



<http://www.delawareonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060721/OPINION10/607210330/1111/OPINION>

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## Our Readers' Views

07/21/2006

**STORYCHAT:** [Post Comment](#)

### State fertile ground for those looking to invest in local entrepreneurs

I read with great interest the June 23 article headlined "Delaware ranks last in new business activity." It presented findings of the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, in which Delaware was found to score last in new business start-ups per 100,000 residents.

Although it is difficult to challenge such a statistic, I believe the culture in Delaware is changing dramatically to enhance the entrepreneurial spirit. I operate two venture capital firms and work closely with such enterprises.

The article suggested that regulatory constraints are holding back Delaware start-up activity. I do not agree. Entrepreneurship is a spirit in individuals or communities. If regulatory bureaucracies were the culprit, one would not see vibrant activities in places such as Philadelphia, New York or Washington, D.C.

Entrepreneurs are the pioneers of the current age and must not be penalized for taking a chance and failing.

The article suggested that entrepreneurship and innovation are not supported in Delaware. This is not accurate. The state Economic Development Office includes a recently established Seed Investment Program and Venture Capital Investment Program for technology businesses. Digital Delaware holds monthly networking meetings where entrepreneurs exchange ideas.

The recent Early Stage East conference in Wilmington was attended by more than 500 people, including financiers representing more than \$5 billion in capital.

The Entrepreneurial Action Group, which is supported by the corporate, private and government sectors, is developing a road map to continue such activities. The Mid-Atlantic Angel Group Fund was launched this past year to invest in start-ups in the Delaware Valley.

So what else is necessary? A central information resource for entrepreneurs seeking funding and guidance. Also, cross-germination of ideas and opportunities between Delaware and neighbor states. Entrepreneurship has no boundaries, but venture capitalists tend to invest in their immediate communities.

The creation of a technology incubator would offer inexpensive space and pooled resources. A technology council similar to those in Pennsylvania, Maryland and New Jersey would effectively be a chamber of commerce for tech-based entrepreneurs.

These strategies require a long-term view but are not unproved. They have been in existence for many years.

David Freschman, Chief executive, Delaware Innovation Fund, Managing principal, Innovation Ventures, Wilmington

### Reagan was not a reliable environmental forecaster

In 1980 Ronald Reagan said, "Approximately 80 percent of our air pollution stems from hydrocarbons released by vegetation." I fail to see how 2006 findings by the Max Planck Institute vindicate him, as a letter writer asserted in the July 14 paper.

<http://www.delawareonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060721/OPINION10/607210330/1111/OPIN...> 7/28/2006

Reagan wasn't an environmental visionary or for that matter a scientist, so it is hardly logical to say his statement was a hypothesis that has now been proved.

The Planck findings were surprising to even modern scientists who assumed that methane could not be co-produced with oxygen. So any implication that Reagan might have caught wind of it in 1980 are ludicrous.

Besides, the finding that vegetation produces 10 percent to 30 percent of methane pales with consideration that they also produce 99 percent of the oxygen in the air.

Melissa Bower, Newark

### **t's not against Constitution to think and act differently**

Call me confused, disillusioned, short-sighted, narrow-minded or whatever the politically correct descriptive of the day may be, but I have to figure out a few things so I can sleep comfortably at night.

Will someone please tell me why we must draft a new law or enact a constitutional amendment every time someone disagrees with something that someone else is doing? What ever happened to "live and let live"?

I'm sure we all have habits that annoy someone else. Should we have a law against everything? Why don't we just prohibit tobacco, alcohol, red meat, sugar, tap water and being in public if you weigh over 200 pounds or are not otherwise pleasing to the eye?

Why don't we ban showing any type of emotion in public?

We can start executing people for such heinous crimes as jaywalking, taking up more than one parking space, looking at another person cross-eyed, having a different religious belief or sleeping more than six hours per day.

Take a look in the mirror, folks. You are not perfect. None of us are. So stop trying to dictate what others can and can't do, just because their views are different from yours.

Iran McBride, New Castle

### **Be balanced in granting entry to illegal immigrants**

I am opposed to amnesty for anyone who entered our country illegally. I would like to see a law passed that gives illegals a short time to register with federal immigration authorities and begin the process to become legal, which includes learning the English language.

It is unreasonable to allow them six years to make it happen. Illegal immigrants who don't bother to register need to be arrested as criminals, and sent back to their country.

I am in favor of getting tough with employers that hire undocumented workers. Use fines, revoke business licenses or other means to send the message that we want it to stop.

Mexican people are hard workers who deserve to be paid a decent wage, live free, and have an opportunity to obtain the American dream. If they do it through legal channels, that would be good for everyone in the United States. But the first priority for national security should be to establish and enforce immigration policies and laws.

I hope politicians will stop dodging immigration and pass legislation that will protect and benefit all U.S. citizens, present and future.

Sandie Carroll, Wilmington

### **Republicans are in control but issues are off-center**

How reassuring that branches of the U.S. government controlled by Bush Republicans have their priorities straight. Oh, wait a second. That would be every branch of government, wouldn't it?

Case in point: the pursuit of a constitutional amendment to define the sanctity of marriage in America -- well, the 50 percent of heterosexual marriages that seem to survive.

Another constitutional amendment proposed to vaccinate our nation against the epidemic of flag burning. It would enable a patriot to walk our streets without inhaling the smoke of yet another desecration of our beloved red, white and blue.

For has the phrase "under God" been overlooked. Still another amendment will secure those sacrosanct words in our Pledge of Allegiance. That whooshing sound is my sigh of relief.

Once those critical challenges are met, it's likely that resolutions to the Iraq conflict, health care, the national deficit, global warming, post-Katrina issues, plus environmental abuses will fall quickly into place.

This is the best I've felt since Ronald Reagan invaded Grenada.

Jack Murphy, Hockessin

**Al Gore is just a political opportunist on environment**

To defend Al Gore as being better than our current president is ludicrous. He would have been just as bad, if not worse, in the long run. Gore is just another political opportunist jumping on a bandwagon to bash our government for its failures.

For eight years in government in the 1990s, he sat on his hands doing nothing about the environment, a pet project Bill Clinton assigned to him.

Gore voted for spending bills when he was in the Senate that created things like dams and factories, which contributed to the problems he is currently fighting against. Gore represents what is wrong with politics today: blaming others for our problems rather than doing something about them.



Jason Jeandell, Seaford

**Eating contests belittle the seriousness of obesity**

Let's say it, at the risk of offending the lucky winner of the Dewey Beach wing-eating contest: Should we really be taking photos and cheering people who clearly eat way too much and surely have obesity-related health concerns?

Shouldn't a nation with a large percentage of morbidly overweight individuals rethink the whole idea of eating contests? How would we react if there was a congratulatory photo of a drunk swinging an empty vodka bottle? Or a cancer patient chain-smoking?

Lisa Thibault, Newark

**STORYCHAT**   [Post a Comment](#)

---

This article does not have any comments associated with it