

Mark L. Melcher Publisher
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

Stephen R. Soukup Editor
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

THEY SAID IT

In the region there is of course a country such as Iran – a great country, a great people and a great civilization which is respected and which plays a stabilizing role in the region....

--French Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy at a press conference, July 31, 2006.

In this Issue

War and Peace.

Melcher for President.

WAR AND PEACE.

Last week, former and perhaps future Democratic presidential candidate John Kerry caused a minor stir when he brazenly declared that the current war between Israel and Hezbollah would not have occurred if the American people had had the good sense to vote differently two years ago. “If I was [sic] president,” Kerry told a small gathering in a Detroit bar and grill, “this wouldn’t have happened.”

Naturally, Kerry’s boast quickly became fodder for the right-leaning commentariat, as it reinforced the perception of the Senator as a pathetic, fixated loser, incapable of dealing with the fact that he was beaten fairly and willing to do or say anything, no matter how outrageous, to try to convince himself and voters that a grave, cosmic mistake was perpetrated when he was denied his rightful spot in the Oval Office.

One of the more entertaining takes on Kerry’s bluster was turned in by OpinionJournal’s James Taranto, who thought that the boast, along with another boast from Kerry’s running mate John Edwards during the 2004 campaign, was suggestive of a rather exaggerated self image on the part of the former candidates. Taranto wrote:

If Kedwards [Kerry and Edwards] have the power to eliminate war and disease, why don’t they use it? This is the age-old problem of evil:

Why does [John Kerry] allow evil? If He is all powerful, then He should be able to prevent it. If He is omnipotent and does nothing about evil, then we suspect that there are limits to His goodness, that there is something wrong with Him, that He is not all good. Perhaps He has an evil streak, or is truly malicious and we are merely His toys – expendable and counting for nothing.

Now, we’re certainly sympathetic to the idea that Kerry is a sad, broken man who will say and do stupid things in his attempt to maintain the illusion that he actually matters politically. Moreover, we’re all for jokes made at his expense, particularly when, like Taranto’s, the jokes are funny.

That said, we can't help but think that the jokes at Kerry's expense tend to mask an important point here, namely that in this one particular instance, the Senator is probably right. If Kerry were, in fact, president, it is quite likely that this hot war between Israel and Hezbollah would never have happened, and if it had, it would have ended quickly, with a broad, internationally sanctioned ceasefire.

There's no way to prove this conclusively, of course. But all the evidence one would need to make a reasonable assumption about how a Kerry administration might have behaved during such a conflagration can be found in the constant clamoring among Kerry's fellow liberals for Israel to temper its response to Hezbollah "proportionally" and in the basic assumption on the left that the best possible outcome of the current hostilities would be a quick ceasefire. The most obvious example of this mindset can be found in the op-ed penned last week by former Clinton Secretary of State and Democratic foreign policy uber-Guru Warren Christopher and published by *The Washington Post*. Christopher wrote:

My own experience in the region underlies my belief that in the short term we should focus our efforts on stopping the killing. Twice during my four years as secretary of state we faced situations similar to the one that confronts us today. Twice, at the request of the Israelis, we helped bring the bloodshed to an end.

In order to achieve this fundamental goal a third time, Christopher proposes a three-step plan. To wit:

First, as in 1996, an immediate cease-fire must take priority, with negotiations on longer-term arrangements to follow. Achieving a cease-fire will be difficult enough without overloading the initial negotiations with a search for permanent solutions.

Second, if a cease-fire is the goal, the United States has an indispensable role to play . . .

Finally, Syria may well be a critical participant in any cease-fire arrangement, just as it was in 1993 and 1996. Although Syria no longer has troops in Lebanon, Hezbollah's supply routes pass through the heart of Syria, and some Hezbollah leaders may reside in Damascus, giving the Syrians more leverage over Hezbollah's actions than any other country save Iran. Syria has invited a direct dialogue with the United States, and although our relations with Syria have seriously deteriorated in recent years (we have not had an ambassador in Damascus for more than a year), we do not have the luxury of continuing to treat it with diplomatic disdain. As the situations with North Korea and Iran confirm, refusing to speak with those we dislike is a recipe for frustration and failure.

Christopher's plan, then, is for the United States to force Israel to stop killing Hezbollah soldiers (and the civilians Hezbollah intentionally places in the way of Israeli bombs) and to ally with Syria to do so. In other words, the former Secretary of State thinks it would be a good idea to ignore reality; to lay the blame for this problem at the feet of the Israelis, not the Syrian and Iranian-backed terrorists who started this war and who continue to target citizens on both sides of the conflict; and to make nice with one of two principal state-sponsors of Hezbollah's terrorism in order to insure that the Israelis get our message.

As *Weekly Standard* editor Bill Kristol noted over the weekend, Christopher's plan is "an example of the fatuousness of liberal elite opinion about the world we live in. That opinion is dominant in the Democratic party . . ." And given that Richard Holbrooke, the man who would have been John Kerry's Secretary of State, was an aide to Christopher during the Clinton administration, one might reasonably assume such fatuous opinion would have been dominant in a Kerry administration as well.

Of course, the real kicker here is that there is every reason to believe that such fatuous opinions about

how to settle disagreements between Israel and her neighbors would not have been necessary under a Kerry presidency, since there is a good chance that those disagreements would never have come to bloodshed, just as Kerry himself claimed last weekend.

It is important to remember as the fighting rages on in both Lebanon and Gaza that it is entirely unlikely that the young and untested government of Ehud Olmert would have felt quite as comfortable about launching a full-scale attack on Hezbollah, complete with attacks on Lebanon's transportation infrastructure, if it had been unsure about the response that would have come from Israel's only true ally, the United States. The fact of the matter is that Olmert and his foreign policy team understood that their actions would be met with all of the usual absurd, anti-Semitic rhetoric from all of the usual suspects. But they understood as well that none of that would matter much, given the virtual guarantee of support that would come from President George Bush.

Would Olmert have done what he did with, say, John Kerry or Al Gore in the Oval Office? It is not possible to say for certain, but we doubt it. It is likely that such a course of action would have met not with categorical support, but with immediate and repeated calls to "bring the bloodshed to an end." And faced with this inevitable outcome, Olmert likely would have understood that the battle was lost before it even began.

To take this thought one step further, one might reasonably wonder if Israel would even have been in this position in the first place if Bush weren't president. Recall that the current crisis began not with Hezbollah's murderous violation of Israeli sovereignty, but with Hamas's. Hezbollah, presumably with the support of its terror masters in Tehran and Damascus, simply copied Hamas's aggression, apparently hoping to capitalize on the Israelis' distraction.

Recall as well that Hamas was only able to launch such a murderous attack because Israel had only recently pulled its troops and settlements out of the Gaza strip. Would Hamas have been able to start this war if the Israelis still occupied Gaza? No. And would the

Israelis have pulled out of Gaza, thus setting the stage for the war if John Kerry were president? Again, the answer is probably no.

Let us explain.

When he made the decision to abandon Gaza, former Prime Minister Ariel Sharon was criticized roundly by members of his own party for giving up the longstanding Israeli "security zone" and thereby inviting Palestinian terrorists to take up positions along the border of Israel proper. It is, we believe, unlikely that Sharon, Israel's most revered and ferocious warrior, didn't understand and agree with his (former) fellow partisans that this would be the outcome. Yet he forged ahead anyway. And the question is "why?"

Obviously, Sharon himself can't say, but we would hardly be surprised if he, like so many others, believed that an eventual reckoning with the Palestinians – and by extension with their allies in Lebanon and their sponsors in Syria and Iran – was inevitable, no matter what he or any other Israeli did. After all, "land for peace" has been a disaster. The Palestinians took the land and delivered no peace. Moreover, the Iranians have extended their influence throughout the Arab and Sunni Middle East, have grown markedly closer to their goal of attaining nuclear weapons, and appear ever more convinced that the road to the Armageddon they clearly seek runs through Tel Aviv.

Does this mean Sharon needlessly precipitated a deadly conflict with Hamas? Of course not. But his plans for the future of his nation were undoubtedly calculated with strategic objectives in mind. And it is entirely possible that one of those objectives was to provide his people and his nation with the greatest odds of surviving the inevitable reckoning with those bent on their destruction.

If, upon Israeli withdrawal from Gaza, the Palestinians and their masters surprised the world, then Israel would have lost nothing. But if they played to type (as they obviously did), then Israel would have the opportunity to confront them sooner rather than later. And this would matter for a couple of reasons. First, the longer Hamas and Hezbollah were allowed to

train with and be armed by their Mullah masters, the more deadly they would become. As columnist Ross Kaminsky noted this morning, “we should be thankful that this conflict started when it did . . . Had this conflict not started for a few more years, the damage they might be doing to Israeli soldiers and Israel itself would be far greater.”

Second, had this conflict been delayed for a few more years, it would have taken place after George Bush had left the White House, when there would be a good chance that the balance of power would have been tilted away from those who understand that the ultimate goal is the defeat of the Islamists and back to those who think that goal is to “bring the bloodshed to an end,” regardless of the long-term consequences.

This brings us to the larger point about the conflict between Israel and Hamas and Hezbollah, between Israel and Syria and Iran, between the United States and Iran, and between the West and Islam. Too many of the commentators and analysts following these conflicts are concerned only with the strategic calculations being made by the bad guys. Why is Iran doing this? What does Syria stand to gain? Why did Hamas decide now was the time? What was Hezbollah thinking? How does all of this fit into the Islamists plan to destroy the West and establish Islamic supremacy?

No one, it would appear, ever stops to consider the possibility that the Israelis and the Americans might be making strategic calculations as well.

The mainstream press dismissed Sharon as a buffoon and pretends that Bush is no different than his father or even Bill Clinton, believing, in fact, that the President and his advisors are simply trying to patch things together, to hold the violence to a minimum, and to put a “lasting solution” off until some other time. The left wrote Sharon off as a “war criminal,” rejects his successor as a naïve hatemonger, and presumes that Bush is a bumbling idiot who can’t do anything right and is incapable of strategic thought. And even the hawks on the right – brilliant men like Michael Ledeen and Andy McCarthy – appear to

believe that Bush has been snookered and appears not to understand the larger implications of what is currently taking place in Lebanon, in Gaza, and even in Baghdad.

Now, we don’t pretend to have an inside track on Bush’s strategy, just as we have no information as to Olmert’s. For that matter, we have no way to prove what we believe Sharon might have been trying to do before he took ill. But we would suggest that the presumption that America and Israel have no strategy at all is just flat wrong. Given the history at work here, given Bush’s willingness to fight the good fight and Israel’s historical reputation as the world’s most effective strategic operator, to presume that the Mullahs and their clients are the only parties approaching this conflict with an eye on the broader strategic battlefield is foolish.

It may turn out that Israel’s strategy will prove ineffective against the entrenched forces of Hezbollah. It may turn out that Bush’s strategy will prove equally ineffective against the wily Mullahs. It may turn out that the Mullahs alone are prepared to fight this war as it must be fought. But to dismiss Israel and the United States simply because their strategic calculations are not as readily apparent as are the Iranians’ is a tremendous mistake.

If neither Bush nor Olmert had invested any time and effort in strategic planning, then it is unlikely that there would currently be a battle raging in Lebanon and Gaza. If Bush had no plan at all, he would have called for a ceasefire. And if Olmert had no plan at all, he would have gone along happily. That would have been the politically expedient thing for both men to do. And, over the long run, it would have been a disaster.

President Bush and his foreign policy advisers may not be the world’s greatest strategic thinkers. And they may not always do what those in the peanut gallery wish them to do. Heaven knows that they almost never do what we wish them to. But it appears to us that too many analysts and commentators think that because Bush et al. are not doing what they want them to do, then they must be doing nothing at all. And that’s just wrong.

If George W. Bush were unable or unwilling to do anything at all about the broader strategic issues in the Middle East, he would look for the easy way out. Chances are what he'd do would be to send his Secretary of State to Damascus, letting her sit for hours on the airport runway, waiting for His Excellency President Assad to deign to see her, much like Bill Clinton sent the aforementioned Warren Christopher to prostrate himself before Assad's father.

But that isn't happening. And it is unlikely to happen. Indeed, a better bet is that President Bush, Vice President Cheney, Condi Rice, Donald Rumsfeld, John Bolton and the rest of the Bush foreign and defense policy team will continue to eschew the legacies of their predecessors and will remain confident in their ability to match wits and military might with the likes of a rag tag bunch of killers, shooting rockets off the back of pickup trucks, and their puppet masters in Tehran and Damascus. And all the while they will care less about what the hopelessly toothless and aggressively anti-Israel Europeans think than would John Kerry or Al Gore or any other Democrat.

We don't know that this means that they'll win every confrontation with the enemy, but certainly they'll continue to fight and will never allow the enemy to gain simply because it's politically expedient or because they are guided by the delusion that violence can and should always be preempted by diplomacy. Unlike their Democratic, European, and United Nations critics, the Bush team understands that violence or the threat of violence is an integral part of the diplomatic process.

Last week, Glenn Reynolds (a.k.a. Instapundit) butchered the old Wynn Catlin quote, but still made an important point, noting that "Diplomacy is the art of saying 'nice doggie' while reaching for a stick." Condi is saying 'nice doggie.' Israel is the stick. One may disapprove of this strategy, but complaints that Condi isn't accomplishing anything merely indicate that the complainer doesn't know what's going on."

Sadly, there are a great many complainers who don't know what's going on. John Kerry and Warren

Christopher are just two of the more prominent complainers. All the more reason, we think, to be grateful that John Kerry is not president today. Sure, if he were, none of this would have happened. But that's not exactly a mark in his favor.

MELCHER FOR PRESIDENT.

I have been watching the early jockeying among presidential hopefuls from both parties and have decided to throw my hat into the ring. I do not intend to raise money for my campaign or to spend any of my own on it. I know this limits my chances for victory, but my confidence is bolstered by the fact that no one amongst the current competition appears to be much smarter than an eggplant.

The following is a copy of my introductory speech. It does not contain all that I have to say on my behalf. And it does not outline my position on all of the important issues. In fact, I have limited my remarks to the discussion of three domestic matters. I have chosen these specifically because I believe my views on these issues will provide some insight into my governing philosophy and to illustrate how it differs in practice from that of the other candidates. As time goes on, I plan to augment this presentation with similar speeches presenting my views on other important issues, including the war against militant Islam.

In the meantime, I trust that this initial effort will spark a groundswell of support for my candidacy that will grow as it becomes apparent that while I may not be much of a candidate, I am at least sentient, which I believe gives me a clear advantage over the others. If I win, I will, of course, give a victory speech. If I lose, I will follow in the footsteps of the last two losers, whining a great deal for years to come and blaming my loss on fraud and an ignorant populace. So here goes:

Friends, Americans, countrymen, as well as all of those illegal aliens who have figured out how to cast a vote, lend me your ears. I have come to bury the opposition candidates not to praise them. The evil that they do is evident all around us. The good is not apparent anywhere. Here are a few of the beliefs I hold that I think are pertinent to my battle for the Presidency against this band of political ne'er-do-wells and miscreants.

I'll begin with the following disclaimer. If you elect me President, I will not make the world a better place. I will do my best to make it not worse. This may seem like an odd admission, especially when juxtaposed to the gaudy promises of the other candidates. But it is a reflection of a fundamental belief of mine. Simply stated, I believe in original sin. This is, of course, considered little more than a quaint story in the post-modern world. Yet, it is also true, as G. K. Chesterton once pointed out, that original sin is the one Christian teaching for which there has always been abundant empirical evidence.

For purposes of this discussion, it doesn't matter whether I believe that the Biblical account of the incident involving Adam, Eve, a snake, and an apple actually occurred or whether I view original sin as a "poetic truth," to borrow a description from the great poet W. H. Auden. The fact is that I believe, once again to borrow from Auden, that "man is a fallen creature with a natural bias to do evil," as opposed to the alternative belief, made popular by the 18th century French radical Jean Jacques Rousseau and considered to be gospel by modern day liberals, that "men are good by nature and made bad by society."

While it may not seem immediately evident, you should consider this to be an important distinction when selecting a president, for the liberal view inevitably leads to continual efforts to improve the lot of mankind by attempting to improve society via the construction of an ever larger and more powerful federal government.

My view is that these schemes, which fall far outside the traditional role of government, inevitably do more harm than good. As with original sin, there is abundant empirical evidence to support my position. Two of the most fertile sources of such evidence can be found by studying the terribly debilitating impact on America's African-American community of the giant welfare programs that began in the 1960s, as well as the massive destruction that the expenditure of huge amounts of Federal money has wreaked upon the American public education system.

And this leads me to my first campaign promise, namely that, if elected, I will not propose any new federal programs or new agencies. In fact, I will oppose any that are proposed by others and will constantly strive to eliminate those that exist.

If this is worrisome to those who fear that the federal government under my direction would "abandon the poor and the needy across the globe," as well as its ability to provide those government services to which Americans have become accustomed, my response can be summed up in two words, "chill out." There are enough large and powerful, federal social engineering programs in existence right now to screw up the lives of every human being on earth many times over. And there is absolutely no chance whatsoever that I, as President, could actually slow any one of them down, much less abolish one.

These organizations and the bureaucracy that manages them are unassailable. In the early 20th century, the great German political economists and sociologist, Max Weber, predicted that the bureaucracy would grow so large in the years ahead that one day it would trap humanity in an "iron cage" of "rational control," creating a "polar night of icy darkness." He outlined in detail why this was unavoidable and why, once established, the resultant bureaucracy would be impossible to destroy.

I won't bore you here with details of his insights, but will simply note that Weber suggested that the correct response to this troubling circumstance would be to make certain that control of these bureaucratic organizations would be in the hands of leaders who would act under non-bureaucratic principles. This may not be apparent to all of you, but it is nevertheless true that I am the only candidate for President who meets this requirement; that is, the only one who would not instinctively seek a bureaucratic solution to every problem I faced as president.

It is now time to outline my position on a few of the specific issues that are thought to be most important by the other candidates, the mainstream media, and by

extension the public. I will begin with some thoughts on what has become known as “pork,” or to be more precise, the practice of quietly adding pet projects known as “earmarks” to various appropriation bills.

This is, as you know, a *cause célèbre* of Senator John McCain. His frontrunner status for the nomination by the Republican Party and his celebrity status among journalists and pundits has assured that all of the other candidates in the race now maintain that they are as ardently against this nefarious procedure as McCain is. My position is that this is much ado about nothing; the kind of thing that poor politicians focus on because they are too stupid or too timid to address the more important and more complicated issues.

Now don't get me wrong. I am not a big fan of “pork,” or “earmarks” or whatever term is used to describe this practice. But of all the things that the federal government does beyond the role originally assigned to it by the founding fathers, this one is, in my opinion, the least offensive.

Here's the deal. Citizens of the states pay money to the federal government in the form of taxes. An astonishing amount of this money is wasted, pure and simple. As I indicated above, even more is spent on programs that actually do a great deal of harm to the nation and to its citizens. In light of this irrefutable fact, it seems to me that while building a bridge to nowhere in Alaska may not be the best expenditure of money, it is certainly not the worst. Nor is the expenditure of federal money on an aquarium in Connecticut or a swimming pool in California.

These “pork” expenditures are, by their nature, aimed at financing some specific project that some representative or group of representatives from a given state have determined that a great many citizens of that state deem to be worthwhile. This may be a poor way to finance projects whose merit is generally confined to a single state. But given the huge and oppressive power of the federal establishment, this practice can be seen as a small, even pathetic attempt to see that a tiny portion of the vast sums of money that the citizens of each state send to Washington

each year is spent on something that makes at least a modicum of sense.

I think of it this way: “Pork” is the average citizen's way of saying, “Maybe you big shots in Washington with your big plans and big ideas could build us a nice swimming pool out here for our kids to swim in, or perhaps an aquarium for our kids to visit, as a small token of your appreciation for the billions of dollars of our hard earned money that you dribble away each year on programs that no one around here gives a tinker's dam for and more often than not does us harm.

So, with that said, the second campaign promise I will make is that if you elect me President I will aggressively try to lower your federal taxes. But failing that, I will do all I can to expand, not limit, the amount of federal funds that are spent on “pork” projects, reflecting my belief that, for example, it would be preferable to cover all of Alaska with bridges to nowhere than to provide Kofi Anan's United Nations with a single dollar to spend on projects and programs that are either a total waste of time or are anathema to America's interests in the world.

And while I'm discussing one of John McCain's billboard issues, I may as well say a few words about another example of his sophomoric understanding of the rudiments of American government. I am referring, of course, to his efforts to place limits on the ability of citizens to influence Washington policy makers by the use of campaign contributions.

Where John McCain sees evil “special interests,” I see groups of ordinary citizens pooling their funds in a desperate effort to protect themselves and their interests from the growing power of the Federal Leviathan. Where John McCain sees a system corrupted by money, I see a system corrupted by the concentration of enormous power in Washington.

Virtually every single one of the hundreds upon hundreds of “special interest groups” that McCain decries traces its origins to some sort of legislation

or regulation that gave the federal government added power over another group of individuals, whether they be doctors, lawyers, natural gas producers, oil drillers, farmers, insurance companies, independent gas station operators, truck stop owners, restaurateurs, building contractors, the elderly, abortion clinics, opponents of abortion clinics, gun owners, gun haters, tree huggers, paper manufacturers, money managers, chemical companies, software producers, and writers of political newsletters whose kids need shoes.

There isn't a person or group of persons in America that isn't represented in Washington by at least one "special interest" lobbying organization, and most are represented, in one way or another, by hundreds. In fact, to fail to have one's interests actively represented in Washington would be a form of madness. How long would virtually any small company, or small industry in this nation survive if it didn't have an organization in Washington to help assure that it wasn't put out of business by some loony regulation from the EPA, OSHA, HUD, CPSC, FDA, the IRS or any one of hundreds of other regulatory bodies?

In fact, given the stakes involved it shouldn't surprise anyone that the system is a breeding ground for corruption; or, to put it another way, that the line is becoming increasingly blurred between corruption and the time-honored, legitimate process of contributing money to politicians and to political campaigns. But the answer is not to deny citizens the right to protect themselves from the madness of their own government. It is to limit the power of the government, so these efforts wouldn't be necessary.

John McCain argues that everything would be fine if campaigns were financed by small contributors and out of the liberal piggy bank called "general revenues." Then, says he, no one could buy influence, and government decisions would be made on the basis of the "common good." The problem with this is, of course, that the definition of "common good" would be decided by the same bureaucrats who have demonstrated an unflinching instinct to mandate one disastrous scheme after another.

Being a bureaucrat in America today is never having to say you're sorry for destroying families with pernicious welfare programs, for wrecking the educational and legal systems with crackpot experiments and the imposition of politically correct nonsense, and for thousands upon thousands of other asinine rules that are based on bad science, bad sociology, and bad economics, all hiding behind the hubristic mask of "we're here to help you."

One can only imagine what these "New Utopians" would do if the targets of their madcap schemes were prevented from pooling their resources to fight back. Ordinary citizens are already at a clear disadvantage in this war and losing battles daily.

If you elect me President, I will do all I can to limit the ability of the federal government to interfere with your life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness and I will defend your right to petition government in any way you see fit. I will push for complete freedom of any and all citizens to give all the money they want to any politician or political party, so long as all such transactions are part of the public record. That is called "daylight" and it is a much more effective remedy for widespread corruption than some complicated new regulatory twist that emanates from the feverish mind of John McCain.

I will now briefly turn my attention to the on-going debate over immigration policy. From the manner in which the other presidential aspirants wax on and on about their personal feelings toward the subject of immigrants and immigration, they seem to think that the law provides the President with a very wide range of options when it comes to dealing with individuals who are in this country illegally. This is nonsense.

The President is obligated to enforce the laws of the nation. There is nothing ambiguous about this obligation or about the definition of the word illegal. If I am elected President, my actions on this issue will not reflect my personal views as to the correctness of the law. I will enforce the law. This means that I will do everything in my power to get the "illegals" out of here and to prevent new "illegals" from coming

in, always acting with prudence and common sense as a recognition of my concomitant duty to maintain domestic tranquility.

Among other things, I will continue to strengthen border enforcement until I am satisfied that additional measures will no longer reap proportional benefits. I will do everything possible to eliminate bureaucratic barriers to the expeditious enforcement of the deportation statutes. I will strongly encourage local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies to enforce all the laws that lessen the attractiveness of living in the United States as an illegal immigrant, including the bans on employment. I will come down hard on a few of the most blatant scofflaws of these employment laws among the business community with large, even debilitating fines, as a method of notifying other businesses of the seriousness of ignoring these laws.

Over time, I believe that this would reduce the attractiveness of both entering the United States illegally and living here illegally, which is the only sure

way of stopping the flow. I would assume that as this process continued, we would gain real time insights into the actual importance of illegal immigrants to the U.S. economy. In fact, I believe that this would provide a much better means of determining this than the on-going dialogue, which appears to be based on a lot of hypothetical nonsense. At some point in the process then, I would work with Congress to make appropriate changes in the laws in accordance with the actual experience of enforcing them, which seems never to have been considered by previous presidents of either party.

Thank you for your time and attention. You need not send money for, as I said earlier, I do not intend to spend any. Advice on my campaign and moral support for the arduous journey to the White House that lies ahead is always welcome. If you wish to have a bumper sticker or a T-shirt made in support of my campaign, my official and might I add, catchy, campaign slogan is: "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Monica Lewinski."

Copyright 2006. 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.