

Blame it on Elsie

It's starting to look like I've underestimated the severity of the threat posed by Swine Flu. Sources report that Obama is already hard at work on an apology to Mexico. He makes particular reference to it serving us right for sending all those drunken college students south during spring break.

And while we're on the subject, I want to state categorically that this is one problem I refuse to blame on illegal aliens living in Virginia. By the time our paperless migrant reaches Prince William County, he's no longer contagious and poses no disease threat.

By the same token, since I am second to no man in my admiration for bacon, I will henceforth join the Israelis and use their kosher term for the disease: Mexican Flu.

But Obama doesn't really want to be talking about the flu, Mexican or otherwise. This should be Earth Week where he cites public opinion and the aggregate number of "climate scientists" who worship at the altar of computer models as proof of the relevancy of his plan to reverse "global warming."

But this public support for "climate change" is just the granola version of the soft support for mass transit.

The National Opinion Research Center shows public backing for mass transit has been increasing for 35 years. Here it's routine to get 50 percent approval. Yet less than 10 percent of the population can be found on public transportation.

Why the gap? Simple, people support mass transit because they want the other guy to get on the bus so their commute will go faster.

Going "green" has similar dynamics. Many supporters enjoy a carbon footprint that's visible from space with a clear conscience, because they expect the other guy to live in a hut and burn sustainable cow chips for warmth.

We even had a neighbor who worked for a famous enviro group who's mission "is the conservation of nature."

Unfortunately, this neighbor could not be bothered to recycle while busy saving the polar bear. It was left to climate criminal Republicans like myself to risk salmonella exposure while washing peanut butter jars for curbside pickup.

Of course if Obama has his way with the climate, there won't be any opt-out provision. His cap and trade bill will cost the average household more than \$3,900.00 each year in increased energy costs. We'll be paying the equivalent of a first class vacation, while we stay at home lubricating the windmill and burying bird carcasses, to solve a problem that's the sun's fault.

Cap and trade is just the beginning of our fiscal adventure. Halbert Fischel calculates drivers will have to pay the equivalent of \$12.00 a gallon to replace gasoline with electricity. Capturing solar power to charge the batteries for automobiles, diesel trucks and buses will require the construction of 300 billion square feet of solar panels, enough to cover the entire state of Massachusetts with a few left over to wall in particularly obnoxious New Yorkers.

These panels, and that's assuming technology rapidly improves from what exists today, will cost \$1.2 trillion and must be replaced every decade. And that doesn't include the cost to construct transmission lines to places like Cape Cod where we wouldn't want solar panels blocking Senator Kennedy's view of the ocean.

Even this colossal expense will leave untouched an even greater greenhouse threat to the planet: cows cutting the cheese.

The United Nations states that livestock methane is responsible for 18 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions — more than all the planes, trains and automobiles combined.

Any boy who's ever been away to summer camp will confirm that methane burns, and requiring farmers to administer Beano in the barn has logistical complications. So why not harness the bovine breeze? It makes as much sense as paneling Massachusetts.

Our environmentalists are not in to practical solutions. They're selling utopia and using your credit card to buy it. This is the reason they studiously ignore nuclear power, the only realistic carbon-free alternative to fossil fuel.

In the belief system of the "global warming" druids, nuclear power = Satan. The fact that we've had 25 years of problem-free nuclear power generation in this country is beside the point.

If we spent the money to upgrade the existing 100 or so nuclear power plants here to the efficiency of the plants in Canada, according to Fischel, we could generate enough power to economically replace gasoline and charge the power packs in every future electric car and light truck in the country.

So the next time you hear one of the "global warming" or "climate change" zombies warning about potential apocalypse, ask them why can't we be like those sophisticated French people and produce 80 percent of our electricity by splitting the atom?

Faith Without Works Is Dead

I think it's high time someone had the courage to state the obvious and boldly confront the fact that one of our political parties has been captured lock, stock and voting booth by religious zealots.

These true believers have warped the party's platform into a theological document filled with dogma that runs counter to the wishes of vast numbers of Americans.

This fanaticism has cowed many elected officials from this party into supporting legislation and policies they know in their heart are wrong for the country, but they also know, to their shame, that to go against the policy spells defeat in the party primary.

This intolerance extends to government bureaucracies that have been stocked with credulous believers who do their best to advance the cause of this rigid belief system at the expense of non-believers.

These almost cult-like followers follow the dictates of their intolerant, exclusionary leaders who distort facts and invent evidence, and as a result co-opt the levers of government to punish, discriminate and demonize citizens who don't adhere to their beliefs.

I am, of course, referring to the capture of the Democrat party by pantheists, Druids and environmentalists. Take your choice: it's all the same belief system.

You think I exaggerate? On the contrary, I'm probably being too kind. Let's explore a single issue and you will see what I mean.

Let's go back to the thrilling days of yesteryear, in June 2008. America's Sleeping Pill: National Public Radio was reporting that gas prices in the U. S. were at an all time high of over \$4/gallon and U. S. drivers were crossing the border to Mexico to make a better life for their family by buying cheap gas.

But if you listened last week to the debate between the three Democrat candidates for governor, it's like last summer never happened. Those days of watching the evil black hose pump your life savings into the gas tank were just a mirage.

That has to be why, when the candidates were asked if they support drilling off the coast of Virginia, all three either opposed drilling or gave such qualified support that they essentially said no.

Brian Moran takes the "progressive" liberal position and is opposed to all drilling off the coast, because it supposedly endangers the "\$1 billion tourism industry in Virginia." Of course without a way to get to Virginia, at a cost they can afford, there won't be any tourists. We'll be reduced to selling snow globes to each other.

Terry McAuliffe is opposed to any drilling for oil and tepidly supports drilling for natural gas, except that there is no way to distinguish between oil and gas drilling until you strike pay dirt. So if an oil company has to promise not to hit oil before they drill, there is not going to be any new holes offshore the Commonwealth.

Finally, R. Creigh Deeds talks the usual Democrat blather about "energy independence" but his support is contingent on oil producers jumping through the same "environmental" and regulatory hoops that have prevented drilling since the 1980s.

The Washington Post calls these “strikingly different positions,” but if all three mean no more oil what’s the difference?

I guess there’s nothing like a 50 percent drop in the price of gasoline to induce forgetfulness and encourage backsliding.

Sure, for a while there it looked like “drill, baby, drill” might actually come true. Virginians wanted to drill for oil and drill now. It was time to stop dithering over mosquito herds in Alaska and open up ANWR.

The outrage over gas prices was so high that even a few Democrats became agnostic with regard to oil drilling. But as soon as the economy cratered — partly due to high energy prices — Democrats regained that Old Time Environmentalism and began blocking oil and gas exploration.

Gas prices skyrocketed last summer because of worldwide increases in demand and a refining bottleneck in the U. S. We have not explored any oilfields offshore since the 1960s and the last refinery was built in 1976. We’re lucky we aren’t still using steam to power our cars.

Democrats oppose more drilling for two reasons: one, either the oil won’t be enough to power the entire country or, two it will take ten years to come on line. Yet when enviros promote “green” automobiles that won’t be ready for a generation, why that’s just around the corner!

Instead, Democrat environmental dogma keeps us dependent on Middle Eastern despots or props up Latin American strongmen.

If you vote for the Democrat for governor this fall you have no right to complain when gas prices start the inevitable climb upward. Your vote has gone to the party whose environmental theology has no room for heretics who believe we can drill for oil and protect the environment.

Instead they await the Immaculate Combustion that produces power without carbon, oil or human intervention.

* Michael R. Shannon is a public relations and advertising consultant with corporate, government and political experience around the globe. He is a dynamic and entertaining keynote speaker. He can be reached at michael-shannon@comcast.net.

Michael R. Shannon
MANDATE: Message, Media & Public Relations
703-583-6277

<http://www.linkedin.com/in/michaelrshannon>
<http://americaspeakon.org/blog/contributor/23>

