

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

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

## THEY SAID IT

Urgent actions are needed to prevent a nuclear 9/11. Terrorists are actively seeking nuclear weapons and the materials to make them. With the needed nuclear materials in hand, making at least a crude nuclear bomb, capable of turning the heart of any modern city into a smoking ruin, is potentially within the capabilities of a sophisticated terrorist group. Yet scores of sites where the essential ingredients of nuclear weapons exist, in dozens of countries around the world, are clearly not well enough secured to defeat the kinds of threats that terrorists and criminals have demonstrated they can pose.

“Securing the Bomb, 2006,” Matthew Bunn and Anthony Wier, Project on Managing the Atom, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, July 2006.

## LEARNING TO LOVE THE BOMB.

The time is approaching when Americans will have to begin to consider what they should do to prepare for a world in which the use of nuclear weapons by America’s enemies is not just possible but probable. We are not thinking here about building bomb shelters and teaching school children to crawl under the desks in anticipation of a nuclear holocaust of the kind depicted in the book “On the Beach,” in which all of civilization is destroyed. We are thinking more in terms of considering how to protect one’s assets in a world in which the economic status quo is suddenly severely disrupted for a significant period of time, a highly confused world of the kind that would make the post-9/11 period look like a grade school evacuation drill.

More importantly, we are suggesting that Americans are going to have to begin to get themselves mentally ready to fight back with the kind of deadly force and calloused fierceness that will be required to destroy an enemy that is capable of using nuclear weapons or providing such weapons to groups that will do so.

We are not saying here that a nuclear strike against targets on the U.S. mainland or against its interests abroad is inevitable, only that it is growing increasingly probable every day and that there is nothing in the works, politically or socially, that is likely to change this trend line for the better any time soon.

Last week, FBI Director Robert Mueller told a conference in Miami that “by some estimates, there is enough highly enriched uranium in global stockpiles to construct thousands of nuclear weapons.” And then he added, matter-of-factly, that the “*economics of supply and demand dictate that someone, somewhere, will provide nuclear material to the highest bidder, and that material will end up in the hands of terrorists.*” (Emphasis added.) His remarks were accompanied by similar warnings from Attorney General Gonzales, which included the following.

### In this Issue

Learning to Love the Bomb.

It’s the Integration, Stupid.

We know, for example, that Al Qaeda has been trying to acquire or make nuclear weapons for over ten years. Indeed, Usama Bin Laden has indicated that he considers the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction to be an obligation for his followers. And the discovery of A.Q. Khan's clandestine nuclear trafficking network demonstrates that the international black market for nuclear weaponry includes both buyers and sellers.

Acquisition of even a small nuclear weapon would provide terrorists with devastating destructive power: The Report of our 9/11 Commission points out that a trained nuclear engineer with an amount of highly enriched uranium or plutonium about the size of a grapefruit or an orange, together with commercially available material, could fashion a nuclear device that could fit in a van like the one Ramzi Yousef parked in the garage of the World Trade Center in 1993. Such a bomb would level Lower Manhattan.

But, of course, the nuclear threat is not confined to terrorist groups with bombs the size of a grapefruit or an orange. North Korea already has nuclear weapons despite pledges by both Presidents Clinton and Bush not to allow this to happen. It is questionable whether North Korea would actually use a nuclear weapon against any of its enemies, but there is little question that it would supply nuclear technology and materials to enemies of its enemies, all of whom are enemies of the United States. Indeed, it probably already has.

Russia also has nuclear weapons and while it has, by all accounts, improved its nuclear security in the past decade or so, its nuclear facilities are a long way from being secure and it looks increasingly as though nuclear security is not a high priority of the thugs who are in charge of the government there. A study entitled "Securing the Bomb 2006," published last July by the Kennedy School of Government, offered the following doleful observation.

Only modest progress has been made [in Russia] in consolidating nuclear weapons and weapons-usable materials into a smaller number of sites and in putting in place effective and effectively enforced nuclear security rules. And while the United States is paying to install effective, modern security and accounting equipment, that equipment will not provide high security unless nascent efforts to forge a strong "security culture" succeed, so that guards no longer patrol without ammunition in their guns and staff no longer turn off intrusion detectors or prop open security doors. Finally, whether Russia will provide the resources, incentives, and organizations needed to sustain high levels of security after international assistance phases out remains very much an open question; to date, Russian government funding for nuclear security remains far below what is needed.

Indeed, Russia is the principle supplier of nuclear assistance to Iran, which is determined to obtain the capability of producing large nuclear weapons that can be used to destroy Israel, a move that would certainly bring a nuclear response from Israel that would devastate large areas of the Middle East, which would not only kill and injure a great many people but would also disrupt the flow of oil from that region for a long time.

And while President Bush talks tough, it seems ever more apparent that he is all whistle and no steam when it comes to honoring his pledge to use any means necessary to keep Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. Moreover, it appears that the Iranian leadership is even more convinced of Bush's timidity than we are, which, whether the President knows it or not, significantly decreases the effectiveness of his tough guy rhetoric.

It is possible, of course, that President Bush is simply exhausting all peaceful means of keeping nuclear weapons out of Iranian hands and that he will take decisive military action if necessary to prevent a nuclear armed Iran in the event that sanctions and covert efforts to bring down the government

there fail. But his reluctance to offer even minor military responses to Iran's constant and aggressive interference in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Lebanon, and now Gaza does little to support the belief that he has the grit to move boldly against Iran if it does not cease its nuclear ambitions.

In any case, even if Iran halts its efforts to build a bomb, it would still have the wherewithal to provide materials and technology to terrorist groups for use against the United States, Israel, or any of their various enemies in the Middle East. And there can be no doubt that it would do so.

Pakistan, of course, already has nuclear weapons, and while President Musharraf has decided for now that his personal well being is best served by being a "friend" of the United States, his country is to Al Qaeda what a sewer is to a city rat, a great place to relax between nighttime excursions into the kitchen of the local McDonalds.

It is comforting to believe that Pakistan is and will always be a firm friend of the United States and that its nuclear weapons and technology are safe in the hands of our "good friend," President Musharraf. But this is a shaky assumption at best. It is worth noting in this context that the above-mentioned A. Q. Kahn, the founder of Pakistan's nuclear program, is considered to be a national hero in Pakistan, not only for his success in making Pakistan the proud owner of the first "Islamic bomb," but also because of his clandestine and illegal efforts to provide nuclear technology to Iran, Libya, and North Korea. Kahn, by the way, was pardoned for this transgression of the law by none other than President Musharraf. It is also worth noting that if Musharraf fails to escape the next assassination attempt, it is unlikely that his successor will be as well disposed toward U.S. interests in the region as he has been.

Relative to Pakistan's nuclear security, the above-cited paper from the JFK schools notes the following.

In the rest of the world [outside of Russia], there is even less good news. At many sites around the world, weapons-usable nuclear

material remains dangerously vulnerable to either outsider or insider theft, even though many countries have strengthened their nuclear security rules since 9/11. Civilian facilities such as research reactors often have little more security than a night watchman and a chain-link fence. *Pakistan's stockpiles remain an urgent concern: while heavily guarded, they face immense threats, from armed remnants of al Qaeda to nuclear insiders with a proven willingness to sell nuclear weapons technology.* [Emphasis added.]

Of course, U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies are working diligently with America's friends and allies around the world to control this situation, and, without question they are doing this job well. Our concern is that it doesn't matter how well it is done, that these measures are, by their very nature, insufficient; that they are reactive, taken, for the most part, to prevent an event that has already been set in motion. The inherent problem that this presents is evident in the cliché, oft-stated by terrorism experts, "that we have to get it right every time, the terrorist only has to get it right once." It is also evident in the similarly oft-stated cliché, favored by terrorism experts, "that it isn't a question of whether another major terrorist attack will occur, but when."

It took President Bush about one year after the 9/11 attacks to recognize this problem. His solution was contained in a 23-page document, released in mid-September 2002, entitled, "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America." The centerpiece of this strategic outline was a policy of "preemption," which was supported by the contention that the threat against the United States has changed markedly in recent years as a result of new technologies coming into the hands of the nation's enemies. The following quotes from various Presidential speeches on the subject of preemption provide the framework for strategy.

The gravest danger to freedom lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology—when that occurs, even

weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations. Our enemies have declared this very intention, and have been caught seeking these terrible weapons. They want the capability to blackmail us, or to harm us, or to harm our friends – and we will oppose them with all our power....

We must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies and friends....

For centuries, international law recognized that nations need not suffer an attack before they can lawfully take action to defend themselves against forces that present an imminent danger of attack. Legal scholars and international jurists often conditioned the legitimacy of preemption on the existence of an imminent threat—most often a visible mobilization of armies, navies, and air forces preparing to attack. *We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today's adversaries....* [Emphasis added.]

In short, the president recognized that counting on stopping terrorist attacks that are already in the planning or operational stage is not a satisfactory, long-term strategy; that the nation needed to go on the offense against self-described enemies of America; an offensive designed to break the eggs before the plans are hatched and grow wings.

This made a lot of sense, to us anyway. But the problem has been in the execution of preemption, or, to be more accurate, in the lack of execution. The United States pre-empted in Afghanistan and Iraq, but then allowed North Korea to gain nuclear weapons and is in the process of allowing Iran to do so, which, in our opinion, is certain to place increasing pressure on the “get it right every time” strategy and highly likely to lead to the fulfillment of prophesy that “it is not a question of whether, but when.” Hence our suggestion in the first paragraph of this piece that

Americans begin to consider what they should do to prepare for a world in which the use of nuclear weapons by America’s enemies is not just possible but probable.

We have often been openly critical of President Bush for what we consider to be his failure to follow through sufficiently on the preemption strategy. But this week we thought we would lay the blame elsewhere, recognizing that this new explanation is considerably less comforting than the blame-Bush one because it suggests that the problem cannot be solved by a change of leadership alone, but must involve a change of attitude by the entire nation. Hence our suggestion in the second paragraph of this piece that Americans are going to have to begin to get themselves mentally ready to fight back with the kind of deadly force and calloused fierceness that will be required to destroy an enemy that is capable of using nuclear weapons or providing such weapons to groups that will do so.

We will begin the explanation of our theory this way. Imagine a scene in which a senior military aid to Pericles in 431 B.C., or Julius Caesar in 52 B.C., or Bismarck in 1871 A.D. enters the room and declares that Corinth (in the case of Pericles), or one of the native tribes in Gaul (in the case of Caesar), or the nation of France (in the case of Bismarck) is about to complete the development of an extraordinary new weapon that could be used to completely destroy the city of Athens and everyone in it (or Rome or Berlin, as the case may be).

Pericles, Caesar, or Bismarck, whichever, is startled, and immediately begins to discuss the proper response to this threat. He (whichever) is provided with a list of options. The first is to do nothing and hope that the enemy will not use the weapon out of the goodness of his heart. The second is to hold negotiations with the enemy, offering multiple concessions in exchange for a promise not to use the weapon. The third is to destroy the enemy immediately, since each of these three nations had the wherewithal at the time to accomplish this particular task.

Is there any question which choice any one of these three would have made? No, of course not. Now, fast forward to George Bush being presented with the news that North Korea and Iran, both avowed enemies of the United States and its interests worldwide, are on the verge of becoming nuclear powers. What choice does he make? We know that, as regards North Korea, he settled on a combination of choices one and two. He is, of course, still in the process of deciding what to do about Iran. But why is this so difficult? What has changed that has made George Bush's choice less certain than the one that we all know would have been made by Pericles, Caesar, Bismarck, *or any leader of any Western state at any time in the entire history of the first 30 or so centuries of Western civilization, or more probably during the entire history of all of mankind since the first clash of the first tribes of humanoids?*

The answer is World Wars I and II. Described by their titles as "world" wars, the devastation suffered during these wars was actually concentrated in "the West." And the effect of this devastation was to convince large numbers of citizens of "the West" and their leaders that, henceforth, every effort needed to be made to assure that there would be no more wars. It was a noble goal. But it was a foolish one, because it was utopian, a word created by Thomas More, meaning "no place." It was based on the dream world view that a handful of well meaning states could eliminate one of the most notable characteristics of humanity, namely its warlike nature. It was the Western version of the disastrous attempt by Communism to create a "new man."

Moreover, the strategy chosen to perform this impossible task rested on the weakness rather than strength. In a sense, the plan was to mimic the passive dog that rolls over and exposes its underbelly to the aggressive dog in a display of submission and friendship. Hence, the reaction of Hitler's neighbors during his rise to power in the wake of World War I was to spurn the traditional means of protecting themselves from such a man in favor of a strategy that became known as "appeasement."

Ironically, the failure of this strategy to prevent the Second World War did not discredit it, but simply hardened the determination of Westerners and their

leaders to achieve the utopian goal of a peaceful world by appeasing aggressors. And today, we in the West live in a culture turned upside down, a culture that views war as a failure of diplomacy rather than as one of its principal tools. And we suffer the rule of politicians who are so steeped in this culture that they are incapable of recognizing its inherently destructive characteristics.

Our guess is that "the West" will return to an historically more normal approach to dealing with enemies in the aftermath of the next 9/11 type attacks, especially if these events involve the wholesale killing of thousands of Americans at the hands of homicidal Islamists using nuclear weapons. We'll see.

In the meantime, as we said earlier, it might be prudent for Americans to begin to consider what they should do to prepare for a world in which the use of nuclear weapons by its enemies is not just possible but probable, and to begin to get mentally ready to fight back with the kind of deadly force and calloused fierceness that will be required to destroy an enemy that is capable of using nuclear weapons or providing such weapons to groups that will do so.

## **IT'S THE INTEGRATION, STUPID.**

After a relatively pleasant, if somewhat uneventful spring, during which President Bush saw his approval ratings stabilize and even improve slightly, early summer has brought the White House nothing but trouble. In the past eight weeks, the President's popularity numbers have tumbled, dropping to 29%, according to a recent *Wall Street Journal* poll. This is the lowest level in the Bush presidency, and there's really no mystery as to why.

Roughly speaking, since the invasion of Iraq became militarily and politically sticky a few years ago, the President's overall approval numbers have held fairly steady in the high-30s to mid-40s range, with nearly all of this support coming from loyal and patriotic Republicans. The oft-discussed "conservative base" has remained constant in its allegiance to Bush, in spite of his problems and his occasionally exasperating ideological squishiness. Until now, that is.

According to last week's poll, the President's approval among Americans in general fell six points over the last two months. And nearly all of this drop can be attributed to waning support among Republicans. In April, 75% of self-identified Republicans approved of the job President Bush was doing, but by last week, this number had plummeted to an anemic 62%. To anyone who has been paying attention, the explanation for this is obvious. It's the immigrants, stupid.

While the overwhelming majority of rank-and-file Republicans are deeply and earnestly concerned about illegal immigration and the potential hazards it poses, President Bush appears not merely unconcerned about the security of the nation's borders, but contemptuous of those who are. It's not that anyone doubts the sincerity of Bush's desire to address the issue of immigration. It's just that most Republicans – and most Americans, if polls are to be believed – disagree strongly with the means by which he proposes to do so. This president, who is constantly reviled on the left for being “out of touch” with the nation, really is out of touch on this issue. Truth be told, we suspect that the charge that Bush is “unconcerned” about border security is a bit of an exaggeration, but that certainly is the impression he gives.

Now, for our part, we sympathize with the President. We, like he and a handful of other conservatives – including Senator/Republican National Committee Chairman Mel Martinez, and the folks on the *Wall Street Journal's* editorial board – tend to believe that immigration is, in general, a good thing. A post-industrial society with falling birth rates cannot hope to sustain itself without the wholesale importation of potential new citizens. Moreover, we tend to agree that in political terms, the GOP is toeing a very fine line here, running the risk of allowing itself to be labeled “anti-immigrant” and thereby semi-permanently alienating Latino voters on the national level in the same way that it alienated Latino voters in California in the 1990s.

Back near the beginning of the Bush administration, we actually wrote a piece endorsing President Bush's fixation on immigration and his desire to normalize the status of the millions of Americans living in this

country illegally and to accommodate future mass immigration. The irony is that that piece had the truly unfortunate publication date of Monday, September 10, 2001, a fact that we believe raises a relevant point.

We suspect, though we cannot prove, that most Americans and indeed most Republicans feel almost precisely the way that we do about immigrants in general. For the most part, immigrants are hardworking, honest, earnest, decent men and women who are not only necessary components of this nation's future but represent the best of this nation's history as well. The true torch-carrying, pitch-fork wielding Buchananite nativists are few and far between. Most Americans like immigrants, understand the importance of immigration, know full well the value of the “melting pot,” and, contrary to the irresponsible charges tossed about recently even by the Bush administration, harbor no innate hostility toward Latino newcomers. That said, there are still a couple of very serious problems with the immigration status quo in this country, a status quo that the Bush-Kennedy legislation seeks to preserve.

The first of these, obviously, is that the nation is currently at war. A number of the men who started this war were in the United States in violation of said immigration status quo, and there can be little doubt that those who would continue it – *on American soil* – will attempt to enter this country illegally, exploiting the unwillingness of the government to enforce its own laws. Before 9/11, one could at least plausibly argue that looking the other way at illegal immigration was a victimless crime. But that is no longer possible. Some 3,000 people were literally *victims* of illegal immigrants, and it is quite likely that some time in the not too distant future, many others will be.

This is not to cast aspersions on the overwhelming majority of illegal immigrants, who clearly want nothing more than to make a better life for themselves and their families. It is merely to acknowledge that the immigration status quo, which effectively ignores illegal immigration, can in fact have serious negative repercussions and therefore cannot be allowed to persist, especially while the nation is at war.

The second problem with the immigration status quo is that its net effect is the creation of an underclass of quasi-Americans populated by people who are poor, undereducated, susceptible to criminal elements, and actually despise the country they've come to call home. Again, we believe that most Americans have no problem with immigrants. Indeed, we believe that most Americans would have no problem with *de facto* open borders, if (and this is a BIG if) the new immigrants were assimilated into American culture and quickly became "Americans," just as all previous generations of immigrants did. The problem is that they aren't doing this.

In a *Chicago Tribune* article last week, columnist Steve Chapman tried very hard to refute the idea of a permanent immigrant underclass. He wrote:

Many Americans think illegal immigrants are prone to all sorts of destructive behavior –committing crime, having children out of wedlock, dropping out of school and refusing to learn English. This is not a full and fair portrayal....

Towns that pass measures against illegal immigrants portray the laws as a way to combat crime. In reality, the belief that this group is prone to felonious habits is largely unfounded. Crime rates plummeted in the 1990s even as illegal immigration surged, and Harvard sociologist Robert Sampson has documented that "living in a neighborhood of concentrated immigration is directly associated with lower violence."

The evidence is surprising but clear: Foreign-born Hispanics are far less likely to end up in prison than native-born whites. They also have low divorce rates.

Unfortunately for Chapman, he doesn't know when to shut up. He continued:

But some indicators provide ample cause for worry. Latino men born in this country are seven times more likely to end up in prison

than those who came here from abroad. Unwed mothers account for nearly half of all Hispanic births. Raul Gonzalez, legislative director of the National Council of La Raza, sees the rise of "negative assimilation" – Latinos adopting the malignant attributes they see in other ethnic groups, rather than the productive ones.

You see, it's easy for folks like La Raza to blame immigrants' problems on "other ethnic groups," because it distracts from their own culpability when it comes to "negative assimilation." But the fact of the matter is that second and third generation Hispanic immigrants have a strong similarity to "other ethnic groups" because they are encouraged to be just another "ethnic group" by folks like La Raza and the nation's educational and political establishments. Steve Chapman wants us to believe that high crime rates and the like are common "characteristics" of all "new" immigrant groups, but what distinguishes previous immigrant groups from today's is that the "Irish, Italians and Jews" (Chapman's three examples) were encouraged to assimilate into the melting pot and to become Americans. Today, by contrast, Latinos are not.

Today, immigrants are taught that it is more important to retain their traditional ethnic identities than to shed them in favor of the unique American identity. Every institution new immigrants encounter, from city government agencies to primary and secondary schools to universities to the federal government, encourage immigrants to retain their foreign identity, all in the pursuit of the ill-defined and often detrimental goal of "multiculturalism." The ethnic Balkanization of America, initiated by a well meaning but shortsighted liberal government and perpetuated by groups like La Raza, is what keeps new immigrants from fully integrating into American society, actually encourages them to take on the attributes of "other ethnic groups," and ultimately causes their ghettoization.

But that's not the worst of it. Second and third generation immigrants are not merely encouraged to retain their own ethnic identity but are actually taught to believe in the superiority of that identity

to the “American” identity. After all, in the eyes of those who dominate the governmental and educational establishments, Americans are selfish, destructive, war mongering despoilers of the environment, who murdered the Indians and stole the American Southwest from Mexico. La Raza proudly denies that it has ever encouraged the “reconquista” of “the Aztlan” (i.e. Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, California). But they don’t need to. That, sadly, is what high school civics teachers are for.

Last month, much was made about a Pew poll of Muslim Americans that showed that while the overwhelming majority of American Muslims reject suicide bombings and other jihadist dicta, a frightening percentage do not. Most commentators focused on the fact that 13% of American Muslims said that suicide bombings could be justified and that 13% of the Muslims in this country is quite a few individuals. But what struck us was that the percentage of those who approve of jihadist techniques actually doubled (to a full quarter of the survey population) among “young” Muslims. What this suggests is that the longer Muslims are in this country, the more they are exposed to American culture and its governmental and educational bureaucracies, the more inclined they are to be sympathetic to the jihadist cause.

This pattern is repeated throughout the Western world. Much has been made about the fact that several of the London subway bombers were English-born, English-educated, normal “lads” who loved cricket and fish and chips. Yet these guys were also steeped in the establishment’s multiculti nonsense and therefore were more inclined to believe in the wickedness of the society in which they were raised and to believe that its destruction was perfectly acceptable.

Immigration opponents in this country often point to Europe as a negative example of what can happen when immigrants are imported wholesale. Londonistan

and the rest of Eurabia serve as a warning to Americans about what unrestricted immigration can do to a society. But the problem there, as here, is not immigration *per se*, but integration. It’s not simply that immigrants in Europe and the United States are not encouraged to assimilate, it’s that they are actively discouraged from doing so by those who believe that Western/European/American culture is hardly worth assimilating into.

If President Bush and the rest of the Washington establishment really wanted a “comprehensive” immigration solution, they’d address the integration question first. But that’s not what they want. Again, we don’t doubt that President Bush’s heart is in the right place, but his intentions don’t really matter here. The bottom line is that he has chosen to partner with groups and individuals who see immigrants not as new Americans, but as just another “minority group” to be demagogued.

Like we said, we think immigration – and mass immigration at that – is possibly vital to this country’s future. But we at least understand why most Americans are uncomfortable with the idea of so many new residents coming to this country yet never fully integrating into it. Integration is, we believe, the key to this issue. And until politicians understand that and address these concerns in some meaningful way, any who support the status quo and its normalization will suffer politically. Just ask President Bush, presidential wannabe John McCain, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, or any of the others who have seen their poll numbers swoon as they have been publicly associated with the position that “undocumented Americans” need simply to be documented.

Copyright 2007. 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.