

Part I: This President Is Weak

Contributed by Ed Sumcad

by Ed Sumcad

NWS Columnist

We may not like it, but prepare for class war, hostage-taking and exploding bombs.

In the community of nations, history recorded former Liberal President Jimmy Carter as a total embarrassment to this richest and mightiest country on the planet.

So much was written of Carter as a weakling in the eyes of America's enemies, especially abroad. Even a group of 400 Iranian students took advantage of his weakness by storming the U.S. Embassy compound in Teheran on November 4, 1979 and took 52 U.S. diplomats hostage. One of the leaders of this young terrorist group is now president of Iran -- Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

If Ahmadinejad threatened the United States while he was just a teething student of terror then, how much more when he is now president of warlike nuclear Iran? He had badly outwitted Carter then and now he is treating Obama like a Katzenjammer Kid in his nuclear game of terror.

There is no doubt that Ahmadinejad enjoys this game of terror by bullying America with his anti-US posturing and then stroking Obama on the back with praises as the president Americans need, which is also the kind of U.S. leader Iran prefers to deal with than former president Bush. A president that the terror of Iran would like to pat in the back is one that admits America is a bully. He may be a limp and bendy president, but he is one that would rather negotiate when attacked than retaliate.

Knowing that the new president of the United States is scrawny and ineffectual even when verbally molested by radical leaders like Sandinista terrorist Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua and Hugo Chavez of Venezuela, I am sure the day is not that too far ahead for Ahmadinejad to decide to double his effort to win the propaganda war with cunning and shrewdness like when he captured American diplomats and mercilessly abused them during Carter's time while he was just a young student.

This "take over" of the U.S. Embassy by a government-sponsored group of terrorists in Teheran was an invasion of the United States' territorial jurisdiction by Ayatollah Khomeini's government under international law's time-honored "Principle of Extraterritoriality" protected by the Vienna Convention, which is observed and recognized by civilized nations. Such violation of law of nations and total disregard of international convention categorized Iranian radicals as terrorists.

Violation of protocol in the treatment of diplomats confirmed their status as terrorists. Ahmadinejad and the ruling Ayatollahs treated "captured" American diplomats like "dirty pigs"; they were paraded around town to be condemned and abhorred by religious Muslims all over the world; our ill-fated diplomats suffered indescribable disgrace and inhuman humiliation when they were displayed in public, chained and manacled like captive animals in an African safari hunt. They were proudly exhibited as "trophies" i.e., live Americans captured by young patriots of the Iranian Revolution, meant to be seen by the cheering crowd and for the entire Muslim world to see how revolutionary Iran could win the struggle against U.S. imperialism.

For, how would any third-world country dare shame the mighty United States in the eyes of the world in such a savage way as beyond anyone's rational comprehension.

When this country is under a Democrat president like Carter, the world's respect of America sinks to the lowest level. Lately, in the Summit of Americas, President Obama, Carter's perfect copy, apologized with regrets to America's enemies like Ortega and Chavez who attacked America in the international fora as an evil empire.

Something is terribly wrong, if you ask me. Only a weak president worse than Carter, would admit that the United States is a tyrant that caused the suffering of millions of people around the world [read Part II of this editorial expose' of Obama as the nation's weakest president]. Take this either as prejudice or perception and I would care less. One's ability to perceive what is than what is not is more important than the pettiness of bias.

First of all, this accusation that the United States is an autocratic ruler of the world ... an evil empire, is a cowardly lie, a canard. It is opposite to what this nation has done and still doing to people around the world that are crying for help notwithstanding the fact that it is being bloodied in the nose by radical troublemakers like Ortega and Chavez.

Secondly, under the leadership of former president Bush as Commander-In-Chief, we are winning the war against terror [at least after 911, America was safe as the terror campaign of Islamic Fundamentalism got a bad beating].

All what we have achieved virtually went down the tube when Obama started changing the image of the United States from that of world leader to a mere follower.

In a photo-shoot of Heads of Government at the G20 conference in London, this president with African decent approached the King of Arabia with "a horizontal pose" as if to embrace the monarch [in short, with a bow] that caught viewing Americans with a "cold chill".

No president of the United States ever bowed to Kings. Obama is president of the United States, the "star" of the gathering. This Yoruba culture of humility practiced in Africa is fine but it cannot be used as an excuse to humiliate this nation with the ignorance of high-level protocol that a less equal head of state should bow to a royalty or a more superior head of state. In the Summit, attending heads of states are equal. But this is one of the worst changes Obama had introduced to America and to the world that if Obamanites are proud of, nothing disgraceful and contemptible could ever be detested and reviled.

Naturally, friendly countries are nervous. But Obama is undaunted by the gradual departure of friendly countries from the U.S. orbit when he preferred to remain silent from the threat Chavez hurled in the Summit: "The United States Empire is on its way down and will be finished in the near future ..." Not a word of response from Obama.

With this disturbing development, Israel and Egypt had started distancing themselves from Washington. Hosni Mubarak of Egypt criticized Obama's "let's talk-cooperate-negotiate" diplomacy with terror, more specifically Washington's courtship of the revolutionary Islamic republic. <http://www.debka.com/article.php?aid=1387>.

Not only that this change to self-hanging in international affairs is a ritual sacrifice of a languorous and enervated leader in the altar of cowardice but also a radical change of expectation among allied nations that looked up to the United States as the hope of the future, from grateful satisfaction to blasphemous dissatisfaction and profane disappointment over a repentant aggressor that in fact this weak president regrets, and has to apologize.

If I have to describe the expected reaction at large, the American public seems prone to just leave their disenchantment and disillusionment inside a corked bottle and would only let it go when the right time comes.

Recall how public reaction to the Embassy hostage situation in Teheran took place forty years ago: The world watched with abated breath what the United States, the most powerful nation on the planet, would do while the hostage drama was going on, not only for days but for several lingering months until Republican presidential candidate Ronald Reagan was elected president who then gave an ultimatum to Iran to release the hostages. Americans could hardly wait to kick Carter out of office and welcome Reagan, the president Russia's Poliburo in Kremlin described as a typical American cowboy who would draw his gun first then ask questions later.

But until Reagan came into the picture, the American public was politically sober yet madly enraged, short of calling on President Carter to turn Teheran into another Hiroshima or Nagasaki and wipe the barbarians off the face of the earth.

But Carter, like Obama, appeared oblivious. What he did was resort to "diplomacy" and "negotiations" in dealing with cutthroat terrorists ... it was perceived worldwide as sort of pleading to kidnapers to be kind and merciful for the release of American hostages they were holding ... begging hostage-takers for mercy as powerful and mighty cowards are normally expected to do!

Needless to say, this mindset of an inutile leadership was a total embarrassment to the nation, so inept for a president of the most powerful nation on earth. In the said hostage crisis, this hesitant leader sent an armed helicopter rescue only to drop dead in the middle of the desert due to incompetence and lack of adequate preparation. Scores of American soldiers were killed in that spineless initiative of an indecisive and dithering Commander-In-Chief, and America's hope to ever defeat terrorism under a Democrat president disappeared in that ill-planned mission.

Surprisingly, this tragic incident did not seem to bother Carter because in the first place he was against any armed confrontation with terrorists while Americans are being held hostage! I dread to see the day when Obama would restrain our security forces from protecting us in the face of danger while he plays the role of a likable diplomat spending time negotiating with murderers and assassins in a similar life-and-death situation. There will be more piracy in the high seas, kidnapping and hijacks of airlines, God forbids [!] because terrorists knew Obama will issue the order to negotiate rather than shoot them dead.

Somalian pirates learned their lesson. Next time Somalian hijackers will take advantage of Obama's negotiation policy while slashing throats and cutting heads to get their ransom. We pray it is not your throat or my head.

A U.S. Marine guard assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Teheran during the hostage crisis mentioned was not allowed to fire a single shot while the Embassy was under siege. This young American patriot was prepared to die for his country.

In an interview with the Media, the young Marine officer was in tears when overcame with remorse that he was shamefully alive while our diplomats he was supposed to guard with his life were spat at, punched and kicked and about to be killed. So were the other diplomats like us who were also in tears while watching the horrifying drama on national television [I was in the UN at the time].

Of course as we now knew, this tragic event marked the resurgence of terrorism and terrorist activities worldwide against the United States. Hundreds if not thousands of Americans more were slaughtered and more buildings, embassies, U.S. military installations including the battleship USS Cole, blown up to smithereens, thanks to the likes of Jimmy Carter, known to terrorists as weakling tenants in the White House!

When the president of the most powerful country in the world holds punches even when poked at right in the face and suffer a bloody nose, terror is not only encouraged but brazenly emboldened to kill Americans or hold them hostage first and then negotiate later.

Today we have a president elected purely as a socialist prime mover by the mass majority of Americans described as America's struggling middle class and the poor mostly living on welfare. Obama promised them equal distribution of wealth, a shift from Capitalism to Socialism, which they welcomed for a change.

Anyway, taking something from the rich and distribute it to the poor maybe good to the lazy poor but bad to the industrious rich.

It is not unlikely that the rich will stage a rebellion against a confiscatory government while the poor masses will threaten revolt if Obama will not tax the rich more and more.

But all of these may not come to pass. When America is disillusioned and angry, a stronger leader may take over anytime. At what price we have to pay, only Him up there knows. #

© Copyright Edwin A. Sumcad. Access NWS May 07, 2009.

The writer is an award-winning journalist. Go to NWS homepage, click on the columnist button to know more about the author or you may e-mail your comment at ed.superx722@yahoo.com.sg. This e-mail address is being protected from spam bots, you need JavaScript enabled to view it