

DILEMMA AND PARADOX

We are faced with alternatives on those horns which offer unfavorable consequences. And statements that seem absurd on the merit that could be true. The three in the arena offer relative truths in all cases and nothing is absolute in their solutions.

I speak of the choices for Commander-in-Chief and despite their intelligence and charisma, one is beset with these options. None of them offer hope, change and solutions in a prism of certainty.

I could vote for a lady as President if in my mind's eye I could visualize a Margaret Thatcher. Two for one is too much. They've been there and done that and left a legacy of arrogance, lies, and a litany of questionable ethics. I could vote for a black man and would have if Colin Powell had run. This one swims in a sea of questionable ethical and political positions running the gamut of faulty judgment as regards his demonic pastor, a chameleon eloquence becoming everyman for everything. His far left record belies this and his puppet dance proposed for world leaders seems naive and suspicious. So this leaves the old timer something like arsenic and lace out in the arena acting Presidential and the only one who seems to support the continuance of the war. His age and the war support may do him in. Yet, he remains my guy, a certified war hero in time of need. He must move quickly and do things with wisdom and experience. War resolve is necessary but a

*cry exists to fix the economy, borders,
immigration and entitlements
among other things. Can he!*

*Somehow he must pull a Houdini on this
war-
continue it, yet discontinue it - an anomaly. How?*

*I
would guess the gamble would be if he
understands the real threat of Islam and does not
rationalize or equivocate then he has a chance to
be a real man on*

*horseback! Strategy could run the spectrum of a
total
war to include its declaration on rogue Islam
states and a distinct warning to the moderates. Or
using the
carrot more than the stick, suggest economic help
to
the moderates with a proviso to eradicate militant
Is-
lam in their midst. Or to suggest a pull-back of
the
majority of US forces to selected Mideast areas
from
Iraq while turning over Baghdad cleared areas to
the Iraqis -rotating forces home and/or on ships
of
a carrier force that is beefed-up in the gulf. The
concept would engulf a total war or containment
rationale: essentially a War on (or Containment
of)
militant Islam. Each strategy would consider
Islam
a State as well as a Religion. As the saying goes:
you*

are with us or against us, and we will take action as appropriate on madrassas and mosques spewing out hatred to the United States and others. This strategy must determine the loyalty of US Muslim citizens. Let us be clear about this! There was legitimate support by the US Congress and the United Nations to take action against Iraq, though its connection to the so-called War against Terror was arguable. Strategy for the operation paralleled the 'shock and awe' of Gulf One, yet failed to perceive the need for sufficient force to secure, control and occupy the country. This led to a series of administrative and tactical errors and the never-ending war. Al-Qaeda slipped in and aided in organizing the insurgency and exacerbated the mix of age-old feuds between Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds. The occupational phase was botched. Much of this can be attributed to a failure to define the strategy as a 'War against militant Islam' rather than the nebulous 'War against Terror' - a real misnomer! We are on the horns of dilemma, yet we must prevail. My take: A War of Civilizations?

