

June 18, 2013

Mark Steyn says the digital superstate is useless when it matters.

Every time I go on his show, my radio pal Hugh Hewitt asks me why congressional Republicans aren't doing more to insist that the GOP suicide note known as "the immigration deal" include a requirement for a border fence. I don't like to tell Hugh that, if they ever get around to building the fence, it won't be to keep the foreigners out but to keep you guys in.

I jest, but only very slightly and only because the government doesn't build much of anything these days – except for that vast complex five times the size of the Capitol the NSA is throwing up in Utah to house everybody's data on everything everyone's ever done with anyone ever.

A few weeks after 9/11, when government was hastily retooling its 1970s hijacking procedures for the new century, I wrote a column for The National Post of Canada and various other publications that, if you're so interested, is preserved in my anthology "The Face Of The Tiger." It began by noting the observation of President Bush's Transportation Secretary, Norman Mineta, that if "a 70-year-old white woman from Vero Beach, Florida" and "a Muslim young man" were in line to board a flight, he hoped there would be no difference in the scrutiny to which each would be subjected.

The TSA was then barely a twinkle in Norm's eye, and in that long ago primitive era it would have seemed absurd to people that one day in America it would be entirely routine for wheelchair-bound nonagenarians to remove leg braces before boarding a plane or for kindergartners to stand patiently as three middle-age latex-gloved officials poke around their genitals. Back then, the idea that everybody is a suspect still seemed slightly crazy. As I wrote in my column, "I'd love to see Norm get his own cop show:

"Capt. Mineta, the witness says the serial rapist's about 5'10" with a thin mustache and a scar down his right cheek.'

"Okay, Sergeant, I want you to pull everyone in.'

"Pardon me?'

"Everyone. Men, women, children. We'll start in the Bronx and work our way through to Staten Island. What matters here is that we not appear to be looking for people who appear to look like the appearance of the people we're looking for. ...

J. Christian Adams explains why the Arizona voting rights decision was a big win for the right.

Something perverse happened after the Supreme Court's decision today invalidating citizenship-verification requirements in Arizona for registrants who use the federal voter registration form. The Left knows they lost most of the battle, but are still claiming victory. That's what they do. Election-integrity proponents and the states are saying they lost, but don't realize they really won.

The Left wins even when they lose, and conservatives are often bewildered and outfoxed in the election-process game.

Earlier today, I called the decision a nothingburger. After re-reading the case and reflecting a bit more, it's clear that the decision was a disaster for the Left and their victory cackles are hollow — and they know it.

Worse, conservatives dooms-dayers who have never litigated a single National Voter Registration Act case have taken to the airwaves, describing the case as a disaster which invites illegal-alien voting.

In the last year, I've litigated five NVRA cases and worked on the preemption issues for years, and there is more to cheer in today's opinion than there is to bemoan. Those complaining about the opinion don't understand what the Left's goal was in this case: total federal preemption. On that score, Justice Scalia foiled them; indeed, the decision today was a huge war won, even if the small Arizona battle was lost.

From my time in the Justice Department Voting Section, I can remember intimately the wars over some of the preemption issues decided today. ...

Streetwise Professor caught a Putin rant.

At a reception on the occasion of Russia Day, Putin held court, and talked about . . . the United States. After awarding the State Prize to Sergei Nikulin, head of the bureau that designed a new nuclear missile designed specifically to defeat US missile defenses, Putin launched into a disquisition on American history:

Pooling together traditional Soviet-time propaganda clichés, Putin recalled the US “genocide” of Native Americans, slavery and racial segregation that is still, according to Putin, very much evident in the United States today. Putin deplored the US nuclear bombing of Japanese cities in 1945 and expressed doubt that Soviet dictator Josef Stalin would have dropped an atom bomb on Nazi Germany if the USSR obtained nuclear weapons in 1945, when an overall victory was already assured. After expressing his “personal opinion” that Americans and their leaders are worse than Stalin, Putin acknowledged that the US is basically a democratic country, built on the principle of individual rights and freedoms, whereas Russian society is built on “collectivism,” which makes it fundamentally different. The Russian national soul, according to Putin, is eternal and directly connected to God, unlike, apparently, the pragmatic American one—“so it is very hard for us to understand each other, but it is possible sometimes”.

Russian soul, blah blah blah. Interesting, that, during a week when a survey was released showing that Russians were among the least religiously observant people in the world. And as Felgenhauer notes, rather than being a narod united in collective solidarity, Russian society is atomized: the Russian social capital account is heavily overdrawn. In other words, Putin's characterization of Russia is a crock.

We are so in Putin's head. He is obsessed with the US. Can you imagine any US president discussing, say, Russian conquests in the Caucasus, or Central Asia?

There is one part of Putin's remarks that is particularly outrageous: "Putin deplored the US nuclear bombing of Japanese cities in 1945 and expressed doubt that Soviet dictator Josef Stalin would have dropped an atom bomb on Nazi Germany if the USSR obtained nuclear weapons in 1945, when an overall victory was already assured."

That is more than a crock: it is an ahistorical outrage. ...

Streetwise Professor also posts on Putin's theft of Bob Kraft's Super Bowl ring. *Vladimir Putin has done some outlandish things, but I think this takes the trophy. Or the ring. The Super Bowl Ring.*

You might recall that Kraft in 2005 joined a cadre of businessmen to meet with Russian President Vladimir Putin in St. Petersburg. The Patriots owner walked into that meeting with a jewel-laced Super Bowl XXXIX ring on his finger, but left empty-handed.

"I showed the president my most recent Super Bowl ring," Kraft said at the time, per The Boston Globe. Putin "was clearly taken with its uniqueness ... at that point, I decided to give him the ring as a symbol of the respect and admiration that I have for the Russian people and the leadership of President Putin."

Not so fast. Kraft now admits Putin nabbed the ring — worth upwards of \$25,000 — without his consent.

"I took out the ring and showed it to (Putin)," Kraft said this week, per the New York Post. "And he put it on and he goes, 'I can kill someone with this ring,' I put my hand out and he put it in his pocket, and three KGB guys got around him and walked out."

That's the head of the Party (and State) of Crooks and Thieves: leading by example!

The only thing that is worse than Putin's in-your-face thievery is the Bush administration's craven response:

Kraft kept his wits about him and complied with a call from the White House, in which a George W. Bush handler told him: "'It would really be in the best interest of U.S.-Soviet relations if you meant to give the ring as a present.' "

FFS. No wonder Putin thinks he can get away with about anything when dealing with the US. Because he can. I think he tries this stuff to see what he can get away with. He gets away with it . . . so he pushes it even more. He'll keep pushing until someone pushes back.

Here's my idea. Have Ray Lewis let Putin hold his Super Bowl ring, and pray that Putin tries to pocket it. And we can make money off this by putting it all on pay-per-view.

Marc Perry celebrates the internal combustion engine.

The automobile stands as an enduring symbol of mobility and opportunity in America — and of innovation that's at the core of our nation's economic strength and prosperity.

Yet the conventional gasoline-powered engine is sometimes disparaged and treated as if it's yesterday's technology. Listening to politicians, environmentalists and media pundits, you might think that the gas engine is inefficient and old-fashioned, a relic of the past that ought to be replaced by alternative automotive technologies like electric cars and plug-in hybrids.

But a good look at the latest advances in the gasoline-powered engine — and those on the horizon — jars this opinion, and the surge in U.S. oil production from shale drilling further refutes the idea that conventional engines are old technology.

Already powering more than 230 million cars in the United States, internal combustion engines have the potential to become substantially more efficient, while providing economic and environmental benefits that extend well beyond the money consumers save at the pump.

Imagine if your car uses advanced computing to control fuel injection far more precisely than before, improving the fuel efficiency of big cars by more than 15 percent. Or what if your car is able to knock another 30 percent off fuel consumption — and corresponding greenhouse-gas emissions — by partly cooling hot exhaust gas before it is pumped into the engine?

Diesel engines, which are more efficient than gasoline engines, might also take off in the U.S. ...

Jewish World Review

The digital superstate useless when it matters

by Mark Steyn

Every time I go on his show, my radio pal Hugh Hewitt asks me why congressional Republicans aren't doing more to insist that the GOP suicide note known as "the immigration deal" include a requirement for a border fence. I don't like to tell Hugh that, if they ever get around to building the fence, it won't be to keep the foreigners out but to keep you guys in.

I jest, but only very slightly and only because the government doesn't build much of anything these days – except for that vast complex five times the size of the Capitol the NSA is throwing up in Utah to house everybody's data on everything everyone's ever done with anyone ever.

A few weeks after 9/11, when government was hastily retooling its 1970s hijacking procedures for the new century, I wrote a column for The National Post of Canada and various other publications that, if you're so interested, is preserved in my anthology "The Face Of The Tiger." It began by noting the observation of President Bush's Transportation Secretary, Norman Mineta, that if "a 70-year-old white woman from Vero Beach, Florida" and "a Muslim young man" were in line to board a flight, he hoped there would be no difference in the scrutiny to which each would be subjected.

The TSA was then barely a twinkle in Norm's eye, and in that long ago primitive era it would have seemed absurd to people that one day in America it would be entirely routine for

wheelchair-bound nonagenarians to remove leg braces before boarding a plane or for kindergartners to stand patiently as three middle-age latex-gloved officials poke around their genitals. Back then, the idea that everybody is a suspect still seemed slightly crazy. As I wrote in my column, "I'd love to see Norm get his own cop show:

"Capt. Mineta, the witness says the serial rapist's about 5'10" with a thin mustache and a scar down his right cheek.'

"Okay, Sergeant, I want you to pull everyone in.'

"Pardon me?'

"*Everyone*. Men, women, children. We'll start in the Bronx and work our way through to Staten Island. What matters here is that we not appear to be looking for people who appear to look like the appearance of the people we're looking for. There are 8 million stories in the Naked City, and I want to hear all of them."

A decade on, it would be asking too much for the new Norm to be confined to the airport terminal. There are 300 million stories in the Naked Republic, and the NSA hears all of them, 24/7. Even in the wake of a four-figure death toll, with the burial pit still smoking, the formal, visible state could not be honest about the very particular threat it faced, and so, in the shadows, the unseen state grew remorselessly, the blades of the harvester whirring endlessly but, don't worry, only for "metadata." As I wrote in National Review in November 2001, "The bigger you make the government, the more you entrust to it, the more powers you give it to nose around the citizenry's bank accounts, and phone calls, and emails, and favorite Internet porn sites, the more you'll enfeeble it with the siren song of the soft target. The Mounties will no longer get their man, they'll get you, instead. Frankly, it's a lot easier." As the IRS scandal reminds us, you have to have a touchingly naïve view of government to believe that the 99.9999 percent of "metadata" entirely irrelevant to terrorism will not be put to some use, sooner or later.

Along the way, alas, Secretary Mineta's dream of a world in which "a 70-year-old white woman from Vero Beach" and "a Muslim young man" are subject to equal scrutiny has not come to pass. The Vero Beach gran'ma gets a lot more attention than the guy from the Yemeni madrassah, especially if she's made the mistake of attending a Tea Party meeting or two. The other day, The Boston Globe ran a story on how the city's police and other agencies had spent months planning a big training exercise for last weekend involving terrorists planting bombs hidden in backpacks left downtown. Unfortunately, the Marathon bombers preempted them, and turned the coppers' hypothetical scenario into bloody reality.

What a freaky coincidence, eh? But it's the differences between the simulation and the actual event that are revealing. In humdrum reality, the Boston bombers were Chechen Muslim brothers with ties to incendiary imams and jihadist groups in Dagestan. In the far more exciting Boston Police fantasy, the bombers were a group of right-wing militia men called "Free America Citizens," a name so suspicious (involving as it does the words "free," "America," and "citizens") that it can only have been leaked to them by the IRS. What fun the law enforcement community in Massachusetts had embroidering their hypothetical scenario: The "Free America Citizens" terrorists even had their own little logo – a skull's head with an Uncle Sam hat. Ooh, scary! The Boston PD graphics department certainly knocked themselves out on that.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, Tamerlan Tsarnaev was training in Dagestan, posting terrorist videos on YouTube, and getting fingered by the Russians to the FBI. Who did nothing.

If you had the misfortune to be blown up by the Tsarnaev brothers, and are now facing a future with one leg and suddenly circumscribed goals, like those brave Americans featured on the cover of the current People magazine under the headline "Boston Tough," you might wish Boston had been a little tougher on Tamerlan and spent less time chasing the phantoms of "Free America Citizens." But, in fact, it would have been extremely difficult to track the Tsarnaevs at, say, the mosque they attended. Your Granny's phone calls, your teenager's Flickr stream your Telecharge tickets for two on the aisle at "Mamma Mia!" for your wife's birthday, and the MasterCard bill for dinner with your mistress three days later are all fair game, but since October 2011 mosques have been off-limits to the security state. If the FBI guy who got the tip-off from Moscow about young Tamerlan had been sufficiently intrigued to want to visit the Boston mosque where he is said to have made pro-terrorism statements during worship, the agent would have been unable to do so without seeking approval from something called the Sensitive Operations Review Committee high up in Eric Holder's Department of Justice. The Sensitive Operations Review Committee is so sensitive nobody knows who's on it. You might get approved, or you might get sentenced to extra sensitivity training for the next three months. Even after the bombing, the cops forbore to set foot in the lads' mosque for four days. Three hundred million Americans are standing naked in the NSA digital scanner, but the all-seeing security state has agreed that not just their womenfolk, but Islam itself, can be fully veiled from head to toe.

We're told that universal surveillance has prevented all kinds of atrocities we can never hear about – an answer straight out of Orwell. Yet, oddly, in the ones we do hear about, the perps are hiding in plain sight (Maj. Hasan with "Soldier of Allah" on his business card), the intelligence services do nothing (the Pantybomber known to the CIA but still permitted to board the plane), and the digital superstate is useless (the Tsarnaev photo rang no bells with the facial-recognition software, but was identified by friends who saw it on TV).

And thus, the bozo leviathan blunders on. Big Politically Correct Brother sees everything ... and nothing.

Pajamas Media

[Left Loses Bid in Citizenship-Verification Supreme Court Case](#)

by J. Christian Adams

Something perverse happened after the Supreme Court's decision today invalidating citizenship-verification requirements in Arizona for registrants who use the federal voter registration form. The Left knows they lost most of the battle, but are still claiming victory. That's what they do. Election-integrity proponents and the states are saying they lost, but don't realize they really won.

The Left wins even when they lose, and conservatives are often bewildered and outfoxed in the election-process game.

Earlier today, I called the decision a [nothingburger](#). After re-reading the case and reflecting a bit more, it's clear that the decision was a disaster for the Left and their victory cackles are hollow — and they know it.

Worse, conservatives dooms-dayers who have never litigated a single National Voter Registration Act case have taken to the airwaves, describing the case as a disaster which invites illegal-alien voting.

In the last year, I've litigated five NVRA cases and worked on the preemption issues for years, and there is more to cheer in today's opinion than there is to bemoan. Those complaining about the opinion don't understand what the Left's goal was in this case: total federal preemption. On that score, Justice Scalia foiled them; indeed, the decision today was a huge war won, even if the small Arizona battle was lost.

From my time in the Justice Department Voting Section, I can remember intimately the wars over some of the preemption issues decided today.

The Left essentially believes that anyone who fills out a federal Election Assistance Commission registration form should be allowed on the rolls, no questions asked. There were complex fights over the "citizen check-off box" issues, with the Left wanting the box rendered meaningless, and conservatives and election-integrity proponents believing a registration cannot be processed until a registrant affirms on the box that he or she is a citizen.

Before the decision today, here is what the Left wanted:

- Invalidation of Arizona's requirement that those submitting a federal form provide proof of citizenship with their federal form. Mind you, the citizenship-proof requirement is NOT part of federal law and the Election Assistance Commission does NOT require it in the form they drafted.
- Invalidation of state citizenship-verification requirements when a *state voter registration form* is used (yes, such forms exist separate from the federal requirement) on the basis of federal preemption. They wanted the Arizona case to invalidate *all* state citizenship-verification requirements.
- Automatic registration if a registrant submits a completed federal EAC approved registration form, no questions asked.
- Federal preemption on the ability for states to have customized federal EAC-approved forms that differed from the default EAC form.
- Federal preemption over states, like Florida and Kansas, looking for independent information on citizenship to root out noncitizens from the voter rolls. Again, the Left wanted the federal EAC form to be the no-questions-asked ticket to the voter rolls.

So what is the score on these five goals after Justice Scalia's opinion today? Election-integrity advocates are batting .800; left wing groups, .200. And the most insignificant issue of the five is the one issue the Left won. Justice Scalia foiled 4 of 5 of their goals, and the 4 biggest ones.

How does it work? The decision today uncorks state power. The Left wanted state power stripped and they lost.

First, Arizona can simply push the state forms in all state offices and online, and keep those federal forms in the back room gathering dust. When you submit a state form, you have to prove citizenship. Thanks to Justice Scalia, that option is perfectly acceptable. Loss for the Left. Victory for election integrity.

You might say, "That's a small victory." Nonsense. This was the whole ballgame to the groups pushing the Arizona lawsuit. They lost, period.

Next, when voters use a state, as opposed to a federal, form, they can still be required to prove citizenship. The federal form is irrelevant in that circumstance.

After the decision today, states have a green light to do double- and triple-checking even if a registrant uses the federal form. The Left wanted the submission of a federal form to mean automatic no-questions-asked registration. This is a big loss for the Left because now states can put suspect forms in limbo while they run checks against non-citizen databases and jury-response forms. Another significant victory in today's decision. The Left wanted to strip them of that double-checking power.

The decision today is a great example of how conservatives can be distracted by squirrels running past. It is understandable and forgivable because they aren't daily immersed in the long-term election-process agenda of the left-wing groups. Nor do they daily involve themselves with the details of election process. But having been in the "preemption wars" for nearly a decade, I can assure you this case is a big win, even if it doesn't appear so at first glance.

Streetwise Professor

[Vladimir Putin: Revisionism for Me, Not For Thee](#)

by Craig Pirrong

[At a reception on the occasion of Russia Day, Putin held court, and talked about . . . the United States.](#) After awarding the State Prize to Sergei Nikulin, head of the bureau that designed a new nuclear missile designed specifically to defeat US missile defenses, Putin launched into a disquisition on American history:

Pooling together traditional Soviet-time propaganda clichés, Putin recalled the US "genocide" of Native Americans, slavery and racial segregation that is still, according to Putin, very much evident in the United States today. Putin deplored the US nuclear bombing of Japanese cities in 1945 and expressed doubt that Soviet dictator Josef Stalin would have dropped an atom bomb on Nazi Germany if the USSR obtained nuclear weapons in 1945, when an overall victory was already assured. After expressing his "personal opinion" that Americans and their leaders are worse than Stalin, Putin acknowledged that the US is basically a democratic country, built on the principle of individual rights and freedoms, whereas Russian society is built on "collectivism," which makes it fundamentally different. The Russian national soul, according to Putin, is eternal

and directly connected to God, unlike, apparently, the pragmatic American one—“so it is very hard for us to understand each other, but it is possible sometimes”.

Russian soul, blah blah blah. Interesting, that, during a week when a survey was released showing that Russians were among the least religiously observant people in the world. And as Felgenhauer notes, rather than being a *narod* united in collective solidarity, Russian society is atomized: the Russian social capital account is heavily overdrawn. In other words, Putin’s characterization of Russia is a crock.

We are so in Putin’s head. He is obsessed with the US. Can you imagine any US president discussing, say, Russian conquests in the Caucasus, or Central Asia?

There is one part of Putin’s remarks that is particularly outrageous: “Putin deplored the US nuclear bombing of Japanese cities in 1945 and expressed doubt that Soviet dictator Josef Stalin would have dropped an atom bomb on Nazi Germany if the USSR obtained nuclear weapons in 1945, *when an overall victory was already assured.*”

That is more than a crock: it is an ahistorical outrage. Allied victory over Japan might have been assured, but the cost would have been horrific. It took almost 3 months for the US 10th Army to take Okinawa. It cost about 12,500 American lives (5,000 on Navy ships, killed in Kamikaze attacks).

But it cost over 200,000 Japanese lives, about 107,000 Japanese soldiers and over 100,000 Japanese civilians.

Okinawa followed the appalling battle at Iwo Jima.

American B-29s were firebombing city after city, night after night.

Yet Japan’s military steadfastly refused even to contemplate surrender, and was preparing for a defense of the home islands to the last ditch and the last man. And the last woman and child.

Contrary to Putin’s insinuation, the war against Japan was not in its denouement. It was approaching a gruesome climax that would have cost hundreds of thousands of lives. Most of them Japanese.

Truman weighed the facts, and made a decision. The fates of millions of American and Allied soldiers rested on his shoulders. I cannot imagine any American president reaching a different decision. The only reason Stalin would have chosen invasion over the use of atomic weapons is that the lives of Soviet soldiers meant little to him.

Note that even after the US dropped atomic weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Japanese military resisted surrender. Hirohito made the decision, and even then, the military attempted a coup to prevent the broadcast of the Emperor’s surrender statement. Achieving the “assured” victory against Japan would have been a humanitarian catastrophe, won against a fanatical enemy at a cost against which the toll of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as horrific as it was, would have paled in comparison.

Putin's slur is particularly disgusting coming from a man who has [attacked WWII revisionism](#), and supported laws criminalizing criticizing the Soviet role in the war:

"We must keep and defend the truth about the war," he said after attending the opening ceremony of a Red Army World War II memorial in the Israeli city of Netanya.

The rewriting of history is a crime to the millions of people who gave their lives for the victory in WWII and future generations who should know the true heroes of the war and be able *"to distinguish the truth from blatant and cynical lies,"* Putin stressed.

Yeah. Take your own advice: distinguish the truth from blatant and cynical lies.

And remember, [Russia has criminalized criticism of its role or tactics in WWII](#).

Sergei Shoigu, the respected emergency situations minister, has called for a law, based on Holocaust denial legislation in Germany, that would make it a criminal offence to suggest that the Soviet Union did not win the War.

Mr Shoigu indicated that the legislation would also seek to punish eastern European or former Soviet states which deny they were liberated by the Red Army. The leaders of those countries could be banned from Russian soil, he said.

The minister's comments appeared particularly aimed at Estonia, which relocated a statue a Red Army soldier from a central square in the capital city Tallinn two years ago to a nearby war cemetery, prompting outrage in Russia.

"Our parliament should pass a law that would envisage liability for the denial of the Soviet victory in the Great patriotic War," Mr Shoigu said. "Then the presidents of certain countries denying this would not be able to visit our country and remain unpunished."

I suggest reading that whole article. Shoigu, by the way, is currently Russian Defense Minister.

Putin's obsession with the US would actually be pathetic, if it weren't so destructive. The catastrophe in Syria, for instance, is a direct consequence of this obsession, and the zero sum attitude Felgenhauer mentions (and which I've written about repeatedly in the past). Russia is "led" by a warped, cynical, twisted man. The destination to which he is leading it is frightening to contemplate.

Addendum: Victory over Nazi Germany was assured in April, 1945, yet Stalin ordered a relentless assault on Berlin, pitting Zhukov against Konev to goad them to getting to Berlin quickly. The casualties were appalling. Official estimates of Soviet dead are around 81K, but it is widely believed that actual deaths were far in excess of that. Probably 100,000 Germans were killed. Do you doubt Stalin would have used everything at his disposal to hasten the conquest of Berlin, despite the fact that victory was assured? And what about Stalin's launching war against Japan in August, 1945 . . . again when the ultimate outcome was assured.

Streetwise Professor

Putin Grabs the Ring. Literally.

by Craig Pirrong

Vladimir Putin has done some outlandish things, [but I think this takes the trophy](#). Or the ring. The Super Bowl Ring.

You might recall that Kraft in 2005 joined a cadre of businessmen to meet with Russian President Vladimir Putin in St. Petersburg. The [Patriots](#) owner walked into that meeting with a jewel-laced [Super Bowl](#) XXXIX ring on his finger, but [left empty-handed](#).

“I showed the president my most recent [Super Bowl](#) ring,” Kraft said at the time, per The Boston Globe. Putin “was clearly taken with its uniqueness ... at that point, I decided to give him the ring as a symbol of the respect and admiration that I have for the Russian people and the leadership of President Putin.”

Not so fast. Kraft now admits Putin nabbed the ring — worth upwards of \$25,000 — without his consent.

“I took out the ring and showed it to (Putin),” Kraft said this week, per the New York Post. “And he put it on and he goes, ‘[I can kill someone with this ring](#),’ I put my hand out and he put it in his pocket, and three KGB guys got around him and walked out.”

That’s the head of the Party (and State) of Crooks and Thieves: leading by example!

The only thing that is worse than Putin’s in-your-face thievery is the Bush administration’s craven response:

Kraft kept his wits about him and complied with a call from the White House, in which a George W. Bush handler told him: “ ‘It would really be in the best interest of U.S.-Soviet relations if you meant to give the ring as a present.’ “

FFS. No wonder Putin thinks he can get away with about anything when dealing with the US. Because he can. I think he tries this stuff to see what he can get away with. He gets away with it . . . so he pushes it even more. He’ll keep pushing until someone pushes back.

Here’s my idea. Have Ray Lewis let Putin hold his Super Bowl ring, and pray that Putin tries to pocket it. And we can make money off this by putting it all on pay-per-view.

Detroit News

Gas engine stands the test of time

by Marc J. Perry

The automobile stands as an enduring symbol of mobility and opportunity in America — and of innovation that’s at the core of our nation’s economic strength and prosperity.

Yet the conventional gasoline-powered engine is sometimes disparaged and treated as if it's yesterday's technology. Listening to politicians, environmentalists and media pundits, you might think that the gas engine is inefficient and old-fashioned, a relic of the past that ought to be replaced by alternative automotive technologies like electric cars and plug-in hybrids.

But a good look at the latest advances in the gasoline-powered engine — and those on the horizon — jars this opinion, and the surge in U.S. oil production from shale drilling further refutes the idea that conventional engines are old technology.

Already powering more than 230 million cars in the United States, internal combustion engines have the potential to become substantially more efficient, while providing economic and environmental benefits that extend well beyond the money consumers save at the pump.

Imagine if your car uses advanced computing to control fuel injection far more precisely than before, improving the fuel efficiency of big cars by more than 15 percent. Or what if your car is able to knock another 30 percent off fuel consumption — and corresponding greenhouse-gas emissions — by partly cooling hot exhaust gas before it is pumped into the engine?

Diesel engines, which are more efficient than gasoline engines, might also take off in the U.S. Half of the cars in Europe are diesel-powered. Diesel engines convert 45 percent of the fuel's chemical energy into mechanical work, compared to only 30 percent for gasoline engines. With federal fuel-economy standards getting tougher by 35 percent over the next five years, auto manufacturers recognize that the efficiency of the internal combustion engine must improve dramatically.

Auto companies are pinning their hopes on technologies like advanced gasoline direct injection and cooled exhaust gas recirculation that make engines of traditional cars and trucks more efficient — and they want it done in the near term. They are also counting on advances in high-tech materials and automobile design to allow them to build lighter cars and small trucks without sacrificing safety. Because lighter vehicles use less fuel, this leads to much-improved fuel economy.

Don't expect all of these technological advances in next year's models, but automakers expect to hit their fuel economy targets over the next decade, rising from about 32 miles-per-gallon today to about 51 by 2025. Importantly, they are achieving technological breakthroughs with the internal combustion engine on their own, without the government subsidies that support the development of electric vehicles. For now, the most cost-effective technology changes in the near term are improvements in conventional cars — advanced internal combustion engines and diesel engines — that will reduce our energy consumption and enhance energy security.

Another issue that's very important: As economics students know, switching technologies involves costs, and the verdict on the economic desirability of the switch to hybrids and electric cars is still out. Hybrids and electric cars use rare earth metals in their batteries and in the systems that propel the cars. China accounts for more than 90 percent of the world's supply of these exotic, rare earth metals. Three years ago, in retaliation for the arrest of a Chinese fishing boat captain, China retaliated by blocking the shipment of rare earth metals destined for Japan. Some questions arise:

Are we substituting a new set of security risks for the old ones involving OPEC oil? Would a major shift to hybrids and electric cars leave the United States less dependent on foreign oil but vulnerable to foreign control of rare earth metals?

The U.S. Energy Information Administration forecasts that even in 2035, more than 99 percent of cars and trucks sold will still have internal combustion engines. With advanced engine technologies, the potential fuel savings will be huge.

Access to more fuel-efficient cars is not only vital to the functioning of the larger U.S. economy, it is vital to people's everyday lives. It also significantly impacts America's energy security, environmental well-being and economic competitiveness.

Success with fuel-efficient cars using conventional engines, both gasoline and diesel, will open up vast new markets and add high-paying jobs in auto manufacturing. And it will preserve America's leadership in automotive technology, while making our world cleaner and more secure.

Mark J. Perry is an economics professor at the University of Michigan–Flint and an American Enterprise Institute scholar.





