

October 20, 2007

Sidebar

HILLARY'S WAR // FREE TRADE PACTS

I Hillary's War. (This is just a dream.) Will the Iraq conflict continue under a President "H" Clinton? This is a great "debate" question for *all* aspirants. I say *yes!* First, this battle against "Al Qaeda in Iraq" will not end anytime soon. President Bush will be in Crawford, Texas, and the *new* president will be handed the "Reins of Battle." So, assuming *arguendo* that "H" is our next president (the Commander in Chief)—What will she do? Second, she will *not* pull the troops out of Iraq. Our next president [D or R] will continue to fight on and on. (The fanatics will not go away.) The battle will expand, I predict, to neighboring Iran (to avoid "nukes"). *Query:* Does "H" have the "internal ..." to fight and defeat terrorism? What is her battle plan to defeat "Al Qaeda"? (How is she going to "capture" bin Laden?) Whatever it is (I have no idea what her military plans are.) she faces a daunting task. Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, who lost his field command because of the Iraq prison scandal, says, "There has been a glaring ... incompetent strategic leadership within our national leadership." Does that mean "H" has no plan? *Note:* *No advice to achieve victory was offered by Sanchez.* Aspirant "H"—before I wake up from this perturbing dream—plan accordingly and present a *smart battle plan*, "if" you want to win the next election. Good morning. Where is my strong *café*?

II Free Trade Pacts. Especially, in Latin America pacts are never easy to understand. How do you feel about the new pacts with the Americas? Is it good for *all* of us? I say maybe. Perhaps the worst scenario emanates from President Bush's "low" approval numbers (and Congress's numbers are even worse). So, the debate rages on. The president preaches: It promotes mutual prosperity; it creates mutual goodwill; it forges better friendships. Is he right? Maybe. *Contra:* *The people of Latin America are told they will fall under the domination of evil Washington. DC.* The truth? Costa Rica is a good example. Critics of the pact almost won a referendum there. "*Si*" won (meaning, the pact moves forward). The Costaricans saw the light—they were told lies—the vote was close (51.6 percent for the pact). Indeed, there are political ramifications from Free Trade Pacts. The *loud critics* ([Presidents] Chavez, Correa, Morales, Ortega, and Castro)—all US haters—fought for CAFTA's defeat in CR. They lost! They do not want the US to have any "freedom loving friends" in Latin America. They want to forge a "block" of anti-Americanism in LA. To solidify the nexus with our southern friends, the US Congress (controlled by Democrats) should, forthwith, approve three pending pacts with Peru, Panama, and Columbia. (Yes, we still have some friends in LA.) That would help strengthen needed ties. Failure to approve those pacts would embolden "the-five-devils." *Note:* Democrats do an injustice (1) to our Hispanic *amigos*, and (2) to President Clinton (the father of NAFTA) if they fail the pacts. Opposition to these pacts makes the US their *enemigos*.