Exploiting the Power of the Military Experience

Description

Welcome, any Lizards who stop by to critique my work!

I had a brief moment of clarity (at least Iâ€™ll call it that) yesterday, while listening to the talk shows once more going over the General Kerr issue at the Republican debate this week.

Here it is: The Clintons (past administration, and the one to maybe come) realize something about the military experience, and are intent on using it for that very purpose. I submit this is wrong. Yes, itâ€™s a social experiment they are after. Why? Because that has been the very power of the organization in history.

default watermark

I have blogged a lot about the society changing work of Eleanor Roosevelt, not directly, but through the stories I have put here about Ben Garrison, and other African-American units that served our nation well in WWII, and then allowed the true integration of the Armed Services, ahead of the general population.

The Tuskegee Airmen are well known. Add to that the USS MASON (DE-529), Subchaser PC-1264, the 761st (â€œBlack Pantherâ€•) Armored Battalion and the 555th (â€œTriple Nickelâ€•) Parachute Battalion. These units, set up by President Roosevelt, showed these men could fight for the country just as well as another other able bodied man in the US.

One thing about race: Throughout history, there has never been any doubt about whether you are born that way, or it is something you chose. This is the big disconnect we are facing. The jury is still out on which it is for homosexuality. Political pressures and the MSM would have you believe there is no choice about it. The â€œscientific evidenceâ€• is sketchy and from small sample sizes, so, at best inconclusive. There are those who, having lived the â€œlife styleâ€• will adamantly tell you itâ€™s a â€œnurtureâ€• thing, and you donâ€™t have to be that way, others will say those people, like Andy Cominsky, have been â€œbrainwashed.â€• Iâ€™ll say, that the discussion on the reasons for being homosexual being debated now, have only become a topic of public debate and concern in the last few decades. That, in my book, smacks of someone trying to make something factual that is not.

Hereâ€™s one of my observations of the scientific community in recent times: On one hand, they will regale you with tales of the long suffering individual, driven by a revelation, suffering public and peer disdain for years, and then, the â€œdiscoveryâ€• comes that completely vindicates them, and they are elevated from the ranks of the dregs of the community, and placed on high pedestals! They become revered and followed. Later, some small voice comes forward and says â€œI donâ€™t think thatâ€™s it.â€• The scientists attack that impetuous one, who would challengeâ€¦but, the cycle repeats. At some point, the theory of the youngster is found to be more correct (those two words chosen specifically), the elder is de-throned, at the worst, or provided a place of honor for having provided some insight, at best, and the history of science continues.

On the other handâ€¦.the â€œscientists,â€• almost without taking a breath, will launch into a discussion of how. letâ€™s say Darwin, is 100% correct and there is no need to revisit the â€œtheoryâ€• of evolution any more, IT IS SETTLED!

I see the current discussion on the condition of being gay as the second case, even while there is much to be looked at with true scientific discipline, untainted by any groups desire to elevate themselves to a special status, above the â€œall men are created equalâ€• measurement.

Toss the entire â€œGlobal ~~Warming~~ Climate Changeâ€• issue in with Darwinâ€™s Theory of Evolution model of â€œitâ€™s that way because a POLITICIAN told meâ€• category. Side note: Yeah, I waited all those months just so I could evacuate before the many Cat 5 hurricanes headed to the â€œplywood stateâ€• and they never cameâ€¦.

Now, back to the topic: Bill Clinton went for it first with â€œDonâ€™t Ask, Donâ€™t Tellâ€• as a political payback for a voting block that went his way in 1992. It was a realistic compromise to get elected, with nothing to do with National Defense. Since end of the draft in 1971, the military had been an all volunteer force. There were adequate numbers of people enlisting. The DADT had nothing to do with abandoning a previous organizational ban, so we could put more manpower into the fight. We werenâ€™t in a fight, and the Clinton Administration was drawing down the military as fast as it could.

default watermark

Using the totalitarian management structure of the military, Bill Clinton, as the Commander-in-Chief, had pretty much Carte Blanche to make it happen, including the power to place his leadership at the top of the military to make sure they went along. That is the prerogative of any president, and Iâ€™m not faulting him for using the system in place, but I would argue about his motivation to repay a political debt, not to strengthen the military.

Thus began the change, were, as an analog to the service of the minority units in WWII, and the later full integration into service life by President Truman, it became a lever to show the general populace a better way to handle our social interactions. In that case, once more, Iâ€™ll point out it was over a matter of a fact of true, scientifically understood heredity.

Now, along comes Hillary. If she is to attain the office of President, she will most likely declare openly gay people will be allowed to enter the service. Why? Once more, to illegitimately use the power of the Commander-in-Chiefâ€™s authority to return a political favor for getting the gay vote.

What does that say about her (and Billâ€™s) view of the Armed Services? Those organizations, setup in The Constitution, to â€œprovide for the common defenseâ€• are nothing more that dating services. Join the service and get to shower with people, without having to ask their permission. In any other part of society, doing so would have one arrested for a sex crime. Itâ€™s all about consent.

The only reason it is important is to get to power by promising access to the homosexual community.

What about the years of training the military has gone through, trying to prevent â€œfraternization.â€• That became an issue with the massive infusion of women in the service, and the incredibly deep rooted human desire for sexual contact. Why didnâ€™t the military want this, even among heterosexuals? It makes for difficult, and many times impossible, decision making moments, where the leadership needs to be scrupulously fair. Sometimes that â€œfairnessâ€• needs to be played out in terms of making sure who you send to a dangerous situation is being done for the right reasons, and

not because you are in a relationship with someone in your unit.

Adding openly homosexual people to the already PCed military environment is just one more obstacle to good order and discipline, which is detracted from by raging hormones left unchecked.

Once more, the â€œhereâ€™s your orders, now get on with itâ€• methodology has the near term possibility to just making it more palatable for the military to take on more of the social interaction phenomena, rather than being focused on combat readiness. Maybe they see it as an offshoot for the â€œbusy gay â€˜professional,â€™ who doesnâ€™t have time to set up a full time relationship.â€• Yeah, thatâ€™s the ticket â€“ Join the military and let everyone around you in the barracks know youâ€™re â€œlike thatâ€• and let the shy ones come to you.

One thing this plan doesnâ€™t include, is respect for the people, who joined the military to serve the nation, and not as a dating service, who do not want those who are sexually attracted to them staring at them in the head facilities.

At least DADT offers the gay person the opportunity to serve and all they have to do is take their â€œrelationshipsâ€• off base. The same is actually expected off all the other service members already. The reason a DADT policy for heterosexuality isnâ€™t necessary is because the vast majority of all humans arenâ€™t homosexual and therefore it would be pretty ridiculous to tell them not to say what their sexual preferences are. They donâ€™t do it now. It wasnâ€™t part of their enlistment contract and it serves no organizational purpose.

default watermark

The only purpose of the Armed services are to serve the people by defending them. If thatâ€™s what someone wants to do, then keep it zipped. Itâ€™s expected of everyone. The UCMJ has all the â€œrulesâ€• and it applies to all in uniform.

And, donâ€™t forget that the Democrats all want to scream and yell about the â€œwaste, fraud and abuseâ€• of the DoD. How about we begin to add up all the costs for the course development, the manpower and facilities, the contractor fees, and the hows spent byt real troops sitting in classrooms getting lectured on being sensitive and not using certain words. Can someone explain how that helps the US military defend the nation better? Iâ€™d like to hold that â€œmetricâ€• up for the â€œyouâ€™re wasting our money crowd and see what they have to say.

Here it is: The Clintons (past administration, and the one to maybe come) realize something about the military experience, and are intent on using it for that very purpose. I submit this is wrong. Yes, itâ€™s a social experiment they are after. Why? Because that has been the very power of the organization in history.

I have blogged a lot about the society changing work of Elanor Roosevelt, not directly, but through the stories I have put here about Ben Garrison, and other African-American units that served our nation well in WWII, and then allowed the true integration of the Armed Services, ahead of the general population.

The Tuskegee Airmen are well known. Add to that the USS MASON (DE-529), Subchaser PC-1264, the 761st (â€œBlack Pantherâ€•) Armored Battalion and the 555th (â€œTriple Nickelâ€•) Parachute Battalion. These units, set up by President Roosevelt, showed these men could fight for the country just as well as another other able bodied man in the US.

One thing about race: Throughout history, there has never been any doubt about whether you are born that way, or it is something you chose. This is the big disconnect we are facing. The jury is still out on which it is for homosexuality. Political pressures and the MSM would have you believe there is no choice about it. The â€œscientific evidenceâ€• is sketchy and from small sample sizes, so, at best inconclusive. There are those who, having lived the â€œlife styleâ€• will adamantly tell you itâ€™s a â€œnurtureâ€• thing, and you donâ€™t have to be that way, others will say those people, like Andy Cominsky, have been â€œbrainwashed.â€• Iâ€™ll say, that the discussion on the reasons for being homosexual being debated now, have only become a topic of public debate and concern in the last few decades. That, in my book, smacks of someone trying to make something factual that is not.

Hereâ€™s one of my observations of the scientific community in recent times: On one hand, they will regale you with tales of the long suffering individual, driven by a revelation, suffering public and peer disdain for years, and then, the â€œdiscoveryâ€• comes that completely vindicates them, and they are elevated from the ranks of the dregs of the community, and placed on high pedestals! They become revered and followed. Later, some small voice comes forward and says â€œI donâ€™t think thatâ€™s it.â€• The scientists attack that impetuous one, who would challengedâ€¦but, the cycle repeats. At some point, the theory of the youngster is found to be more correct (those two words chosen superficially), the elder is de-throned, at the worst, or provided a place of honor for having provided some insight, at best, and the history of science continues.

default watermark

On the other handâ€¦the â€œscientists,â€• almost without taking a breath, will launch into a discussion of how. letâ€™s say Darwin, is 100% correct and there is no need to revisit the â€œtheoryâ€• of evolution any more, IT IS SETTLED!

I see the current discussion on the condition of being gay as the second case, even while there is much to be looked at with true scientific discipline, untainted by any groups desire to elevate themselves to a special status, above the â€œall men are created equalâ€• measurement.

Toss the entire â€œGlobal ~~Warming~~ Climate Changeâ€• issue in with Darwinâ€™s Theory of Evolution model of â€œitâ€™s that way because a POLITICIAN told meâ€• category. Side note: Yeah, I waited all those months just so I could evacuate before the many Cat 5 hurricanes headed to the â€œplywood stateâ€• and they never cameâ€¦.

Now, back to the topic: Bill Clinton went for it first with â€œDonâ€™t Ask, Donâ€™t Tellâ€• as a political payback for a voting block that went his way in 1992. It was a realistic compromise to get elected, with nothing to do with National Defense. Since end of the draft in 1971, the military had been an all volunteer force. There were adequate numbers of people enlisting. The DADT had nothing to do with abandoning a previous organizational ban, so we could put more manpower into the fight. We werenâ€™t in a fight, and the Clinton Administration was drawing down the military as fast as it could.

Using the totalitarian management structure of the military, Bill Clinton, as the Commander-in-Chief, had pretty much Carte Blanche to make it happen, including the power to place his leadership at the top of the military to make sure they went along. That is the prerogative of any president, and Iâ€™m not faulting him for using the system in place, but I would argue about his motivation to repay a political debt, not to strengthen the military.

Thus began the change, were, as an analog to the service of the minority units in WWII, and the later full integration into service life by President Truman, it became a lever to show the general populace a

better way to handle our social interactions. In that case, once more, Iâ€™ll point out it was over a matter of a fact of true, scientifically understood heredity.

Now, along comes Hillary. If she is to attain the office of President, she will most likely declare openly gay people will be allowed to enter the service. Why? Once more, to illegitimately use the power of the Commander-in-Chiefâ€™s authority to return a political favor for getting the gay vote.

What does that say about her (and Billâ€™s) view of the Armed Services? Those organizations, setup in The Constitution, to â€œprovide for the common defenseâ€• are nothing more that dating services. Join the service and get to shower with people, without having to ask their permission. In any other part of society, doing so would have one arrested for a sex crime. Itâ€™s all about consent.

The only reason it is important is to get to power by promising access to the homosexual community.

What about the years of training the military has gone through, trying to prevent â€œfraternization.â€• That became an issue with the massive infusion of women in the service, and the incredibly deep rooted human desire for sexual contact. Why didnâ€™t the military want this, even among heterosexuals? It makes for difficult, and many times impossible, decision making moments, where the leadership needs to be scrupulously fair. Sometimes that â€œfairnessâ€• needs to be played out in terms of making sure who you send to a dangerous situation is being done for the right reasons, and not because you are in a relationship with someone in your unit.

default watermark

Adding openly homosexual people to the already PCed military environment is just one more obstacle to good order and discipline, which is detracted from by raging hormones left unchecked.

Once more, the â€œhereâ€™s your orders, now get on with itâ€• methodology has the near term possibility to just making it more palatable for the military to take on more of the social interaction phenomena, rather than being focused on combat readiness. Maybe they see it as an offshoot for the â€œbusy gay â€˜professional,â€™ who doesnâ€™t have time to set up a full time relationship.â€• Yeah, thatâ€™s the ticket â€“ Join the military and let everyone around you in the barracks know youâ€™re â€œlike thatâ€• and let the shy ones come to you.

One thing this plan doesnâ€™t include, is respect for the people, who joined the military to serve the nation, and not as a dating service, who do not want those who are sexually attracted to them staring at them in the head facilities.

At least DADT offers the gay person the opportunity to serve and all they have to do is take their â€œrelationshipsâ€• off base. The same is actually expected off all the other service members already. The reason a DADT policy for heterosexuality isnâ€™t necessary is because the vast majority of all humans arenâ€™t homosexual and therefore it would be pretty ridiculous to tell them not to say what their sexual preferences are. They donâ€™t do it now. It wasnâ€™t part of their enlistment contract and it serves no organizational purpose.

The only purpose of the Armed services are to serve the people by defending them. If thatâ€™s what someone wants to do, then keep it zipped. Itâ€™s expected of everyone. The UCMJ has all the â€œrulesâ€• and it applies to all in uniform.

And, donâ€™t forget that the Democrats all want to scream and yell about the â€œwaste, fraud and abuseâ€• of the DoD. How about we begin to add up all the costs for the course development, the manpower and facilities, the contractor fees, and the hows spent byt real troops sitting in classrooms getting lectured on being sensitive and not using certain words. Can someone explain how that helps the US military defend the nation better? Iâ€™d like to hold that â€œmetricâ€• up for the â€œyouâ€™re wasting our money crowd and see what they have to say.

Anyhow, a vote for Hillary is a vote to actually turn the US Armed Forces into a sexual experimentation labs of epic proportions and combat efficiency be damned. Not because a law says so, but because her character will allow her to do it, and the vote gives her the power. What sexual preference/proclivity/perversion will next gain the favor of Hillary and therefore be made â€œlegalâ€• in the military to gain some more votes?

Iâ€™d prefer the method they used when they started to vilify smokers in the late 80s: If any one person in a space objects to smoking, then no one can. How about we apply the same principle here for people who think they joined the military to fight for the country, and not to be ogled by gay people?

default watermark

Category

1. Military
2. Military History
3. Political
4. Stream of Consciousness

Date Created
December 1, 2007
Author
admin