



rRemarks Data for June 2, 2026 Village Council Meeting

Agenda Section & Item: Comments of a General Nature

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Comment on CC's report regarding the response to his doing a pride month proclamation

In his report at VC's 19 May meeting, CC asserted he believes every citizen is "constitutionally protected and a child of god."

One might find his claim believable were it not for the fact that to my knowledge he is a card-carrying member of the Republican Party. Which history indicates does not particularly agree with either claim.

The leader of his party currently occupying the White House clearly doesn't believe in the Constitution, nor do the members of his party in Congress in view of the fact they show no sign of fulfilling their legal responsibilities under the law.

Which is to say his belief about constitutional protections of citizens seems rather hollow. Especially these days.

What about the idea every citizen is a child of god?

Beyond his questionable linking of citizenship with the phrase 'child of god' — easily disregarded since his remark was not prepared —

Should we take the phrase 'child of god' literally?

Why make presumption of our shared humanity contingent on a religious belief?

Clearly, comments made by conservative Christians at the VC meetings indicate their understanding of Christianity disagrees with those versions of Christianity accepting of non-straight individuals.

So whose version of Christianity is right?

But even should we want to give his phrase the benefit of the doubt, the policies he and other Republicans support more often than not negate whatever modeling of behavior he thinks he's encouraging in terms of our displaying shared kinship and potentialities.

Agenda Section & Item: Comments of a General Nature

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Followup comment on VC's resolution regarding the Build Act

In addition to the points I raised about the resolution in my remark to the 19 May meeting,

https://agendadocs.downers.us/public/docs/agendas/2026/05_19_2026/rEmarks.pdf?_gl=1*m7wz7w*_ga*MTU4Njg0MTg5OC4xNzgwMzU5NDM5*_ga_50YCDGRG70*czE3ODAzNTk0MzgkbzEkZzEkdDE3ODAzNTk0NTkkajM5JGwwJGgw

it is also worth pointing out that VC's purported interest in "attainable housing" comes only after VC and DG moved in precisely the opposite direction — in a relentless (and ongoing) drive for ever greater residential property values (more and bigger houses) that worsened the problem of affordable housing — for at least the past three decades. Having left the critters out of the barn, for VC to now claim it is working to help solve the problem is absurd on its face.

For me, the lack of 'attainable housing' is just one of many manifestations of the fact the way of living in the US (including DG) is not ecologically sustainable, a reality to this day the US — including DG residents — refuses to admit and address.

The Build act may deserve to be opposed, but to invoke the Republican mantra of 'unfunded mandates' and 'threat to home rule' as the rationale for doing so deflects from the fact DG and other munis have done nothing to address the housing problem, either individually or collectively.

Given the vote was 7-0, apparently even Dems representing the well-to-do are prepared to join the chorus.