

A Good Year for Peace and Love

By

Charles R. Coombs

Janet Shaw Crouse, Senior Fellow at the Beverly La Haye Institute of the Concerned Women for America, has written [the best article](#) about what happened on November 7th, 2006, a date which will live in infamy.

From that article we learn that 9% of Republicans and 21% of conservatives voted for Democrats that day. We discover that mothers and married men, who voted heavily for Republicans in 2000 and 2002, went about 50-50 this year, and 54% of voters who attend church weekly, voted for Democrats.

These numbers clearly indicate that this election had nothing to do with purging the Republican Party or punishing conservatives for being unduly liberal. This fundamental shift in conservative religious philosophy has given our government a mandate to 1.) Withdraw precipitately from the Iraq as we did from Vietnam, 2.) "Normalize" relations with North Korea and Iran, trusting to reason that these nations will suspend development of nuclear weapons, and 3.) Offer amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants, including several thousand highly probable terrorists, assuring a supply of new Democrat voters sufficient to offset losses by abortion.

All this is well and good: If we Americans are discontent with our government, we're endowed by our Creator with the right to overthrow and dismember it. There are, however, people of whom I remain fond in places like New York City, Boston, Philadelphia and Washington D. C. I'd like to suggest to them that now might be a very good time to move to, say, Fort Worth or Tulsa instead.

Once we're out of Iraq (and Afghanistan, as we shortly will be), North Korea will share The Bomb with Iran, who will distribute it freely among other nations of The Religion of Peace and Love, may it bathe warmly in the blood of unbelievers, in exchange for an agreement that they'll deliver it here (after lovingly annihilating Israel, of course). Now, say I'm a terrorist in the service of Peace and Love. I'm not, but say I were. As I read "terror works" from the lips of celebrating Democrats between the lines on my HDTV, what would I be thinking?

Well, first of all, I'd want to identify prominent, accessible targets. Prominent targets would be large and economically and/or politically significant. Accessible targets would most likely be those with ports -- It's so much easier to use one's own ships for these missions than it is to hijack someone else's airplanes anymore. Of equal importance, however, would be to hit where guns are banned. If I unleashed my amnestied allies on whatever remained after the blast, I could kill many more infidels there than in a place where the population might be able to defend itself. Thus New York would be a likely target, as would Washington, D. C. Inland areas like Dallas, which are too thinly spread

out as well as too heavily armed, would be less attractive. Even Houston, which has channel into the refineries for tankers potentially laden with nuclear weapons, is also less desirable, simply because so many people are armed that the post-bombing attacks would be unduly costly. A better hope might be New Orleans, where we know the weapons have been confiscated.

Los Angeles and San Francisco would be equally utile, if rather more distant. I'd have to send my ships through the Panama Canal or around the Horn, but Peace and Love are patient. And, unlike Americans, its followers are able to keep secrets out of their newspapers long enough to stage eight or ten simultaneous attacks on opposite sides of a country.

Having picked my targets, I would simply wait until my friends in the new Congress should strip away the remaining protections of the P.A.T.R.I.O.T. act as they cripple Homeland Security. With the national defense rendered thus impotent, it would be up to police and state militias alone to defend my targets.

Americans' insistence on treating me as a citizen would also be encouraging: Even in the unlikely event I were caught, American forbearance should result in years of appeals and retrials, perhaps even releasing me to strike again. Die for Peace and Love, yes, but waste not, want not!

I realize I'd be destroying many of my supporters -- Democrats, liberal Republicans, other followers of Peace and Love -- by hitting any of these targets, but it's the quantity of lives you take that matters, not the quality. It seems unlikely enough to be worth the risk that the United States -- conservative or liberal -- will ever again have the will or the courage to resist attacks in the future.

It's a good year for Peace and Love!