

The Political Forum

*A review of social and political trends and events
impacting the world's financial markets*

Mark L. Melcher
Publisher
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

Stephen R. Soukup
Senior Editor
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

Monday, June 21, 2004

THEY SAID IT

“Say what you like, but, in the Clinton era, the only naked guy with women's panties on his head and a dog leash round his neck would have been the President breaking in the new intern pool.”

-- “Clinton Has The Heat – But It’s The Democrats Who Are Getting Burnt,” Mark Steyn, *London Telegraph*, June 21, 2004.

A DUNG HEAP CALLED THE UNITED NATIONS. Recently, I heard a radio commercial that referenced the so-called “butterfly effect,” which holds that a butterfly flapping its wings in one area of the world could cause a tornado in another faraway place. This notion concerning the interconnectedness of seemingly unconnected occurrences is an old one, which has been stated in many different ways, some more fanciful than others. My favorite was uttered by Jack Burton, the narrator in Robert Penn Warren’s great political novel, *All the King’s Men*. “I eat a persimmon and the teeth of a tinker in Tibet are put on edge,” he said.

All of this came to mind last week when I read news accounts of U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan’s commencement address at Harvard, where he criticized President Bush’s assertion that the United States had both a right and an obligation to take offensive action against any nation that threatens it, whether the rest of the world likes it or not. His specific words were as follows.

What kind of world would it be, and who would want to live in it, if every country was (sic) allowed to use force, without collective agreement, simply because it thought there might be a threat?

Why did this remind me of the theories of the butterfly and the persimmon? Because it brought to mind another example of the same concept, which goes as follows.

An old man from North Carolina suffers several years of declining health, his resolve weakens, he is bamboozled into believing men whom he would once have recognized as liars, he abandons a lonely position of principle, and finally retires from his job in Washington, D.C., and all over the earth, from large cities to the most remote corners, corrupt and licentious men smile without knowing why and children cry out restlessly in their sleep.

Subscriptions to The Political Forum are available by contacting:
The Political Forum

8563 Senedo Rd., Mt. Jackson, Virginia 22842
Tel 540-477-9762, Fax 540-477-3359, Email melcher@thepoliticalforum.com,
or visit us at www.thepoliticalforum.com

Far fetched? Well maybe, but in my opinion the link between these two events is a lot closer than the one between the butterfly and the tornado, or the persimmon eater and the tinker. In fact, it is similar to another variation on the same theme set forth by the above-mentioned Jack Burton. He called it the “flower in the crannied wall theory” and described it as follows:

So I plucked the flower out of its cranny and discovered an astonishing botanical fact. I discovered that its delicate little root, with many loops and kinks, ran all the way to New York City, where it tapped the lush dung heap called the Madison Corporation. The flower in the cranny was the Southern Belle Fuel Company. So I plucked another little flower called the American Electric Power Company, and discovered that its delicate little root tapped the same dung heap.

You see, the plucked flower in my story was a U.S. Senator from North Carolina named Jesse Helms, who was also linked to a dung heap in New York, only this one was called the United Nations, and Helm’s connection to it was antagonistic, not symbiotic. In fact, he was the only politician in the world who had the courage to carry on a principled fight year after year against the accumulation of power by the United Nations. And when his health failed, followed by his retirement, the world was left with no one to lead the fight to force even a modicum of responsibility and accountability on this global centerpiece for sleaze and corruption.

Really Mark, where do you get this stuff? Well, you can begin by reading the following from an article in the Jerusalem Post dated May 18, 2004 by Mark Steyn entitled “UN Fetish.”

Is the UN good? Well, I’m not sure I’d even say that. But if you object to what’s going on in those Abu Ghraib pictures - the sexual humiliation of prisoners and their conscription as a vast army of extras in their guards’ porno fantasies - then you might want to think twice about handing over Iraq to the UN.

In Eritrea, the government recently accused the UN mission of, among other offences, pedophilia. In Cambodia, UN troops fueled an explosion of child prostitutes and AIDS. Amnesty International reports that the UN mission in Kosovo has presided over a massive expansion of the sex trade, with girls as young as 11 being lured from Moldova and Bulgaria to service international peacekeepers.

In Bosnia, where the sex-slave trade barely existed before the UN showed up in 1995, there are now hundreds of brothels with underage girls living as captives. The 2002 Save the Children report on the UN’s cover-up of the sex-for-food scandal in West Africa provides grim details of peacekeepers’ demanding sexual favors from children as young as four in exchange for biscuits and cake powder. “What is particularly shocking and appalling is that those people who ought to be there protecting the local population have actually become perpetrators,” said Steve Crawshaw, the director of Human Rights Watch.

And then, if you like, you can “Google” the leads provided by Steyn and find a plethora of details and support for his accusations, scores more than I can fit into these pages. One example is an article in *The Guardian* dated February 28, 2002 entitled “Agencies hid scandal of aid workers who bought child sex with food,” from which the following is excerpted.

The report (made for UN High Commissioner for Refugees and Save the Children UK) says UN peacekeepers sexually exploited very young girls in refugee camps in West Africa, making them pose naked for pictures in exchange for biscuits, cake powder and other food. They are also accused of pooling money so that groups of them could have sex with the same girl . . .

Sexual exploitation was defined by children as “when them big man go loving with small girl for money. Them big men can go loving to small girls, they can call girl when she walking along the road and then the girl go and they go in house and lock the door. And when the big man has done his business he will give the small girl money or gift.”

The majority of children said they knew of at least one child who exchanged sex for money or gifts. Most were aged between 13 and 18 but some were younger and girls aged four to 12 had reported sexual harassment. Most of the allegations involved male staff recruited within the country trading for sex with oil, bulgur wheat, tarpaulin, medicines, transport, ration cards, loans, education courses, skills training and other goods. A girl in Liberia said: “It’s difficult to escape those NGO people; they use the food as bait to get you to sex with them.”

Or this report about a Danish documentary put out in August 2000.

A hard-hitting Danish television documentary on the UN peacekeeping mission to Cambodia in 1992 accuses the world body of having introduced AIDS to the southeast Asian country, which today has one of the highest rates of HIV infection in the region. “And Then Came the UN” also shows how UN peacekeepers fathered and left behind untold numbers of children, who are now teased & bullied by other youngsters for being of mixed race.

Currently airing in Europe, the documentary reveals for the first time the full extent of the seedy side of the UN Transition Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), challenging years of UN statements that the mission was one of the most successful ever and worth its US\$3-billion cost. Coincidentally, the claims of success are expected to be repeated today in a comprehensive UN report on lessons learned from acknowledged peacekeeping debacles in Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia, Angola and, most recently, Sierra Leone.

But Yasushi Akashi, UNTAC's chief in New York, replied that "Boys will be boys," the documentary reports. "He told people, 'Everybody has the right, even the soldiers, to enjoy the young ladies, and we cannot discriminate the HIV- positive soldiers,' " says Beat Richner, a Swiss doctor who still operates 3 children's hospitals in Cambodia. But he adds that the world body's failure to control its troops was like "passive genocide."

Or this from two stories that appeared in the *Guardian* in August 2002.

Patients at United Nations mental institutions in Kosovo have been raped and physically attacked under the eyes of UN staff, held in "filthy and degrading" conditions, and threatened with punishment if they report the abuses, according to a damning

investigation published in New York yesterday....A damning dossier sent by Kathryn Bolkovac to her employers, detailing UN workers' involvement in the sex trade in Bosnia, cost the American her job with the international police force. She was sacked after disclosing that UN peacekeepers went to nightclubs where girls as young as 15 were forced to dance naked and have sex with customers, and that UN personnel and international aid workers were linked to prostitution rings in the Balkans.

And finally, you might "Google" some combination of words and phrases like "Kofi's son Kojo," "oil-for-food program," "Saddam Hussein," "cover-up," "scandal," "massive corruption," "billions in bribes," "tidal wave of graft," "kick-backs to Saddam."

If you do this you will find that the tinge of corruption and sleaze at the United Nations goes all the way to Kofi himself, the fellow who criticized the United States, before a cheering crowd of Harvard graduates, for moving into Iraq without the approval of such nations as France, Russia, and China, who were, like his own son, up to their butts in the "massive corruption" that pervaded the "oil for food" program, which in turn was propping up a murderous dictator.

You will find that at least \$11 billion – that's billion – vanished from the U.N.-administered program, which was established in order to assure that Iraqi children had food and medicine during the U.N.-sponsored program to force Saddam Hussein to comply with U.N. disarmament demands. And you will find that the fraud lined the pockets of some of the most vocal critics of American insistence that the United Nations enforce its resolutions against the Hussein regime.

The United Nations has, of course, pledged to thoroughly investigate itself regarding this matter, and has chosen the aging Paul Volcker to head up this surreal task. Needless to say, he has zero chance of tracing the delicate little roots, with their many loops and kinks, all the way to the top of the dung heap. After all, the reason that a scandal of such global reach and magnitude could exist at all is because, for all practical purposes, neither the United Nations bureaucracy nor its leadership is accountable to anyone, not even its members.

Theoretically, of course, the United Nations needs to justify its existence to the U.S. taxpayers, who pay the lion's share of its operating expenses. But since Jesse Helms left the scene, there is no one of any importance left in the U.S. government, including the "conservative" President of the United States, who would dare even to raise the issue of reducing America's U.N. dues payment in exchange for accountability and decent leadership.

Kofi has, of course, rubbed Bush's nose in this fact numerous times since the Texan joined the U.N. Secretary General among the exalted ranks of "world leaders." A classic example occurred last year when Bush publicly "deplored" Cuba's re-election to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, which is chaired by Libya, another giant in the field of human rights. Kofi as much as told Bush where to stuff the "troubling issues" the President said it raised, and the White House responded by assuring Kofi that it was all talk, that Bush had no intention of trying to do anything about it, like perhaps withdrawing American taxpayer support for an organization that has the moral moorings of a mass murderer.

In any case, as you are "Googling" the web, don't bother entering the words "Kofi" and "resignation" because you will find no connection between the two, even though the link

between the U.N. Pooh Bah and the perversions and corruption scandals that have engulfed his organization since he took control of it are far more direct than those between the forced nudity of Arab men at Abu Ghraib and senior members of the Bush administration whose resignations have been demanded by the liberal media.

Could Jesse Helms have forced a change in time to save the children in the Balkans and West Africa and Asia, and prevented the United Nations from using its worldwide network of influence to prop up the government of Saddam Hussein and participate in the theft of billions of dollars that was earmarked to provide food and medicine to Iraqi children?

No. But before he threw in the towel, Helms had managed over the years to block significant amounts of U.S. funding for the organization, which limited the amount of money that it could use for corrupt purposes, as well as the number of children that could be raped and brutalized by the sexual predators that it sends into the world with the money it gets from U.S. taxpayers. And like the butterfly and the tornado, when Jesse gave up the fight “small girls” around the globe suddenly became even more vulnerable to “them big men” because no one anywhere any longer cared what was done to them by the “peacekeepers,” whose ranks were about to multiply.

In 1996, Jesse Helms wrote an article entitled “Saving the U.N.: A Challenge to the Next Secretary General,” which appeared in *Foreign Affairs* magazine. In it, he warned the United Nations that it had to reform if it was going to continue to receive American financial support. He concluded it as follows:

The time has come for the United States to deliver an ultimatum: Either the United Nations reforms, quickly and dramatically, or the United States will end its participation. For too long, the Clinton administration has paid lip service to the idea of U.N. reform, without imposing any real costs for U.N. failure to do so. I am convinced that without the threat of American withdrawal, nothing will change. Withholding U.S. contributions has not worked. In 1986, Congress passed the Kassebaum-Solomon bill, which said to the United Nations in clear and unmistakable terms, reform or die. That did not work. A decade later, the United Nations has neither reformed nor died. The time has come for it to do one or the other....

If the United Nations is not clearly on the path of real reform well before the year 2000, then I believe the United States should withdraw. We must not enter the new millennium with the current U.N. structure in place. The United States has a responsibility to lay out what is wrong with the United Nations, what the benchmarks for adequate reform are, and what steps we are willing to take if those benchmarks are not met by a date certain.

The United Nations will certainly resist any and all reform - particularly many of the smaller and less developed members, which benefit from the current system and gain influence by selling their sovereignty to the organization. That is why the next secretary-general has an enormous job to do: his or her mandate will be nothing less than to save the United Nations from itself, prove that it is not impervious to reform, and show that it can be downsized, brought under control, and harnessed to contribute to the security needs of the 21st century. This is a gargantuan, and perhaps impossible,

task. But if it cannot be done, then the United Nations is not worth saving. And if it is not done, I, for one, will be leading the charge for U.S. withdrawal.

Needless to say, the United Nations had not reformed itself by 2000. In fact, by naming Kofi Annan as its new Secretary General on January 1, 1997, it set a firm course toward more bloat and more corruption and more sexual predation toward children. Yet, on January 28, 2000, the headline in the *USA Today* read as follows: “Helms Makes Peace With United Nations.”

His health failing and two years away from retirement, the 79-year-old Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee acquiesced to “months of effort” by Bill Clinton’s controversial Ambassador to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke, and the liberal lightweight Senator from Delaware Joseph Biden, and agreed to go along with a \$1 billion payment to the United Nations in back dues in exchange for a few meaningless, cosmetic “reforms.”

By making this agreement, *USA Today* happily concluded that Helms had “transformed himself from an angry spectator who had been threatening to leave the stands, to an impact player who has taken the field.” With no criticism at all intended for Jesse Helms, an old man who had fought the good fight with little or no help from his party for a very long time, I would argue that he didn’t take the field, but indeed left the stands, and in doing so left the game in the hands of a gang of crooks and perverts the likes of which the world has rarely ever seen.

Holbrooke, by the way, is said to be in line for the job of Secretary of State, should John Kerry win the election in November, which helps explain why Kerry has made much of the fact that if he is elected he will work more closely with the United Nations than George Bush has done.

It is possible, of course, that a Kerry-Holbrooke team could make this work to the advantage of the United States; that together the United States and the United Nation’s could pursue an agenda of peace on earth and good will toward men. But it is, in my opinion, more likely that such an attempt would backfire on Kerry. By tying American actions to the “collective agreement” of such U.N. powerhouse nations as France, Germany, China, and Russia, Kerry could put his presidency, as well as his country, in some very difficult and dangerous positions, given the unsettled nature of the post-Cold-War world.

In any case, the United States would likely get very dirty in the process. Dung heaps have a way of soiling those who get close to them.

THE MEDIA AND IRAQ, REDUX. It has become a truism among conservatives, and indeed among many Americans with no particular political leanings at all, that the mainstream media is not only liberal, but overtly so. This bias is, of course, irritating to Republicans, most especially in election years. But it has been so much a part of the political scene for so long that the Party has learned to deal with it quite effectively, enough so to have won four out of the last six presidential races and to have captured control of both houses of Congress.

This year, however, the liberal bias in the mainstream media has, I think, become extremely worrisome, not because of its potential impact on the Bush campaign per se, but because of its potential impact on public support for the war in Iraq, which could have drastic implications for the nation’s security.

Last week, I noted that “it has become more and more difficult not to suspect that even the mainstream press is making a concerted effort to emphasize the negative over the positive in Iraq.” This week I would add that things have grown markedly worse in the mere six days since those words were published.

Of course, the newshounds and likeminded folks on the political left would have us all believe that this is the media’s historic responsibility, i.e., to challenge the prevailing logic and to question the party line spouted by a nominally untrustworthy government. But that is, in my opinion, a pretty weak rationalization for trying to pass off personal biases and prejudices about President Bush and the war in Iraq as fact. The truth of the matter is that the apparent effort by the mainstream press in this country today to undercut the war in Iraq is not only dangerous, but largely, unprecedented, the media’s high-minded protestations notwithstanding.

I should note, of course, that, like today, the media did play a significant role in eroding public support for the Vietnam War. In fact, its opposition to that conflict is notorious – or legendary, depending, naturally on one’s perspective. As Mackubin Thomas Owens, a professor of strategy and force planning at the Naval War College in Newport, R.I, noted recently: “the fact was that for a very long time after that conflict, military members believed in their hearts that reporters were part of the counter-culture trying to ‘get them.’”

And indeed they were. But the difference between Vietnam and today, which is subtle, but nonetheless important, is that in Vietnam, the media turned against a long, bloody war that saw multiple casualties every day and that was waged against an enemy that many citizens felt was undeserving of American military wrath. In short, the media, like many individuals, was against that war, regardless of which party was in power.

Today, in contrast, the media opposition to the war is predicated on the fact that it is George W. Bush’s war. Or to put this another way, in Vietnam the media undermined the war because that was the most obvious and effective means to end it. In Iraq the media undermines the war because it is the most obvious and effective means to end the Bush administration.

This is a highly dangerous game because, while it certainly can be a legitimate and honorable position to believe that America should not have gone to war Iraq in the first place, it would seem impossible, even for anti-war liberals, to make the case that having now done so it would be a good thing for America to be defeated by the opposition movement within that country.

It is one thing to dislike President Bush and to seek his defeat this November, but it is quite another to work actively to undermine the war effort by trying to convince Americans that failure is inevitable and that the cause was entirely unjust. One wonders if these individuals who are so intent on emphasizing the negative ever think about the implications for the United States, for decent Iraqis, and for the entire Middle East of a chastened America skulking away in defeat and leaving Iraq under the governance of a murderous and fanatical religious cult.

Over the past week, two stories in particular have amplified, in my opinion, the mainstream media’s intention to present a universally negative picture of the conflict in Iraq and to avoid having to make the case that regardless of their feelings toward George Bush and the war itself,

some good has come out of it. One of these stories is important because of the headlines it generated, and the other because it generated no headlines at all.

Now, unless you are one of the privileged few who can spend the majority of your waking hours reading about Washington, there is a good chance that you missed what ought to have been one of the most interesting and best covered stories of all of last week. On Tuesday, the American Enterprise Institute held a public screening of a video showing the *real* horrors of Abu Ghraib prison. TechCentral Station's Nick Schulz described the video thusly:

The first film clip opens with the camera showing a man standing in a bland, mostly empty room. The camera pans down to show his right hand. Folded rugs are visible in the background. The clip jumps to footage of scrub-clad "surgeons" with rubber surgical gloves severing the man's hand at the wrist. First the skin is peeled away with surgical knives and tweezers; ligaments, tendons, muscle, and bone underneath are exposed. Then the gloved hands wielding the knives begin to slice, shredding through the sinews, slashing muscle, breaking bone, until the hand is ultimately detached and plopped onto a green cloth, as yellow, pulpy tissue spills forth . . .

The next clip opens amid Saddam Fedayeen — Fedayeen means "those willing to die for Saddam" — chanting loudly: "With blood and spirit we will redeem you Saddam." The Fedayeen stand barking and clapping in a courtyard. A blindfolded prisoner, forced to his knees and held in position has his arm outstretched before him along a low concrete wall. A masked member of the Fedayeen raises high a three-foot-long blade and ferociously slams down on the man's hand, slicing through his fingertips. The victim is wailing, howling, screaming in agony.

The swordsman-torturer, not sufficiently satisfied with his first effort, raises the sword again and drives down once more on the man's immobile hand. This time he severs the fingers closer to the knuckles as blood spurts cartoonishly from his hand spilling over and down the concrete slab. The victim emits a wail I have never heard — could never imagine hearing — from a grown man, this time louder, harder than the first. The camera then turns to the assembled Fedayeen as they continue rhythmically chanting . .

In another clip a hooded and blindfolded prisoner is led to a room where he is forced to kneel, hands tied behind his back. Another man sits before the prisoner with thick metal tweezers and a scalpel. With his left hand he grabs the tip of the prisoner's tongue with the tweezers and pulls it forward from his head. With the scalpel in his other hand he slices through the prisoner's tongue, cutting it out of his mouth and then dropping it on the floor.

This ritual is repeated for more prisoners who are lined up, squatting in a row like parts on an assembly line waiting for processing, sitting ducks surrounded by dozens of men bearing witness to a Baathist tongue lashing . . .

In the final clip we see a blindfolded prisoner being led to his fate as the assembled men around him sing "Happy Birthday, long live the leader, eternal gift to the people." Again with arms tied behind his back he is shoved to the ground, bent over stuffed

burlap sacks. A black-clad Fedayeen loosens the prisoner's shirt exposing his back and neck, while another stands two feet from him holding a long silver blade at its curved handle. He raises his arms and strikes, hacking the prisoner's head from his body, tumbling it to the ground. He picks up the severed head by the hair and places it ceremoniously on the dead man's back as the camera pans in closer and closer and you can make out the victim's now lifeless and bloodied face.

The reason that AEI felt it necessary to screen the video was that it had, nearly two weeks earlier, been screened for the media at a conference held by three U.S. Senators, including former Democratic presidential hopeful Joseph Lieberman, but had not been deemed important enough by anyone in the mainstream press to merit even a word about it.

Think about that for a minute. Three U.S. Senators hear about several videos recovered from Baathist offices in Baghdad and ask the Defense Department if it's possible to see them. The Defense Department puts together a four-minute tape of Saddam's "greatest hits," if you will. And when the Senators go public with this tape, believing that it more than amply demonstrates in part why Saddam was deposed and why the moral equivalence being peddled by the left is completely nutty, no one in the mainstream media feels it worth even a brief mention.

So a conservative think tank follows up and publicly re-shows the video. And still no one cares. Indeed, as of Friday, only three media outlets, all of which fall outside of the mainstream and can be called "conservative," to a greater or lesser degree (*The New York Post*, *The Wall Street Journal's* "OpinionJournal," and *National Review*, publisher of the Schulz story), had paid any attention to the story at all. Nick Schulz notes that one of the justifications given by the media, specifically CNN's Aaron Brown, for running the pictures of U.S. abuses at Abu Ghraib over and over *ad nauseum* is, in Brown's words, "You don't appreciate what happened in that prison until you see it." Yet somehow that standard only applies to "atrocities" committed by little girls from West Virginia and their perverted, emotionally disturbed boyfriends, not to Saddam and his tongue-lashing squad.

The other story is one most Americans undoubtedly saw last week, although where they saw it likely affected their perception of it. After the 9/11 Commission released preliminary findings that they have been unable to find conclusive evidence that Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda cooperated in the 9/11 hijackings, the mainstream press ran with headlines and stories indicating (once again) that "Bush lied" and that the definitive word had been given by a commission that had disproved any connection between Saddam and al-Qaeda.

The press's misleading and unwarranted conclusions were deemed so egregious that Vice President Cheney took the unusual step of denying them aggressively in an interview given late in the week. Andrew McCarthy, the "former chief assistant U.S. attorney who led the 1995 terrorism prosecution against Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman and eleven others," was so appalled by *The New York Times* skewed depiction of the commission's findings that he felt it necessary to update the paper's famous motto, changing it to "All the News That's Full of S**t." Even Lee Hamilton, the *Democratic* vice chairman of the Commission felt it necessary to note that the media had distorted the commission's findings, making it appear that was a greater discrepancy between what the administration said and what the commission found. He put it thusly.

I must say I have trouble understanding the flack over this. The vice president is saying, I think, that there were connections between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein's government. **We don't disagree with that.** What we have said is what the governor just said, we don't have any evidence of a cooperative, or a corroborative relationship between Saddam Hussein's government and these al-Qaeda operatives with regard to the attacks on the United States. **So it seems to me that sharp difference that the press has drawn, the media has drawn, are not that apparent to me.** [emphasis added]

In closing, I would draw attention to one other story that I think illustrates this important point. The feature piece on the front page of the Sunday *Washington Post* carried this headline: "Mistakes Loom Large As Handover Nears." Predictably, the story opens with a laundry list of mistakes that have been made by the American authority in Iraq, all of which are almost certainly quite true, especially when measured against carefully chosen examples of the goals and dreams of those who had sincerely wanted to achieve more and have been distressed to learn that their ambitious dreams would take a lot longer to achieve than they had thought.

While contemplating the grim and apparently shocking news that sometimes war plans don't play out exactly as they're drawn up, one finds, after the jump to page 16, the following paragraph, which, in some Americans might stir a feeling of pride for being a citizen of one of the few nations in the history of the world that routinely sacrifices blood and money to help those whom it has defeated in combat.

The Coalition Provisional Authority, the U.S. entity that has administered Iraq, cites many successes of its tenure. Nearly 2,500 schools have been repaired, 3 million children have been immunized, \$5 million in loans have been distributed to small businesses and 8 million text books have been printed, according to the CPA. New banknotes have replaced currency with ousted president Saddam Hussein's picture. Local councils have been formed in every city and province. An interim national government promises to hold general elections next January.

But this type of good news gets short shrift in a paper such as the *Washington Post*. In fact, it is quickly put in its place by the following sentence, which leads to two full pages of additional gloom. "But in many key quantifiable areas, the occupation has fallen far short of its goals...."

In the end, Mark and I both think the effort to unseat Bush by undermining support for the effort in Iraq will fail. On the other hand, it is likely to be successful in convincing America's enemies that the nation is divided as to the importance of establishing a free and friendly Iraq, and that a few more deaths might tip the scales in their favor. As the murderer Osama bin Laden has repeatedly noted, people tend to want to side with the "strong horse." It is such a shame therefore that the media would put lives at risk by making the American horse look startlingly weak all in the interest of petty partisan politics.

THE POLITICAL FORUM

Copyright 2004. The Political Forum. 8563 Senedo Road, Mt. Jackson, Virginia 22842, tel. 540-477-9762, fax 540-477-3359. All rights reserved. Information contained herein is based on data obtained from recognized services, issuer reports or communications, or other sources believed to be reliable. However, such information has not been verified by us, and we do not make any representations as to its accuracy or completeness, and we are not responsible for typographical errors. Any statements nonfactual in nature constitute only current opinions which are subject to change without notice.