

Funding the Iraq Occupation without Timelines or Deadlines is a Travesty.

Reid & Pelosi: traitors and turncoats to our troops, the voters, the constitution

By [Rob Kezelis](#)

Global Research, May 25, 2007

[Capitol Hill Blue](#) 23 May 2007

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAQ REPORT](#)

In the face of a petulant, pig-headed, pertinacious President, for weeks both Reid and Pelosi claimed the moral high ground. They promised to insist on timelines for the withdrawal of our troops, currently stuck like fish in a barrel.

Let's review what is happening in today's IraqNam. General David Howell Petraeus was appointed to take over command after four years of lies and misreporting, after four years of worsening conditions and growing turmoil and death. His prior success in a small region was his biggest selling point. Anyone who could actually make friends and earn the trust of several factions, despite the brain-damaged policies of Bremer, Rice, Rumsfeld, Cheney, Bush, Feith, Wolfowitz, had to have something going for him. Congress approved his promotion by an overwhelming majority.

Three years ago, President Bush called for the first surge (a rose by any other name still has thorns). Six months later, he increased troops again, (many thorns), and a year ago, there was a fourth, perhaps fifth surge. Each surge had a minor, temporary impact. For example, people forget that we re-invaded Baghdad no less than three times, AFTER we invaded the very first time. Each time resulted in a slight lowering of the kidnapping, death and torture rates, while there was a noticeable increase in violence and death outside of the capital.

In December, as violence levels rose across the country of 24,000,000 disenchanted, suffering, unhappy, occupied people, Bush proposed his latest surge as a Final Solution. Despite generals and experts claiming that 20,000 troops would have little or no impact, Bush and his spin team painted his many critics as being unpatriotic, intent on losing and more intent on playing political games than doing the right thing. As usual, his oration was filled with half-truths, half-assed cliches, and half-brained arguments.

Were it not for the blogs, the liberals, the moderates - the true patriots, the Democratic majority would have caved in back then. Instead, the hue and cry from the grassroots caused the Democratic leaders to take a step back and reconsider their standard, spineless, yellow-belly response to a power-hungry, fascist White House. Even though Bush got his surge, the Democrats seemed willing to stand up for the first time in six years.

We learned that the 20,000 quickly grew to 29,000. Then we learned that 50,000 additional support troops were needed to supply, arm and support the new targets. This week we learned that another 50,000 might be necessary and that the military plans to stay in Iraq for at least 10 years.

So much for a Final Solution, unless you happen to be one of the 386 dead US soldiers, including 15 over the weekend, 2 on Monday and 9 more wasted lives today.

So what happened to those brave, smart, politically savvy Democratic leaders like Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid? Where was the long missing spine that 70% of the US population wants to see in action? How will these two bravely stand up to an abusive, misguided and arrogant administration that lies as a matter of practice, and deceives out of habit? And what sort of timelines, deadlines and demands for withdrawal would they pass, in the face of a second presidential veto?

"For heaven's sake, look where we've come. It's a lot more than the president ever expected he'd have to agree to," chirped the brave Harry Reid, explaining why he and Pelosi caved in like a poorly regulated and uninspected Virginia coal mine.

You are right, Harry. He did not expect you to cave in so quickly, removing the best chance our soldiers had.

Just last week, that center of integrity, Nancy Pelosi promised that timelines were an integral part of the funding package. Yesterday, she cravenly explained that she might not support the entire bill, sans timelines, yet the reality is that she stood up to the president about as strongly as a mature, white dandelion bud to a tornado.

But, they argue, WE HAVE STRONG BENCHMARKS, SIXTEEN OF THEM! Yeah, except by the bill's own language, the president can waive each one of them on a whim. Some benchmark.

There is just one way to describe the actions of Pelosi and Reid. Turncoat comes to mind. Traitor to our troops also springs forth. Negligent, lacking, and dilatory in upholding their oath to the constitution might work, too. Your choice.

The problem with Harry and Nancy meeting George on his terms is that 70% of America has been figuratively stabbed in the back. Instead of removing the funding, saving our troops by getting them home, and leaving a quagmire of our own making, the Democrat Party leadership has just signed on as co-owners of Bush's war. From this day forward, every US death is as much on their hands as the president's. From now on, every drop of blood spilled by our boys and girls is a stain on the Democratic leadership as much as on this administration.

Shame seems to be a missing emotion inside the Bloatway. Must be something in the water. It is time for a voters' revolution. Unless and until the will of the people is expressed by our elected officials, it is our duty to work on replacing the miscreants, the turncoats, the persons responsible for getting our soldiers killed and maimed.

The original source of this article is [Capitol Hill Blue](#)
Copyright © [Rob Kezelis](#), [Capitol Hill Blue](#), 2007

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Rob Kezelis](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca