



Straight Talk Decent People Don't Justify Mass Murder

by Muriel Sluyter

04 November, 2003

Greetings, Gentle Reader,

The liberation of Poland took ten years, East Germany about ten months, Czechoslovakia about ten days, with Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Bulgaria following closely behind.

The Soviet Union was powerful during most of the Poles' decade of struggle, but by East Germany's liberation, things had changed. Gorbachev was in power, but slipping. Contrary to protestations of America-haters, President Reagan out-smarted, out-maneuvered and out-classed him, finally bankrupting the Soviet's blood-soaked empire.

Many Cold War policy makers raged against the president's determination to whip the Soviets. One month into Reagan's presidency, Strobe Talbott, indefatigable Soviet sympathizer, said the Soviet Union was "stronger and bolder than ever... The U.S. must learn to live with parity. Whether America likes it or not, Leonid Brezhnev is quite correct in describing any U.S. quest for nuclear supremacy as misguided. The U.S. cannot get there from here not against a Soviet Union that is ready and able to match America in any kind of arms race."

U.S. professors from Harvard, Columbia, Cornell, and Georgetown, made the same point. The Soviets were too strong, both militarily and economically, for us to challenge them. We could not win such a challenge.

Then, poof! The Soviet Union collapsed. Reagan had won the Cold War, as Margaret Thatcher said, "without firing a shot."

Then the script changed. Eleanor Clift of Newsweek put it this way, "People who want to give Ronald Reagan the entire credit for the collapse of the Soviet Union ignore the fact that the Soviet economy was collapsing and the Reagan Administration covered it up.... The CIA concealed what was happening over there so they could keep the defense budget over here high." (Informed Americans, except Clift, knew they were bankrupt.)

Alan Brinkley, Columbia University, said historians believe the end of the Cold War had, "more to do with the grave internal weaknesses in the Soviet system."

Strobe Talbot chimed in once more, from the other side of his mouth. "A new consensus is emerging, that the Soviet threat is not what it used to be. The real point, however, is that it never was. The Doves in the Great Debate of the past forty years were right all along." Though he had changed his position 180 degrees, Talbot was still right!

Talbot personifies Robert Frost's declaration that, "A liberal is a man too broadminded to take his own side in a quarrel." Or perhaps he simply cannot resist exposing his revulsion for America.

John F. Kennedy said the U.S. would, "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to ensure the survival and the success of liberty." Then he was killed, and with him, his position.

A short decade later, liberals insisted it was better to deny defense funding and let the Communists finish their Cambodian slaughter quickly, so the peoples' agony would end sooner. The Los Angeles Times wanted military funds denied the Cambodian government, "for the good of the suffering Cambodian people."

Bob Carr, Michigan Congressman (D) "...won't the granting of aid only further prolong the fighting and, with it, the killing?"

Sydney Schanberg, New York Times, insisted the slaughter of innocent Cambodians would no longer be necessary once the Hanoi-created Khmer Rouge controlled the whole country.

The Khmer Rouge drove Cambodians from their cities, killing over two million with heat, thirst, starvation, exhaustion and cold-blooded murder.

Stalin and his successors killed tens of millions, Mao-tse-tung over 65 million, Kim Il-sung over 2 million, Ho Chi Minh killed about one million, imprisoned one million, and caused 800,000 to escape in boats.

Those who excuse and/or justify such atrocities classify themselves.