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Looking at things from a generalist's viewpoint, it seems to see things it would take a specialist to demonstrate. Examples: Britain seduced Argentina into invading the Falklands, and this was a good thing. There was no rush to take Rome after Anzio, for good reasons. There was no need to drive the Nazis entirely out of North Africa after Alamein (better to have the Americans practice on them there and also keep Hitler stretched)(resembles the intercepted Roosevelt-Churchill telegram that encouraged Hitler to leave armies in Italy). See, this British general says on TV he shoulda taken Tripoli even tho Churchill took away much of his army (sent to Greece), but 'as any fool k'n plainly see' that assumes it would have been a good thing to drive Hitler out of North Africa at that time; an assumption more obvious than valid. So, while we wonder about the sinking of the Belgrano, let's not overlook the question: what was British policy toward Argentina and the Falklands over the long term? Was that policy constructive? Was the effect desirable?

As to the formulation and execution of British policy as a process with disquieting implications, that is quite another matter, and as a United States citizen I am concerned, due to the heavy influence London has upon Washington.

We cannot know now which of the crises forming the arch of our entrance into the twenty-first century will be the keystone; but it may well turn out to have been the crisis of control over the actual war-making powers of the great nations.

During the past several decades the common man and woman have been scrambling to catch up with an awareness of what is going on in the big wide world and what their governments are doing abroad. How can we speak of representative government when the people at large whom the representative government represents do not know what has been done? Of course, to know what has been done is not the same as knowing what is afoot---but one cannot know what is being done, if one does not know what is afoot. So who is responsible?

We do not want mob rule, or its modern perversion (rule by pollsters) and the elected official must accept the responsibility of decisive action. But the society as a whole has the responsibility of describing the office in terms of delegated responsibility---and succeeding generations have the responsibility of maintaining the boundaries of delegated responsibilities and improving them.
The United States has a Constitution which embodies certain values --- these are the principles for which we stand. Some hypocrisy inevitably accompanies principles, but with Ronald Reagan we have let the 'American dilemma' run riot in an orgy of cynicism. If he gets re-elected it will be the time that tries the soul of our nation. Shall the United States Constitution be tested to destruction?! In which case it may mean the destruction of the world as well.

Historians without the ulterior motives of the Neo-Republicans will easily shrug and point to what did us in: we drifted away from the constitutional definition of the war powers. No one would bell the cat; or, rather, the people at large were indifferent of telling George not to do it --- it was easier, less a threat to their sanctimoniousness (had they not saved the world from Hitler?), to let the king take the responsibility and become the scapegoat of history. But it is the citizenry who are selling their birthright for a mess of pardons --- they cannot escape that ignominy they will deserve if they allow the current truly anti-American administration to continue!

So Reagan's dictatorial behavior in Grenada is wrong for the contempt of the constitution it implies. And that implication is born out repeatedly in Reagan's rampages in and around Nicaragua. One wonders what he would have pulled in Lebanon if not restrained by people outside his administration.

But 'we get what government we deserve'. And a person such as Reagan who removed the portrait of Jefferson (could that have not been symbolic?!) is entitled to feel that 'if God had not intended them to be shorn He would not have made them sheep'. But American citizens are not entitled to be sheep!

Who are these 'Silent Majority'? Are they deaf too? And blind? Are they so dumb that they do not hear the sliding nor see the disappearance of American principles of Liberty? --- Can my fellow Americans deny that Reagan's jingo-ism abroad is rehearsal for Know-Nothing-ism at home?!

Send not to ask for whom the Liberty Bell tolls...

Vote for The Constitution!
Elect Mondale and Ferraro!

And Reagan's confidence trick has a second part: he betrays our posterity by spending the principal of their patrimony --- he pays for today's cake and circus with tomorrow's meat! And he has
borrowed from his friends on our behalf at usurious rates!
we have a rat race of usury, and you can be sure that the first
to think themselves past the post will not scruple to exterminate
the lemmings at the back so as to collect a fee from Mars.
Drive the usurers out of The White House now! --- before their
goons drive us out of our houses at the dead of night later!

perhaps i oughtn't mention it, but i cannot avoid the feeling
that a cozy axis has developed between this current administration
and the present Holy Father. the Polish Pope may have his own
axe to grind, but the coincidence of Washington affording diplo­
matic recognition to The Vatican a few months after the Pope's
atypical brusqueness which affronted the Nicaraguans who had
come to greet him, thus playing into Reagan's hand, and which
Reagan has been exploiting with oily enthusiasm so as to mitigate
the unfortunate impression that it is Protestants against Catholics
--- an, well. need one be surprised at such back-washing? no, but
considering our separation of church and state...

there are some who simply adore Ronny and indeed he is an
ideal front-man; but will he live as long as Khomeini? or Franco?
or Mao? doesn't Bush have a better chance than Ferraro of taking
over from a deceased or debilitated incumbent? and you know with
the practice at personality shifting gained apropo Watergate, a
shift (ah, yes, see Frederick Forsyte's new novel, the fourth
somethingorother) to Jesse Helms would station Dracula himself
in place for a possible, shall we say, ELEVEN years! if you laugh,
then you have to discount the power of media manipulation --- and
the only way to do that is to eject Reagan immediately!

i warned against the election of reagan four years ago, and now
i do not know if the world can tolerate four more years of him ---
and some people think reagan actively wants a major war: if he is
re-elected, it will be up to those who love American values to
use the powers The Founding Fathers gave us to save our nation,
and then we may well actually be the last best hope of mankind!

but then we might ask why couldn't we get the American people to
see what they see, that Reagan and his behavior constitute a
clear and present danger to The United States, to The Free World,
to The Third World, to The Second World, to Generations As Yet
Unborn, to The Penguins in Antarctica and to The Primeval Doze
(not to mention You and Me!). And think of the SHAME!!

actually, i like to think that the American People are actually
pulling a fast one on Cl' Uncle Ronal'--- that we are smiling on
him all the way to the guillotine boots,