

**Mark L. Melcher** Publisher  
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

**Stephen R. Soukup** Editor  
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

## THEY SAID IT

“Politicians have nothing to fear from the Utopias which present a deceptive mirage of the future to the people, and turn [in the words of Clemenceau] “men towards immediate realizations of terrestrial felicity, which any one who looks at these matters scientifically knows can only be very partially realised, and even then only after long efforts on the part of several generations.” The more readily the electors believe in the magical forces of the State, the more will they be disposed to vote for the candidate who promises marvels; in the electoral struggle each candidate tries to outbid the others; in order that the Socialist candidates may put the Radicals to rout, the electors must be credulous enough to believe every promise of future bliss; our Socialist politicians take very good care therefore, not to combat these comfortable Utopias in any very effective way

...

Enfeebled classes habitually put their trust in people who promise them the protection of the State, without ever trying to understand how this protection could possibly harmonise their discordant interests; they readily enter into every coalition formed for the purpose of forcing concessions from the Government; they greatly admire charlatans who speak with a glib tongue . . .

--Georges Sorel, *Réflexions sur la violence*, 1908.

## WHITHER EUROPE?

To understand the recent votes in Europe against the new constitution one need only know that the relationship between the socialist “planners” who run things there and the people for whom they “plan” is what is known in biology as *parasitic symbiosis*. This is a host/parasite relationship in which the health of the host is impaired, but very slowly, thus allowing the parasite to exploit it over a longer period.

Eventually, of course, the host either dies or becomes so debilitated that the parasite dies or moves on by attaching itself to another victim. In the case of Europe, both the host and the parasite are in the process of dying.

It is likely to be a long and ugly death, with the parasite growing increasingly desperate to sap as much strength from the host as it can while it still lives, and the host going through extraordinary machinations to shed its tormentor and regain its health.

### In this Issue

Whither Europe?

The Real Lessons of Watergate

End Notes

Some European commentators say they fear that this latter process will take the form of various reactionary political responses. They are almost certainly correct. For one thing, these “European commentators” are, for the most part, agents of the parasite, and parasites will always consider any effort to reject them to be “reactionary.” But even more importantly, as the Nature Channel routinely documents, even the tiniest insect will kick a little as the Venus flytrap is closing in around it.

Fascism is the most common alarm raised by the socialist parasite that feeds on Europe. This is, of course, an extreme insult to the European people, even if they are too dumb to recognize it as such. It implies that their response to any exposure to the concept of free markets for ideas and goods will be an overwhelming temptation to become mass murderers in much the same way that a werewolf reacts to a full moon.

Lord only knows what horrors would be released upon the world if the Europeans were exposed to the “Anglo-Saxon” ideas of such well-known, right-wing reactionaries as Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Jean-Baptiste Say, Nassau Senior, William Stanley Jevons, Karl Menger, Eugene Böhm-Bawerk, Léon Walras, Vilfredo Pareto, Frank Knight, Alfred Marshall, Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek, John Maynard Keynes, Milton Friedman and yes, Robert Mundell. Could a new Hitler be far behind?

My guess is that two “reactionary” trends will eventually emerge in Europe as separate and distinct movements. Neither will have anything to do with “fascism,” and neither will be strong enough to completely liberate the host from the parasite. The first will be widespread civil unrest and the second will be attempts by some of the member nations to divorce themselves from the European Union.

It is important to keep in mind when considering this that almost two hundred years of socialism has slowly but ever so surely sapped much of the energy that once was a distinguishing characteristic of the European population.

Marx had it wrong. Religion is not the opiate of the people. But socialism and communism are. These evil ideologies teach all the wrong lessons about the proper role of government in the lives of men, about how success is achieved in a commercial society, and about the importance of personal responsibility. They imbue people with grand visions of their “rights” and convince them to transfer their responsibilities to government entities that willingly take on this burden in exchange for their liberty.

Ironically, socialism and communism rob the individual of the one “right” that truly matters, the right to be viewed as a singular human being, created in the image of God, and valued for that reason alone. As Pope John Paul II noted in his justly famous encyclical *Centesimus Annus*, under socialism, “the concept of the person as the autonomous subject of moral decision disappears.” Elaborating on this notion he added the following:

Socialism considers the individual person simply as an element, a molecule within the social organism, so that the good of the individual is completely subordinated to the functioning of the socioeconomic mechanism. Socialism likewise maintains that the good of the individual can be realized without reference to his free choice, to the unique and exclusive responsibility which he exercises in the face of good or evil.

The inevitable result of this is a spiritual ennui and an obsessive materialism that manifests in a loss of individual initiative, a sick dependency on what Lady Thatcher once described as the “nanny state,” and childlike fits of anger when “the system” fails to produce the prosperity and contentment that once was the product of hard work and faith.

Thus, as I indicated earlier, it seems to me that one of the principal “reactions” to the current problems within the European community will not be for Europeans to work harder and make sacrifices on behalf of the common good. It will be widespread civil unrest. But this won’t be aimed at overthrowing

the existing socialist form of government, for that would leave the protester defenseless against the vicissitudes of life. Instead, it will be the kind of unrest that a child in a crowded day care center exhibits, which is designed to alert the mother figure to some particular dissatisfaction.

These demonstrations of unhappiness will increase over the years as the economy deteriorates; the standard of living declines; unemployment rises; capital flight continues; crime and corruption increase; and racial tensions grow. But this will be a slow process, similar in nature to the decay experienced by many of America's large cities during the 1970s and '80s. European life will become shoddier; government services will become less dependable; the streets will be a little dirtier; the quality of health care will decline; bureaucrats will be harder to get on the phone; the trains will not run on time.

The second "reaction" will be that at some point within the next few years, some of the European states will make an effort to free themselves from the parasite by separating themselves from the host. The result will be a new category of membership in the European Union, designed to preserve the fiction of a united Europe by keeping these nations within some newly defined federation. Other nations will find this new category to be more attractive than full membership, and Brussels will become increasingly less important. At this point, some decisions will have to be made about the future of the euro.

Some of these newly liberated nations are likely to stage an economic rebound, becoming healthy entities as they adopt a few of the reactionary, "Anglo-Saxon" policies designed to allow them to find a place within the new globalized economy. Tax cuts and immigration controls are likely to be among the first of these. Other nations will be unable to escape the grasp of the socialist parasites.

And then someday, just as surely as rain falls in Indianapolis in the summertime, the deathbed demographics of Europe will lead to a confrontation between native Europeans and the large Muslim immigrants within their midst.

This will be an extraordinary confrontation when it occurs. Indeed, if I were doing the advanced billing, I would describe it with no hyperbole intended, as "The Fight of the Century."

On one side will stand a once proud race of people, who are slowly dying out because they have lost the desire to reproduce themselves, who have no religious beliefs to give their lives meaning beyond materialistic pleasures, but who still control the state and its large and powerful police organizations, and have no compunction about doing whatever it takes to protect their material privileges, since their ethics and morals are situational, based on fad and whim.

On the other side will be a motley crowd of "immigrants" and their offspring who believe so strongly in their religious faith that they will happily sacrifice their lives in large numbers in order to expand that faith around the globe through a process called *jihad*, which is a fancy term for the mass murder of any group of people who do not share their faith in a God who holds the lives of non-believers to be of no value.

These Muslims will argue that since they do the work of the nation they should have a greater say in its government; that their religion should be regarded by the state as the one true religion, since the indigenous population has no alternative transcendental concept to offer; and that if their demands are not met they will strike terror into the land from which the crusaders attacked them ten centuries earlier.

This confrontation will either destroy Europe as we know it today or save it by creating the kind of national crisis that will provide Europeans with a cause that truly does justify the unity that so many Europeans have desired for so many years.

## THE REAL LESSONS OF WATERGATE.

Since last week's revelation that former deputy director of the FBI W. Mark Felt was Watergate's infamous "Deep Throat," the political world has been in full-on nostalgia mode, with the Washington press and a handful of wistful Democrats in particular remembering fondly the "good old days," when a couple of reporters on the Metro beat helped bring down the twice-elected President of the United States. Felt's unmasking provided an occasion for both the mainstream media and the political left to relive the glory of yesteryear and to revel in the power they once wielded and used to "save the nation" from a corrupt president.

For my part, I would have thought that a touch of sobriety would have been added to the celebration of "Watergate's legacy" by the revelation that the hero of an entire generation was hardly the idealistic whistleblower he'd been portrayed to be, but was, rather, a sad, bitter man unhappy that he had been passed over for promotion. But I can't say that I was surprised that such circumspection was by and large absent from the week's revelry.

As with Vietnam, Watergate is near and dear to the hearts of those who currently lead both the media and the Democratic Party. It was one of the defining moments of their collective youth and an event integral in the formation of their political consciousness. And there is little chance that they will let something so trivial as reality disabuse them of the myth that they "changed the world" and taught the establishment some desperately needed lessons.

The problem for these devotees of Woodward, Bernstein, Deep Throat, and the rest of the Watergate crowd is that the lessons that were taught by that scandal are nowhere near as simple as they have come to believe. The self-indulgent Baby Boomer power brokers in the mainstream media and the Democratic Party see Watergate only through the fractured prism of their own egotism and political bias and are therefore unable to make out very clearly what happened or, more to the point, its relevance to politics today. In short, they learned the *wrong* lessons from Watergate, just as they did from Vietnam.

Yes, Watergate taught that power in the hands of unscrupulous men can be a very dangerous thing. And yes, it taught that in politics it's not the crime that matters, but the cover up. And yes, it taught a host of other now standard Inside-the-Beltway clichés about such things as the importance of a vigilant media.

But those lessons are pretty general, applying not just to Watergate, but to most any political scandal. And the citation of such commonplace political axioms as "deeply valuable" and "essential" lessons of Watergate demonstrates fairly conclusively just how little attention the media and Baby Boom Democrats have actually paid to the scandal and its aftermath.

The truly valuable lessons specific to Watergate are, more likely, those that were not immediately apparent, but which have become so only as time has passed and the political system has adapted. Today, it is evident, for example, that in a republic such as the United States, even the most powerful cannot survive political corruption if the base of their power abandons them. Moreover, if that base decides that the corruption of high office is too great and therefore voluntarily abandons one of its own, the short-term political damage may be significant, but the long-term damage will likely be minimal. Granted, these lessons – the second one in particular – were somewhat less than obvious thirty-one years ago. But to anyone who has followed American politics honestly since the Watergate scandal broke, they are rather clear today.

Part of the reason that these lessons are so obvious today is that we have the opportunity to judge the aftermath of Watergate against the aftermath of the only constitutional-crisis-producing scandal since, namely the Lewinski affair. The media and the Democrats, of course, refuse to acknowledge the Lewinski scandal – given its sexual component – as even remotely comparable to Watergate and so it is hardly surprising that the lessons are lost on them. But the fact of the matter is that the "unseriousness" of the Lewinski mess actually helps focus the political lessons of Watergate more clearly.

While there is no question that the reporting done by Woodward and Bernstein and the leaks provided by Deep Throat were exceptionally damaging to President Nixon and laid the foundation for the case against him, the notion that Nixon would be forced from office by this “third rate burglary” seemed unlikely until members of his own party turned against him. Recall that the famous question “What did the President know and when did he know it?” was uttered not by an independent prosecutor or a partisan enemy of Nixon’s, but by Tennessee Republican and friend of the President’s, Howard Baker, who nevertheless was vice-chairman of the Senate Watergate Committee and spearheaded the GOP efforts to push Nixon out, for the good of the party and the good of the country.

Did the Republicans pay a political price for Nixon’s corruption? Of course they did. The midterm election of 1974 was one of the worst (or best, depending on one’s perspective) in Congressional history, with Democrats netting 49 new seats in the House and 4 in the Senate. And, of course, two years later, Gerald Ford, Nixon’s Vice President and the man who pardoned him, lost his run at a full presidential term of his own to a virtually unknown peanut farmer from Plains, Georgia.

But the public’s punishment of the GOP was short-lived. A scant six years later, Ronald Reagan became the first challenger to defeat an elected incumbent president since FDR, drubbing Carter soundly. And just 14 years after that (20 from Nixon’s resignation), Republicans staged their own Congressional landslide and recaptured the majority in both Houses of Congress for the first time in over half a century. Today the GOP is the majority party in the country for the first time since before the Great Depression.

The point here is that Republicans paid what amounted to a negligible political price for Nixon’s corruption because they were unwilling to make his corruption theirs as well, or to put this another way, to corrupt themselves on his behalf. Rather than protect Nixon as “one of their own,” against “partisan agitators” and a “vast left-wing conspiracy,”

Baker and a handful of GOP cohorts pushed Nixon to resign. In so doing, they not only averted a likely impeachment, but, by behaving honorably under less than ideal circumstances, distanced themselves from Nixon’s personal corruption. Nixon couldn’t survive once his fellow Republicans decided it was over, and voters ultimately recognized the party’s political sacrifices. As Carl Bernstein himself put it, “Ultimately, Richard Nixon left office voluntarily because courageous leaders of the Republican Party put principle above party and acted with heroism in defense of the Constitution and rule of law.”

Contrast this with Congressional Democrats’ behavior during the Lewinski scandal. Despite the unseemliness of Bill’s behavior; his obvious and undeniable deception of a federal grand jury, of his family, his friends, his cabinet, his fellow partisans, and the nation as a whole; and the glaring abuse of the power of his office, not a single Democrat ever publicly condemned Bill in terms that would suggest that he should no longer serve as President of the United States.

A few of them – notably Joseph Lieberman and Pat Moynihan – made half-hearted attempts to denounce Bill’s actions with the young intern and the indecorousness of the entire political conversation those actions provoked. But none ever suggested that he should resign or even accept any significant consequences for his actions. We kept waiting for someone – anyone – to have a “Baker moment” and mutter the equivalent of the “what did the president know” line. And we’re still waiting. When push came to shove, the Democrats chose party unity over “doing the right thing” and decided to fight it out regardless of the cost in credibility and self-respect.

Have the Democrats paid a political price for protecting Clinton? I don’t think there’s a person in this country – outside of maybe Bill, Hillary, and the usual cast of Clinton sycophants (Begala, etc.) – who would argue that they haven’t. The analogy with Watergate is not perfect, of course, and so it’s not as if the Democrats lost a huge number of House seats to the “Monica-gate babies,” but they most certainly have suffered.

For starters, they lost the presidency. At a time of virtually unprecedented peace and prosperity, the ostensible incumbent, Bill's Vice President Al, was defeated for election in 2000, a huge and stunning upset by almost any measure. Part of the reason for Gore's surprising defeat was his rather weird and off-putting personality. But just as big a part of it was his association with Clinton, the so-called "Clinton fatigue" factor.

But it didn't have to be that way. By comparison, Monica-gate was far (far, far, far) more personal a scandal than was Watergate. And there is little question that the American electorate that forgave the GOP for Nixon's personal corruption would have done the same for Gore. But rather than the political courage shown by Baker a generation before, Gore and the rest of his party radiated fear and submissiveness. And the voters took notice, actually punishing Gore for Clinton's seediness in addition to his own fecklessness.

More to the point, Gore could have run in 2000 as the *actual* incumbent, rather than the *ostensible* incumbent. Had the Democrats gone to the White House as Baker et al. did a quarter of a century earlier and asked Bill to follow the Nixon example and do the honorable thing, Gore would have become president and would have been able to run in 2000 as the most powerful man in the world. Given that Clinton's offenses were primarily of a personal nature, certainly far more than were Nixon's; given that Gore wouldn't have been forced to make the mistake of pardoning his corrupt predecessor, as Ford did; and given that American voters generally don't like to turn incumbents out of office (having done it only thrice since Roosevelt beat Hoover), it is almost certain that Gore would have won re-election 2000.

And this, in turn, means that George W. Bush never would have been president. That the United States would not have had a "huge" tax cut "for the rich" in 2001 and another in 2003. That the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq either would not have been fought or would have been fought quite differently. That the United States would not be a "global pariah."

That the Social Security "lockbox" would be safe, with no threat of "risky schemes" involving private accounts. Etc. etc.

And the losses didn't stop there. A huge number of previously important and powerful Democratic pressure groups, most notably the feminists, lost all semblance of credibility defending Bill and have consequently lost most of whatever political power they once had. Can anyone imagine, for example, the pre-Monica versions of NOW or NARAL being forced to sit quietly by while both the chairman of the Democratic Party and its presumptive presidential nominee for the next election argue that it is absolutely imperative to compromise and find "common ground" with pro-lifers on abortion? Neither can I.

Finally, the Democrats lost the opportunity to free themselves for good from the motley collection of political crooks, con men, shysters, and flibbertigibbets with whom Bill associated and whom he placed in various positions of power throughout the party. Had the Democrats not surrendered their consciences to Bill, it is unlikely that Terry McAuliffe would ever have become Democratic National Committee chairman, which means that it is unlikely that the Democrats would have become so obsessed with raising money that they would spend two entire election cycles in the single-minded pursuit of campaign donations to the exclusion of developing coherent election strategies and appealing policy prescriptions.

When Bill was still president, Mark and I, like a lot of folks covering politics, remarked often that Bill's legacy would almost certainly be that his presidency ultimately destroyed his party. Bill's tenure was great for Bill but was awful for just about every other Democrat in the nation, as their party lost control of the House, the Senate, and the vast majority of governorships and state legislatures. In retrospect, it is likely that we were too hard on Bill, since those losses were almost certainly not his fault, but part of a greater political realignment. His presidency was actually the one exception to this general rightward shift in the political predilections of the nation.

But if we were too hard on him, his fellow Democrats were too easy on him. And because of their leniency and lack of conviction, at least part of Bill's legacy is the dissolution of the former ruling coalition into an angry, confused party that lacks direction, credibility, and moral resolve.

So while the Democrats and their friends are paying homage to the "gallantry" of Mark Felt, introducing Congressional resolutions to honor Deep Throat as a national hero, and generally celebrating the glories of Watergate, the party purportedly disgraced by that scandal is enjoying control of all of the levers of power in Washington.

The Democrats and the mainstream press continue to insist that they alone learned the proper lessons from Watergate, but it is manifestly clear that they actually learned very little. Because the Republican Party used Watergate to purge the corruption from its ranks, *six* years later, it celebrated an historic comeback and the first of several impressive electoral victories.

As for the Democrats, who chose not to use the Monica-gate scandal to engage in a similar purge, they are still suffering from Clinton fatigue, now *seven* years after that scandal broke. They may argue that the Lewinski matter was terribly trivial by comparison to Watergate. And they are probably right about that. But that doesn't change the fact that the real lesson of Watergate is that neither the crime nor the cover-up is all that important. What matters most is how the cover-up is handled once it's been discovered. But don't hold your breath waiting for Woodward and Bernstein to tell you that.

### **END NOTES. John Quixote and the Continuing Descent Into Madness.**

It is quite possible that you missed this over the weekend, since almost no media outlets thought it particularly newsworthy, but it appears that failed presidential wannabe John Kerry has decided that he

agrees with Ralph Nader and believes that President Bush should be impeached. According to our old friend Chris Ruddy's Newsmax.com news service:

John Kerry said Thursday that he intends to confront Congress with a document touted by critics of President Bush as evidence that he committed impeachable crimes by falsifying evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

"When I go back [to Washington] on Monday, I am going to raise the issue," Kerry said, referring to the Downing Street Memo in an interview with Massachusetts' *Standard Times* newspaper.

"I think it's a stunning, unbelievably simple and understandable statement of the truth and a profoundly important document that raises stunning issues here at home," the top Democrat added.

The Downing Street Memo, first reported on May 1 by the London *Times*, was drafted by a Matthew Rycroft, a foreign policy aide to Prime Minister Tony Blair. It is said to be minutes of a July 2002 meeting where Blair allegedly admitted that the Bush administration "fixed" Iraq intelligence to manufacture a rationale for war.

Apparently, the left-wing blogosphere is all atwitter with ruminations about the Downing Street Memo and the mainstream media's "refusal" to cover the story. It appears as well that Kerry, taking his cue from these bloggers (and from Nader) has also decided that the media is cutting Bush a break with regard to the memo and that it will somehow benefit him to challenge the press and "bring down" the Bush administration (something he couldn't do through the electoral process).

I hate to keep going back to the “descent into madness” theme every time a Democrat does something incredibly goofy, but the only word that describes Kerry and the rest of the anti-Bushies who think that this is an important story and that the press is ignoring it out of deference to the President is “delusional.”

For starters, anyone who believes that there is an Iraq-related story out there that is extremely damaging to President Bush but that the folks at *The New York Times*, and the *Washington Post* Corporation (including *Newsweek*), and *Time*, and *The New Yorker*, etc., etc., *ad infinitum* are sitting on it because they don't want to damage Bush or the war effort is just plain bonkers.

The left-wing bloggers, the left-wing talk show hosts at the dreadful Air America radio network, and the goofballs at Al Gore's new left-wing television network have convinced themselves that they exist for the same reason that their right-wing counterparts exist, to provide an “alternative” source of information. What they don't appear to get is that no one really takes them seriously as an “alternative” because unlike the right-wing versions, they simply don't offer an alternative perspective from the mainstream press. They share big media's political biases and therefore provide nothing different or out of the ordinary.

The left-wing bloggers are screaming that the mainstream media outlets refuse to cover the Downing Street Memo because they are scared of Bush. It is much more likely that they are not covering the story because, as Gertrude Stein said of Oakland, there's no there there.

That brings us to the memo itself, which, it turns out, is pretty flimsy “evidence” on which to base an impeachment inquiry. The memo is the transcription of the notes taken by a British national security aide during a meeting between Tony Blair and his advisors at which several advisors discussed what they had recently been told by their American sources about what their American counterparts were saying

about what Bush was thinking. Got that? As many observers have pointed out, there is a legal term for such “evidence.” It's called “hearsay.”

But even if the memo weren't hearsay (which it is); and even if it could be proven that the memo accurately reflects the thoughts of American cabinet officials (which it can't); and even if it could be proven that the cabinet officials spoke for Bush (which it can't) and that the phrase “fixing the evidence around” means intentionally manipulating intelligence to justify an unjustifiable war (which it can't), there's still the little matter of anyone caring or thinking that any of this is news.

The left has been crying for two years now that “Bush lied,” so how exactly does this memo add anything to the conversation? The American public has long since moved beyond the WMD issue, and the bitter cries of a presidential loser (who, by the way, sat on the Senate Intelligence Committee and therefore saw much of the same intelligence as did Bush) are rather unlikely to change that.

If Kerry is serious about pursuing the impeachment issue based on the Downing Street Memo, then it will be clear that he has given up all hope of ever being a serious national-level political figure again. And if the Democratic establishment joins him in his Quixotic crusade, then it will be clear that it has given up all hope of ever being a serious national-level political party again.

Of course, that doesn't mean that they won't do it.

## Impeach Dean?

And speaking of impeachment, it looks more and more as if some prominent members of the Democratic Party have had enough of Dr. Howard Dean and his leadership of the party through his position as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. And this may well presage an ugly battle to remove him from that job.

Over the weekend, once and future presidential loser and current Breck shampoo spokesmodel John Edwards expressed his displeasure with Dean's several recent bouts of foot-in-mouth disease by declaring that "The chairman of the DNC is not the spokesman for the party. He's a voice. I don't agree with it."

And yesterday, once and future presidential loser and current Hair-Plug Club for Men spokesmodel Senator Joseph Biden told ABC's "This Morning" that "[Dean] doesn't speak for me with that kind of rhetoric, and I don't think he speaks for the majority of Democrats. And I wish that rhetoric would change."

We can't say for sure if these will prove, in the long run, to be isolated incidents, or if they are indicative of a growing dissatisfaction with Dean that may manifest as an effort to remove him from his role as party leader. But we can say that Dean's brief tenure at the DNC has, by almost any measure (e.g. stupid things said; stupid things reiterated; money raised or, more accurately, not raised), been an absolute disaster for his party. In short, he has been everything the Republicans had hoped he would be, and more.

And while we certainly think it possible, if not likely, that Democratic big shots who might actually like to be elected to office again someday will see Dean as the threat he is and push to have him removed from

the chairmanship, it is most assuredly not possible that Dean would leave quietly or that such a removal attempt would go smoothly.

Remember that there is a reason why Dean is chairman of the party, and it's not because he's particularly suave and good looking. He's in that job because many of the new power brokers in the party agree with him both on policy and rhetoric and believe that he "speaks truth to power" when he says the stupid things he says. If there is an attempt to remove Dean, this "psych ward" wing of the party will almost certainly react quickly, aggressively, and, well, crazily.

The longer Dean serves as chairman and the closer the 2006 midterms draw, the more likely it becomes that he will do serious damage to his party's electoral chances. I suspect more and more Democratic party leaders will come to that conclusion themselves over the next several weeks. How they will act on that conclusion is anyone's guess. But whatever they do, it is almost guaranteed to be ugly.

Copyright 2005. 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.