

Mark L. Melcher Publisher
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

Stephen R. Soukup Editor
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

In this Issue

The West In Extremis.

He's Heavy. He's My Husband.

THEY SAID IT

We're accustomed to associating hatred of Jews with the ridiculed Neanderthal Right of those in sheets and jackboots. But this new venom, at least in its Western form, is mostly a leftwing, and often an academic, enterprise. It's also far more insidious, given the left's moral pretensions and its influence in the prestigious media and universities. We see the unfortunate results in frequent anti-Israeli demonstrations on campuses that conflate Israel with Nazis, while the media have published fraudulent pictures and slanted events in southern Lebanon.

The renewed hatred of Jews in the Middle East - and the indifference to it in the West - is a sort of "post anti-Semitism." Islamic zealots supply the old venomous hatred, while affluent and timid Westerners provide the new necessary indifference - if punctuated by the occasional off-the-cuff Amen in the manner of a Louis Farrakhan or Mel Gibson outburst.

The dangers of this post anti-Semitism is not just that Jews are shot in Europe and the United States - or that a drunken celebrity or demagogue mouths off. Instead, ever so insidiously, radical Islam's hatred of Jews is becoming normalized.

The result is that the world's politicians and media are talking seriously with those who not merely want back the West Bank, but rather want an end to Israel altogether and everyone inside it.

--Victor Davis Hanson, "The New Anti-Semitism," Tribune Media Services, September 28, 2006.

THE WEST IN EXTREMIS.

In the ten years immediately following the collapse of the Soviet Union, there was a great deal of speculation among geopolitical analysts and theorists about the fate of those institutions that grew out of World War II and gave shape to the conflicts that so dominated the nearly half century that followed. Most of this conjecture ended abruptly on September 11, 2001, when the world's focus shifted to seemingly more pertinent matters and many of the institutions in question found fresh justifications for their existence.

Unfortunately, this short-circuiting of the discussion about the continued relevancy of these institutions has done serious damage to the United States and to some of its allies by allowing some of these organizations to live on after having outlived their utility and by putting others, which should be salvaged, in danger of being sacrificed in the name of convenience and indifference.

Consider, for example, the fate of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which was established in 1949 to stem Soviet expansion in Europe. One might have thought that the end of the Cold War and the collapse of NATO's specific Soviet foil, the Warsaw Pact, would have ended the need for such an organization. Yet it persisted and, indeed, persists to this day.

Certainly, there is nothing wrong in principle with the organization or with enduring alliances in general. But the elimination of the threat that bound Europe to the United States changed NATO in many ways, some of which have hindered or even harmed American interests in the post-Cold War and post-9/11 eras. During the 1990s, it became clear not only that the United States and her erstwhile European allies no longer shared the same basic national interests, but no longer even shared the same basic vision of the world. When Europe decided to police the break-up of what was then Yugoslavia, it found that it was unable to do so without the support of the American military. Indeed, the campaigns in the Balkans demonstrated unmistakably that the respective members of NATO no longer held remotely comparable beliefs, nor even remotely comparable capabilities.

While these differences likely exacerbated the suffering in the Balkans, it is only since 9/11 and, indeed, over the last two years in particular, that the real costs of NATO's post-Cold War evolution have become clear. Of late, the mainstream press has often suggested that the forgotten Afghan front in the "War on Terror" is going just as poorly as is the war in Iraq. What it nearly always fails to mention is that the principal reason for this is that responsibility for actions in Afghanistan has been turned over by the United States to its "allies" in NATO, and that these "allies" are proving themselves remarkably incapable of maintaining any semblance of order or stability.

Near the end of last month, Gerard Baker, the United States editor of *The Times* of London, told the following story:

Late last year, at the invitation of Nato, and in the company of a small band of globetrotting pundits, I travelled to

Afghanistan to witness first-hand the allied operation to reconstruct the benighted country.

After a day of briefings in Kabul, our friendly Nato hosts flew us by military transport to Herat, on the western border with Iran. We were due to spend a day touring a Nato post in the city and then fly back that evening to the capital. But the Danish plane that had taken us developed propeller problems and was grounded. As we cooled our heels outside the airfield, we waited for word of the aircraft that was supposed to come for us: a German C-130.

It soon became clear that the replacement plane was not coming. The reason, it turned out, was that the Germans would not fly in the dark. German aircraft are not permitted by their national rules to undertake night flights . . . The Germans are not alone. Many of the European nations with forces in Afghanistan are operating under similarly ludicrous restrictions.

Indeed, the Germans are not even the worst of NATO's "allies" when it comes to engaging the enemy. On September 13, the Norwegian newspaper *Aftenposten* reported on a growing rift between the Norwegian contingent in Afghanistan and NATO's command structure, i.e. the United States. According to the paper, "NATO wants to shift more force to fight the Taliban in the area and sketched out a draft order that would move Norway's Quick Reaction Force from the north to Kandahar in the troubled south. There it would relieve an allied watch force which in turn would join the fight against the Taliban." Of course, the problem with Norway's "Quick Reaction Force" is that it is neither authorized nor trained and equipped to "respond" to anything. The paper continued:

"This was an assignment not in keeping with the what the Norwegian soldiers were sent to Afghanistan to do," brigadier Gunnar Gustavsen, chief of staff at the

Joint Defense operative headquarters, told *Aftenposten* . . . Norway has made it clear that its forces in Afghanistan are not sufficiently trained to take part in combat and not properly equipped to do so either.

All of this discussion about NATO and its role in Afghanistan took place in the context of a resurgent threat from the Taliban and an attendant reexamination of that battlefield. As it turns out, the reexamination turned up an ugly truth about Afghanistan and its Western “defenders,” what Gerard Baker called, the “tragicomic spectacle of European NATO countries lining up to decline politely the request to beef up their forces in Afghanistan....” American and British forces have been requesting additional support from their NATO allies for over a year now, yet only Canada has offered to increase its commitment.

For fifty-plus years, the United States served as Europe’s protector. But in the post-Cold War world, Europe has endeavored to dissociate itself from American goals and, more tragically, to abandon its commitments at the first request for reciprocal aid. The Warsaw Pact folded when the Soviet empire fell. It now seems possible that the lone tragedy of that collapse was that NATO did not dissolve as well.

Of course, for post-World War II institutions that have outlived their utility and have thus become a burden on the United States, NATO can’t hold a proverbial candle to the United Nations. We won’t bore you by repeating that “august” organization’s history of disgrace, but it should suffice to say that the long list of infamies – including chronic anti-Semitism, aggressive anti-Americanism, financial fraud, deep-seated corruption, sexual abuse of minors, sexual slavery, and a host of others – should give some of the world’s leaders pause to question its suitability as a proxy global government. But that’s hardly been the case. If anything, since 9/11 the United Nations has become even more powerful and more esteemed among the elites of Europe and North America. And that seems unlikely to change, even as the list of scandals and abuses grows.

Last week, according to the BBC, the United Nations insisted that “the world body [read: the United States and Great Britain] must abandon efforts to pressure Sudan to accept UN peacekeepers in Darfur.”

Apparently, American and British efforts to halt the slaughter in Darfur are “counterproductive” in the words of “deputy secretary general Mark Malloch Brown,” and the region would be better served by the involvement of “major Arab and African states, as well as China.”

Of course, the United Nations’ penchant for sanctioning genocide such as is taking place in Darfur is hardly new, as *The Times* of London documented yesterday. To wit:

Srebrenica is rarely mentioned nowadays in Annan’s offices on the 38th floor of the UN secretariat building in New York. He steps down in December after a decade as secretary-general. His retirement will be marked by plaudits. But behind the honorifics and the accolades lies a darker story: of incompetence, mismanagement and worse. Annan was the head of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) between March 1993 and December 1996. The Srebrenica massacre of up to 8,000 men and boys and the slaughter of 800,000 people in Rwanda happened on his watch. In Bosnia and Rwanda, UN officials directed peacekeepers to stand back from the killing, their concern apparently to guard the UN’s status as a neutral observer. This was a shock to those who believed the UN was there to help them . . . Arguably, a trial of the UN would be more apt than a leaving party.

The charge sheet would include guarding its own interests over those it supposedly protects; endemic opacity and lack of accountability; obstructing investigations, promoting the inept and marginalising the dedicated.

The UN was, of course, founded in 1945 by the victorious allies (Britain, France, the United States, and the Soviet Union) to bring order back to a chaotic world. As the *Times* notes, the UN's own charter declares that its mission is to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights". It has manifestly failed in these aims, particularly since the end of the Cold War. Even to suggest so, however, is to marginalize oneself in the "global community," which has, despite all of the evidence suggesting that the opposite course would be prudent, invested greater moral authority in the disgraced body since 9/11.

Not so long ago, then-North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms succeeded in at least temporarily denying the United Nations its slush fund (also known as America's "UN dues") because of its inherent corruption. In the decade since, the United Nations has only grown more corrupt and more hostile to American interests, yet today even Helms would fail miserably to elicit even the mildest rebuke of the body from the global elites.

But while the United Nations and NATO continue to solidify their status in the post-9/11 world, all the while damaging American interests, there is one post-World War II institution of which the global community has clearly tired. And as best we can tell, there is only one such institution; the one whose founding was perhaps the most important and morally consequential upshot of Allied victory over Nazi Germany; the one whose very existence serves as a testament to man's ability to overcome even the most horrific of tragedies; and the one that has unequivocally and unflinchingly stood by the United States through good times and bad. On the off chance you haven't yet figured it out, we are referring to the state of Israel.

Though Israel is not often designated as a post-World War II institutional construct, that is precisely what it is, or at least what it was before it became the only democracy in the Middle East, one of the most innovative and advanced nation's on earth, and one of the United States' most trusted allies. It was a nation founded specifically to provide a sanctuary and homeland to the most obvious victims of the war

(not to mention centuries of other abuse) but which has, as noted by Victor Davis Hanson in the same piece from which the "They Said It" quote above is drawn, evolved into convenient concentration of Jews for the radical Islamists to carry out "their own Final Solution."

Meanwhile the rest of the world sits idly by, protesting that defending Israel is simply too hard and complicated, or conceding the Islamists' argument that the Jews don't belong in the Middle East, or worse yet, deluding themselves that this time the bad guys don't really mean it when they say that they will "exterminate the Jewish race."

As we have noted for well over three years now (and as Hanson reiterates above), the anti-Semitism that was once the province of the political right has today been relegated almost exclusively to the political left. And some on the left argue that they oppose Israel merely because its "lobby" is too strong and that American politicians therefore unduly favor Israel and exacerbate Muslim grievances. Many take that case a step further arguing that the "neocons" who control American foreign policy cannot be trusted and are either agents of the Zionist conspiracy or, at the very least, men with questionable allegiances.

Others contend simply that Muslim grievances are, at heart, legitimate and that Israel should not exist where it does. They argue as *The Washington Post's* uber-establishment columnist Richard Cohen did this past summer that "Israel itself is a mistake."

Still others cling to the idea that the radical millenarian cult that governs Iran doesn't really mean Israel any harm and that it can and should be trusted with nuclear weapons since, after all, Israel has them. Those who mocked the idea of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) for decades while it nevertheless deterred Soviet nuclear aggression, are new converts to the theory, arguing that the Iranians would never use a nuclear bomb for fear that Israel would retaliate. What they choose to ignore is that the Iranian leaders actually yearn for such destruction and chaos and have unabashedly conceded that they would be willing to trade nuclear strikes with Israel, fully aware that one bomb could destroy Israel entirely.

To save Israel, to come to an ally's aid, to keep the promise that we will "never again" allow genocide to be perpetrated against the Jews is, for many on the left, simply too much trouble. Moreover, it's the kind of trouble that would be supported by George W. Bush, and, as such, must be avoided at all costs.

Back in 1998, when we began thinking about the post-World War II institutions and their relevance in the wake of the Soviet Union's collapse, we felt reasonably comfortable that the one such institution that would survive was Israel. After all, Israel was celebrating her 50th birthday and, in the process, reminding the world of the remarkable progress she had made in just half-a-century.

Today, however, that picture has been turned completely upside down. Israel is, in the eyes of many Westerners, expendable. Meanwhile, the institutions that should, by rights, be allowed to wither away, are invested with even greater resources and greater moral authority, all of which they use to help ensure that Israel is, indeed, lost to the world.

In the wake of 9/11, analysts and pundits liked to talk about how "everything has changed." They were wrong. Very little has changed. One thing that did change, though, was global attitudes about Israel, the United Nations, NATO and a handful of other post-World War II constructs. Unfortunately, these attitudes did not change for the better, and the moral and psychological sloth that have been characteristic of much of the West for the last half century now threaten the single such institution that should be preserved at all costs.

HE'S HEAVY. HE'S MY HUSBAND.

Whenever we see Bill Clinton in full dudgeon, as we did last week on Fox News, we are reminded how good he has been to us, to the Republican Party, and yes, to the country. If this sounds incongruous, let us explain.

For eight years, he was to us what George III was to John Wolcot, the British satirist who wrote under the pen name Peter Pindar and was famous for his

humorous and biting comments about the eccentric British King. According to one story, an elderly woman once stopped Wolcot on the street and asked him if he did not think that he was "a very bad subject of our most pious King George." To which Wolcot replied, "I do not know anything about that, Madam, but I do know the king has been a devilish good subject for me." And such has Bill been for us.

As for Bill's contribution to the GOP, during his eight years in the White House he decimated the Democratic Party, reducing it from decades of high privilege and majority status to a backbench hodgepodge of left wing snollygosters. Like St. Patrick, who drove the snakes out of Ireland, Bill rid the American heartland of millions of Democrats. He failed to drive them into the sea, but he herded them into small, crowded enclaves on the two coasts, causing them to begin the destructive process of incestuous intellectual inbreeding, which continues today to threaten the long-term existence of their party.

As for the nation, Bill personalized the decay that had been eating away at the social fabric since the 1960s. Most Americans noticed with alarm that corruption, post-modernist claptrap, attacks on the traditional family, and disregard for the sanctity of human life had been growing around them for years like scum on a stagnant pond. But they didn't fully understand it and were not sure what to do about it. Those who tried were publicly pilloried, derided as politically incorrect bigots, right wing fanatics, and religious nuts.

Then Bill came onto the scene with his entourage of small town shysters, sharpies, fly-by-nighters, fibbertigibbets, savings and loan robbers, international thieves, impoverished Buddhist nuns with big checkbooks, Chinese spies, crooked arms dealers, dope peddlers, union plug-uglies, commodity market crooks, harridans, harpies, perjurers, liars, corrupt real estate magnets, porn peddlers, and of course, Hillary. And millions of ordinary Americans began to better understand the threat to their country that was emanating from the extremists on the left who were bent on destroying the America that they loved.

Before Bill, this threat had been an abstraction for most. He gave it a face, a persona. And Americans from all walks of life joined together under the banner of respect for traditional American values, for long-revered religious beliefs, for life, and for the American family. They refused to accept the propositions, which were central to Bill's presidency, that truth is subjective, that morality as defined for thousands of years is not a necessary ingredient in leadership, and that patriotism is passé. Bill didn't bring the decay with him. It was already ubiquitous. But he personalized it. Indeed, he reveled in it, and in doing so, he rallied ordinary Americans from all walks of life to take a stand against the forces of darkness.

For this, the nation should be eternally thankful to the "Man from Hope." But he has one more job to perform before he can join the ranks of those whose names will forever be enshrined among the great heroes of American conservatism. He must destroy the political career of the woman whom the irrepressible and always brilliant Wlady Pleszczynski of the old *American Spectator* used to call "Bill's lovely wife Bruno."

It won't be good enough for Bill to destroy her presidency, should she be elected. Four years of Hillary would be too painful for the nation, even if she performed the same good deeds that her husband did, providing grist for our weekly musings, strengthening the GOP's majority on Capitol Hill and in state houses across the nation, and alerting citizens to the threat presented by the extreme form of liberalism that she and her husband represent. For lasting fame, Bill needs to destroy her before she gains the Oval Office.

He can do it. To paraphrase the great Orestes Brownson, he can bind on his tunic of coarse serge, and feed on water in which pulse has been boiled, as did Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, or sew himself up in a suit of leather, as did the sturdy old George Fox, and ask not what his age wants, but what it needs, not what it will reward, but what, without which, it cannot be saved. He can do it.

Indeed, he has already begun work on this great, final Herculean task to which he has been summoned by fate. The world witnessed him pursuing this labor just last week when he appeared on Fox News, reprising his world's famous, finger-shaking performance, which he perfected during the Monica Lewinski affair. It was a sight to behold, to never forget, to relate to one's grandchildren one day in the future when the grinders cease because they are few, and those that look out of the windows be darkened. Like the great 18th century evangelist George Whitefield whose oratorical powers were said to be so great that he could reduce listeners to tears by simply uttering the word "Mesopotamia," Bill frowned and wagged his finger and conservative hearts throughout the nation were filled with joy, sheer joy. "He's back," they cried.

He can do it. He hasn't lost his touch. In a flash, last week, he not only reminded Americans once again of the unusual marital arrangement that the lady who would be president shares with her priapic husband, but he also shifted the news spotlight onto the subject of terrorism and the defense, which are problems for Miss Hillary, whose zest for martial matters ebbs and flows with the polls. Moreover, his performance on Fox News forced her to appear on the national stage and to refer to Bill as "my husband," and once again, as in those bitter day of yore, to defend him. Oh the joy!

But this was a mere dart in Bill's quiver of sturdy arrows that can be aimed at the lady's presidential prospects. Indeed, he has numerous other on-going projects to that end. Among these, according to pundit Dick Morris, are his dealings with the emir of Dubai, Sheik Mohammed Bin Rashid Al Maktoum. Morris described it this way in a September 21 article in the *New York Post*.

Last February, Sen. Clinton was out front in condemning DP World, a Dubai government owned company seeking to take over key operations at American ports. But, at the same time, Bill was advising the emir to hire his former press secretary, Joe Lockhart, to get the deal approved.

Back then, Lockhart denied working for the emir. And when Bill's role became public, Hillary claimed that she had no idea that he had any involvement in DP World issues. Now, it turns out that the emir's Dubai International Capital Corp. hired Lockhart's company, Glover Park group, last April to help with another U.S. deal – a takeover of two defense firms (Besides Lockhart, Glover Park's partners also include Hillary's chief political gurus, Howard Wolfson and Gigi Georges. Dubai paid the firm \$100,000 for its services.)

Oddly, the lobbying came through a California law firm – Morrison, Foerster. One of that firm's partners is Raj Tanden – whose sister is Neera Tanden, Sen. Clinton's former legislative director and still a top Hillary advisor.

No six degrees of separation here.

Morris told a group of conservative bloggers last week that in his opinion this will be “the major scandal” of the 2008 presidential campaign. Frankly, we doubt that it will be the scandal of the campaign. But the following from the same story provides some meat to his prediction.

The relationship between the Clintons and the emir has long been too close to avoid scrutiny. Something is driving up Bill and Hillary's net worth pretty dramatically. In 2003, Sen. Clinton disclosed assets of at least

\$352,000 but less than \$3.8 million. By 2005, she was declaring assets in the \$10 million to \$50 million range. What caused the jump? It might have been Dubai.

Frankly, we think Bill can and will do better. He is, after all, driven by devils that have forced lesser men than he to perform astonishing deeds in the name of vanity, greed, and political power. It is too early to tell which past or future foible or action of Bill's will be the most glorious. It is enough to know that Hillary must pursue her arduous journey to the White House with him at her side.

Like the old joke about the golfer who told of the terrible trials he suffered when his best friend died of a heart attack on the fifth tee, “Hit the ball, drag Ernie. Hit the ball, drag Ernie,” Hillary will have to drag Bill's legacy with her from town to town, city to city, speech to speech; a living legacy at that, one that constantly stacks new outrages onto the sordid foundation of old ones as Bill vainly pursues the impossible dream of changing his image from an amusing buffoon to “the highly respected former president.”

We have enormous confidence that Bill will continue to serve the conservative cause as he has in the past. Hillary will try desperately to keep him under control between now and November 2008. But as he has demonstrated many times in the past, he is a tough dog to keep on the porch. She failed miserably in the past when she slept just down the hall from him at the White House. She has little chance now that they are rarely in the same town at the same time.

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.