheal More takes an interest in her story. What does one have to do with the other?? It's almost the same principal invoked in the Schiavo case; that somehow the way people behave at death should be defined by others who know nothing of the situation and have no standing whatsoever.

---