

(Blood) Pressure Points

In this rant, I'd like to get a few things off my chest. They'll be random but they've been thorns in my mental side for a long time. Let's begin.

Diplomacy:

The problem with diplomacy is how it lulls people into thinking it actually works. What is diplomacy really? Put simply, diplomacy is talking rather than fighting. The problem is, with the big, issues—the really hot, sensitive ones—it seldom works. Think about it for a moment. Prior to WW I, the European powers palavered their heads off, trying to keep a restless Germany from making war with its neighbors (without getting to the *real* reasons). Then, when a wild-eyed crazy shot Archduke Franz Ferdinand, Germany found its excuse to bring out the long knives and literally *millions* died. Then, some inept and unduly harsh diplomacy *after* the war left Germany to fester—the perfect opportunity for Adolph Hitler to exploit. Oh yeah, remember Neville Chamberlain and his supposedly successful negotiations with Hitler? “Peace in our time!” the headlines crowed. It lasted until Germany crushed Poland a month later, dragging Europe into WW II.

Prior to WW II, US diplomacy with Japan which, like Germany, had many grievances (its biggest over—*gee, big surprise*—oil!) stalled and they broke off negotiations with a declaration of war. Pearl Harbor came as more of a surprise than it should have, due to that declaration being sidetracked to a vacant desk, only to be discovered after the attack—another triumph of bureaucracy. Diplomacy recommenced only after we had *literally* crushed Japan's ability to fight (by means of 2 atom bombs). That diplomacy took the form of a complete surrender demand, followed by a discussion of the terms we laid down. Japan, with the reminder of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as a prod, complied. Note the progression here, for it's important.

Here's my position. Diplomacy has its place—before (though it usually doesn't work) and *after* hostilities. It *never* manages successfully to conclude hostilities. Think I'm blowing smoke? Think Korea and Vietnam. When the diplomats finished “negotiating” Korea, UN forces, which sat squarely at Korea's northern border, looking at China, had to withdraw back to the 39th Parallel. The result of this diplomatic coup? We now have North and South Korea. The latter, modeled itself on Japan's industrial successes (a model created by the USA, incidentally) and has a thriving economy. The former, under an insane totalitarian despot, suffers grinding poverty and the near starvation of its population.

Are you old enough to remember the Paris Peace Talks over Vietnam? I am and they proved about as successful as the Korean talks—no, even *less* so. The American military left Vietnam in disgrace and the country is now in about the same shape as North Korea, perhaps a bit better, due to today's tourism. The only Vietnamese who really benefitted from the sterling diplomatic handling of the peace talks, were those “boat people” we took responsibility for (and rightly so) and allowed to live here. Another diplomatic triumph.

Here's why diplomacy and organizations like the UN (successor to the League of Nations) don't work: they both fail to recognize that peace isn't the natural state of man. Like the “survival of the fittest” in the animal kingdom (not that I'm equating mankind with animals, mind you)

mankind arrives at peace not by sitting down and having our enemies over for tea, but by the principal of who had the most power. Simply put, if I'm stronger than you are, I set the terms and all you can do is get me to agree to a few concessions. In addition, if you *know* that I can kick your behind all the way back to the Stone Age, you don't attack me.

The "doves" sneered at MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction), which stood between the USA (the world's biggest First World power) and the Soviet Union (an essentially Third World power made to look bigger by virtue of its HUGE military) from the end of WW II until 1991, when the unexpected happened and what the diplomats considered a monolith crumbled (something many are slow to admit Ronald Reagan made possible with his policies toward The Soviet Union). Sneer if you want, but MAD worked because the Soviets *knew* that, were they to try to attack us, it would result in their annihilation. Think I'm blowing smoke again? Then why did Khrushchev, Mr. "We will bury you!" blink in 1962, when JFK made his ultimatums for the Soviet Union to get out of Cuba (not one of JFK's finest moments)? I'll answer my own question—because he knew he'd come up short in a shooting match with the good ol' US of A.

In the War on Terror (more rightly called The War on Radical Islamists), again diplomacy won't work. Ask Israel. Every time they sit down to negotiate with the Palestinians (usually at the urging of the UN) the cease-fire only lasts until the PLO retrenches and can strike back again. Has the deal Israel cut with Hezbollah, giving the Palestinians land of their own, worked? Of course not. Arab extremists like the PLO don't want concessions from Israel—they want Israel GONE! Yet another diplomatic triumph.

We need to get this through our heads: extremist Muslim terrorists don't want to sit down and negotiate with us, **THEY WANT TO DESTROY US!** The only thing they understand is an Army boot on the back of their neck, backed up by a fully-loaded M-16! It's what *they* would do given half a chance. Think of the people they've captured and *beheaded*.

Don't get me wrong; diplomacy has its place—*after* the dust settles and the bullets stop flying. Go ahead and try to negotiate before the fact, but just don't hold out any hope it will actually work—it hasn't so far and history proves it, over and over again.

Dependence On Foreign Oil:

I've heard the Left chant this mantra for years. "We've got to reduce our dependence on foreign oil!" How do they propose to do that? "Let's build electric cars, erect huge windmills, produce ethanol, and use fluorescent light bulbs—blah, blah, blah..." I have a much simpler solution, one brought to prominence by Sarah Palin, **DRILL, DRILL, DRILL!** Remember how many laughed at her for saying that? Well, she had the right idea and the right approach. America sits on HUGE reserves of oil, but that benighted flock of gooney birds in DC won't vote to let us exploit it, **OR** build new refineries to process what we already obtain.

Here's my take on it. Were I President, I'd urge Congress to exploit our native oil resources, develop the infrastructure, then go to the Middle Eastern oil producers and tell them, "Please cancel our oil contracts—we won't be needing your oil any longer, thank you." How long do you think it would take all those Arab potentates, who so despise us, to line up, turbans in hand and beg us to resume using their oil? After all, we use more than most other countries in the world

combined, excluding China. What do you think *that* would do the price of a barrel of oil? To use a submariner phrase, “Dive, dive, dive!”

Worried over those big, bad oil companies making so much profit? Let them build new refineries and initiate legislation to move them into replacing old refineries. Since they’d be able to drill to their hearts’ content, they’d gladly upgrade. That would cut into their profits, don’t you think? To allay the fears of the “gloom-and-doom, eco-freaks,” don’t you think that those new refineries, using state-of-the-art technology, would be clean and eco-friendly? Quick answer: Yes! At one time, we lived near the Bayway refinery in Linden, NJ. When the prevailing winds shifted a bit, the stink headed our way. Phew! Then, Exxon sold it to Tenneco and, probably due to the clean air regulations, Tenneco upgraded it. Today, you don’t smell a thing. Voila! Technology at work.

By way of a side trip, at about the same time a member of a group protesting the building of a modern, high-mass incinerator came by our house. He asked me if I wanted an incinerator in my backyard. I gave him an answer he didn’t expect. I told him that it would be a “clean” incinerator, utilizing modern “scrubbing” technology (there’s that technology again!) and asked the question, “What exists right next to it?” When the protestor finally grasped the answer, Bayway, I reminded him that we wouldn’t even smell the incinerator for the stink from the refinery. “Have a nice life,” I said as I closed the door.

Today, after enduring protests that started from day one of construction, the incinerator quietly opened (if you don’t count the protestors) and went to work. Then, with the refinery next door producing little to no effluents, all you notice from that amazing incinerator is a plume of *steam*! What I *do* notice is a steady stream of garbage trucks (from other states as well), bringing in garbage to burn and not cause overflowing landfills. The bonus here is that it provides revenue to New Jersey for the use of the incinerator. How’s that for technology solving problems? Would that other states would get the message and build incinerators of their own.

Here’s another heads up: why go to “alternate sources of energy” when our entire world infrastructure is set up to use oil? As technology goes forward, we’re developing cleaner-running cars and were we to deploy our own oil via drilling, tanker spills wouldn’t occur, because we wouldn’t need to bring crude oil from halfway around the world. Besides, we get *so much more* than just gasoline and diesel from crude oil. How about asphalt, lubricating oils, pharmaceutical chemicals, plastics and industrial chemicals? The list goes on.

Incidentally, in Germany, when they drilled for oil, they got an unexpected by-product—natural gas—in prodigious quantities. Once they tapped it, they couldn’t put the genie back in the bottle, so they used it to make clean electric power, along with their nuclear reactors. As a result, electricity in Germany is CHEAP! Yet another bonus for drilling for your own oil.

I’m not against alternate sources of energy. Even though—despite the pundits who’ve been running around the last forty years like Chicken Little, crying that we’ll run out of oil in fifteen years—we’ve been discovering literal *oceans* of it left and right—the Anwar, off Mexico, in Canada and off our coasts. Heck, shale oil *alone* outweighs all the rest, and that’s what *we now know* exists! Oil is supposedly a “nonrenewable resource,” but perhaps it isn’t and is being made

even as we use it. Nevertheless, when the day comes and the last oil well makes a sound akin to the sound of a straw at the bottom of an empty soft drink container—I'm confident we'll have the infrastructure and technology waiting in the wings to deploy. We made the transition from horses and wagons to "horseless carriages" didn't we?

Muslim Extremists:

Here's one that makes my blood pressure go up. The last time I checked, it turned out to be 19 guys from Saudi Arabia, led by a plan conceived by Osama bin Laden, et al, who took down the two World Trade Centers, damaged the Pentagon (Who thought *that* would ever happen?) and nearly resulted in the destruction of the White House (the suspected target of the Flight 93 that crashed in PA due to the heroic efforts of some incredibly brave passengers who threw the outdated "How to Deal with Hijackers" manual out). Tell me this: why are we now bending over backwards to kiss Muslims' butts?

I'm not saying that we should put all Muslims into detention camps, nor am I advocating we not allow them to immigrate. I just don't think we should be doing contortions to prove how open-minded we are to their faith. I'm not speaking idly here. I know some Muslims, and have Muslim in-laws, so I have *some* idea of what I'm talking about. In conversations with a Muslim man, Salim, I knew when I worked at the mall, he told me that he and his family came here *because* they wished to get out from under sharia law—sort of freedom *from* religion. Among my in-laws are a number of "secular" Muslims who, like nominal Christians and Jews, observe little else than holidays and some dietary restrictions (probably more from habit than any other factor). I treat Muslim friends as I treat Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, agnostic and atheist friends—with respect and tolerance. What I *don't* do is apologize for my Christian faith, my love of America, or my disgust at extremist of all stripes.

Here's something that puzzles and annoys me; namely the inability of some people in government to see what sits squarely before them. I'll use the incident of that Major at Fort Hood, who recently killed 13 people, as my example. The media hacks, who examined every option as to why he did what he did—carefully tiptoeing around the *real* reason—overlooked the fact he acted *exactly* like a radical Islamic terrorist! Face it: his Muslim beliefs fueled his actions. Heck, he gave out Qurans to his associates and yelled "Allah Akbar!" before he pulled the trigger! What more do they need—a signed love note, written to bin Laden, giving details of his rationale? I doubt even *that* would convince them!

My biggest question is why he had been put in his position as an officer in the US Military in the first place. Where are the security guidelines when you need them? Don't they vet out these people before promoting them? Most folks have to go to more trouble to apply for a driver's license! I suspect, like the school authorities at Columbine, they ignored all the signs out of some warped politically correct obligation not to seem "harsh," or "bigoted," or "racist."

The dirty little secret that Muslims don't want you to know is that Muhammad incorporated violence into the warp and woof of the Quran. Think *jihad*. You have to do mental back flips to make it an intellectual struggle and not an actual, physical act. We're not talking ancient history, either, like the stories in the Old Testament, we're taking active principles. This kind of thing makes me suspicious when I hear some imam talking about how Islam is a religion of peace. Oh,

yeah? I'm not blowing smoke here and don't want to belabor the point. Look in the Quran; it's in there.

Which brings up another annoying subject—this “we can't profile” mania. The reason the ACLU (there's nothing American, civil, or liberty-loving about that group of crazies) and its minions harangue against profiling is that it *works*! The last time I checked, the people who are prone to fly planes into buildings, deploy car bombs, and wear explosive clothing and footwear hew to the Muslim hard-line. There's no reason an 85-year-old grandmother has to give up her knitting needles; my wife her tiny, sewing scissors; and some senior citizen, Congressional Medal of Honor recipient his medal because it's too pointy to bring with him to a speaking engagement! It's demeaning, insulting, and just plain stupid—politically correct idiocy! It's a grand example of not seeing the forest for the trees!

Face it: political correctness will be the end of America as we know it if we don't wise up. If we continue on this insane course, people will die, we'll tie ourselves in knots over trivia and aid and abet the enemies of this country—which happen to be radical Islamists at this point in our history. Who knows what's next? Don't rule out Russia. The Russian bear isn't a teddy bear.

Political Lemmings:

What is it with some people? Why do they cling to unworkable ideas, proven to be just that—unworkable? Take the situation we now face in our country. People voted for Barack Obama because they wanted a change. The problem with that thinking is that change comes in two flavors—good *and* bad.

Though I blame the Republican Party for putting up such a lack-luster candidate as John McCain, he would have been a far less radical and dangerous choice than Obama. And what really rankles is the fact Obama *stated* what he stood for, even as he tried to bamboozle the voters. Couldn't *anyone* see the handwriting on *that* wall? Obama speaks *English*, for Pete's sake, even if he needs a teleprompter!

To make matters worse, Obama is presiding over an economic catastrophe, while the lapdog media, ever loyal to a losing cause, prattles on about how, though we're still bleeding red ink, we're not bleeding *as much* red ink! Ask a doctor to try to fly that by a patient who's hemorrhaging! Even the economic collapse, engineered by the libs in the first place, seemed to be a big mystery to the pundits-at-large. And don't *even* get me started on the subject of letting the government, the *least efficient* organization to run *anything*, run our health care system—the best in the world! Ask any Canadian, lovers of their so-called “excellent” national healthcare system, if you doubt me.

What irks me no end is that the economic strategy engineered by Ronald Reagan, sneeringly referred to as “Voodoo Economics” by his own vice President (!), *worked*—sparking over two *decades* of rampant prosperity heretofore unheard of in this country since the Great Depression, perhaps *ever*. So, knowing that, why is the *opposite* happening? It's driving me crazy!

My current theory for this lunacy is the “lemming principle.” Lemmings are innocuous little rodents (they look like guinea pigs) that, when they over-populate an area—far beyond

predators' ability to control their numbers—have been observed to walk into the sea to drown. This is not because they're suicidal. It's just that the vast number of them press the leaders into jumping into the sea and the rest follow. They *can* swim, but drown when exhausted.

It seems that liberals, like lemmings, exhibit the same tendencies—probably systemic to why they are liberal in the first place. Looking at what's occurring in this country today, in spite of the damage that the Obama administration is doing, his supporters can't help but continue on the course they're on—in the face of rampant discontent from the voters. They just can't help themselves. Soon, the weight of numbers behind them will eventually become their downfall—they'll jump off the political cliff and drown from exhaustion, trying to swim across the ocean of reality. The mid-term elections of 2010 proved that.

How else can you explain such behavior? Look at what's happening in this country—we wring our hands over trivia, while our so-called leaders chip away at the very infrastructure of our republican form of government, Constitution and business to the point of collapse. The question that runs through my mind is: WHY? Why would any American put into practice policies, laws and taxes designed to bring down our country? Are they not Americans? What are they trying to accomplish and what do they propose to replace our current form of government with? You know, the Soviet Union, in all its glory, couldn't do what these turkeys and traitors (what else could you call them?) propose to do if allowed to continue. It's a total mystery to me.

After listening to libs criticize “stupid George Bush” for eight years, continuing even today, I'm not necessarily a Bush groupie, but I defy any of them to show me anything approaching the disaster the Obama administration is presiding over. They can try to say that it all started under Bush, but events are proving the opposite. Obama can't seem to do anything right and his numbers in the polls keep descending. He owns what's happening now and he can't duck it any longer. Stupid George Bush, indeed! Stupid Obama now!

Think what happened during the Carter administration; which left the field open for Ronald Reagan's ascension and kicked off two decades of prosperity. Take heart—perhaps the American people have finally endured enough. I predicted (along with many others) that the elections of 2010 would result in a repudiation of the “spend and tax until we create prosperity” mentality of the current disastrous administration, in favor of the more rational—and *workable*—policies of a more conservative administration and events proved us right. I predict the same thing in 2012, unless the libs take a far different tack. However, I don't think they, with their lemming hearts, will.

Dear Lord—I pray I'm right!