APPROVED

This book has been approved by the Department of Homeland Security. It contains no seditious acts or acts of treason. Each word has been examined and analyzed by a team of terrorism experts to insure that it gives neither aid nor comfort to The Enemy. This book reveals no state secrets nor does it make public any classified documents that may cause embarrassment to the United States of America or its commander-in-chief. No hidden messages to terrorists are contained within. This is a good Christian book, written by a patriotic American who knows that we will crash him should it ever step out of line. If you have purchased this book we are required to notify you per Section 29A of the USA Patriot Act that your name has now been entered into a database of potential suspects should the need to declare martial law ever arise, which we are sure will never happen. Being on this list of names also qualifies you for the grand prize drawing where ten lucky winners will receive all new Formica kitchen counters, compliments of Kitchen Magic. If you are indeed a bona fide terrorist and have purchased this copy in a bookstore, or obtained it at a library in the hopes of using the information embedded on these pages, rest assured that we already know who you are. This page you are fingering right now is made of a top-secret loan paper that registers an automatic fingerprint and beams it to our central command in Kissimmee, Florida. Do not attempt to tear this page out of the book—IT IS TOO LATE. Do not attempt to run because we’ve got a lock on you right now, you dirty so good evildoer…. FREEZE! DROP THE BOOK! HANDS IN THE AIR! YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO… SCREW IT! YOU DON’T HAVE ANY RIGHTS! YOU NO LONGER EXIST! AND TO THINK IF YOU HAD ONLY APPRECIATED OUR WAY OF LIFE YOU COULD HAVE HAD YOUR OWN STAIN-RESISTANT FORMICA COUNTERS!

—Tom Ridge, Secretary of the Homeland
—George W. Bush, Commander in Chief of the Fatherland
that I am sure he appreciated. After all, he was your good friend “Bandar Bush,” the prince from Saudi Arabia. 97

As the smoke from the ashes still billowed through the air over Manhattan and Arlington, the smoke from the Saudi prince’s cigar wafted through the balmy night air of Washington, D.C., with you, George W. Bush, by his side.

These are my seven questions, Mr. Bush—seven questions that I believe you should answer. The 3,000 dead and their surviving loved ones deserve no less, and a nation of millions is sooner or later going to want to know the truth and demand you come clean, or leave.

lies that brought us down in the eyes of the world. "I am not a crook," was a lie, and a crook. Nothing. No new taxes, no more wars, so much as a broken promise. It's a very sad day for the American people. The American people built the American economy. America is the greatest country in the world, and I am the greatest president. The American people are not fools, and they will see through the lies and the propaganda. And when they do, they will punish the President for those lies."

As the President lied to us into the Iraq War, started to unravel and expose the lie, the Bush administration went into reverse and kept denying and lying and twisting the truth. They were so bad that they couldn't even tell a white lie. They couldn't even tell a lie without making the truth worse.

But nothing can hide this indisputable fact: There is no reason to send their children off to fight a war that did not need to be fought. If one thing is clear, it is that the Bush administration did not care about the lives of American soldiers. They only cared about their political careers and their own personal score. They lied and dodged and deceived the American people in order to get the country into a war that was not only a waste of lives, but a waste of money. They were willing to sacrifice the lives of American soldiers in order to get what they wanted.

The Bush administration was not only lying to the American people, they were lying to the world. They lied about the threat of weapons of mass destruction, they lied about the need for military intervention, they lied about the success of the war. They were not interested in the truth, they were interested in power and control. They were not interested in the lives of American soldiers, they were interested in their own power and prestige.

The Bush administration's lies were not just about the Iraq War, they were about everything. They lied about the economy, they lied about the budget, they lied about the environment, they lied about the war on terror. They lied about everything. They were not interested in the truth, they were interested in power and control. They were not interested in the lives of American soldiers, they were interested in their own power and prestige.

The Bush administration was not just disrespected, they were despised. They were not just lying to the American people, they were lying to the world. They were not just a threat to American democracy, they were a threat to the world. They were not just a threat to the United States, they were a threat to the world. They were not just a threat to the Bush administration, they were a threat to the world.
How to sway the American public from its initial reluctance to go to war with Iraq? Just say “mushroom cloud” and—BOOM!—watch those poll numbers turn around!

In addition to uranium from Africa, Bush said the Iraqis had “attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes and other equipment needed for gas centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.”

Frightening stuff. Imagine how much more frightening it would have been if it was actually true. Joseph Wilson, a senior American diplomat with more than 20 years of experience, including positions in Africa and Iraq, was sent to Niger in 2002 on a CIA-directed mission to investigate the British claims that Iraq had tried to buy “yellowcake uranium” from Niger. He concluded that the allegations were false. Later, Wilson said:

Based on my experience with the administration in the months leading up to the war, I have little choice but to conclude that some of the intelligence related to Iraq’s nuclear weapons program was twisted to exaggerate the threat. . . . The CIA asked if I would travel to Niger to check out the story. . . . In early March, I arrived [back] in Washington and submitted a detailed briefing to the CIA. . . . There should be at least four documents in the United States government archives confirming my mission.

(In July 2003, Wilson also had this to say: “It really comes down to the administration misrepresenting the facts on an issue that was a fundamental justification for going to war. It begs the question, what else are they lying about?”)

The White House ignored Wilson’s report and instead kept the hoax alive. When the administration persisted with the fabricated story, one official, according to The New York Times, said, “People winced and thought, why are you repeating this trash?”

The documents from Niger were so badly faked that the Niger foreign minister who “signed” one of them was no longer in the government—in fact, he had been, unbeknownst to the British or American liars who made up the story, out of office for more than a decade.

The aluminum tubes “discovery” also turned out to be a fictitious threat. On January 27, 2003—the day before Bush’s State of the Union address—the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohamed ElBaradei, told the U.N. Security Council that two months of inspections in Iraq had produced no evidence of prohibited activities at former Iraqi nuclear sites. In addition, ElBaradei said, the aluminum tubes “unless modified, would not be suitable for manufacturing centrifuges.”

According to reports in The Washington Post, Newsweek, and other publications, the assertion that the tubes could be used for nuclear weapons production had already been questioned by U.S. and British intelligence officials. U.N. inspectors said they had found proof that Iraq planned to use the tubes to build small rockets, not nuclear weapons. And the Iraqis were not trying to buy the equipment in secret—their purchase order was accessible on the Internet.

But Mr. Bush didn’t let facts stand in the way of his tough-talking State of the Union address to almost sixty-two million viewers on January 28, 2003: “. . . Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa,” he stated. “Imagine those nineteen hijackers with other weapons and other plans—this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day never comes.”

On March 16, Co-President Dick Cheney appeared on Meet the Press and told the nation that Hussein has “been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons. And we believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons.”

Three days later, we went to war.
In the spring and summer of 2003, criticism of the administration’s reliance on lies about Iraq’s nuclear capabilities heated up to the point that even President Bush could no longer ignore it or put a stop to the questions just by acting cranky. First, he tried to make CIA Director George Tenet the sacrificial lamb. “[The] CIA approved the president’s State of the Union address before it was delivered,” Tenet was ordered to say in July. “I am responsible for the approval process in my agency. And … the President had every reason to believe that the text presented to him was sound. These sixteen words [regarding the African uranium] should never have been included in the text written for the president.” But then came the memos from October that showed that Tenet’s CIA did tell the White House not to make such a bogus claim. While the White House initially took this advice, they repeatedly disregarded it afterwards, most notably in the State of the Union. The next scapegoat became Condoleezza Rice’s deputy, Stephen Hadley, who said it was he who approved the language in Bush’s January address. This looked so lame that finally Bush, in a rare press conference on July 30, said that he and he alone is responsible for any words that come out of his mouth. That those words even need to be said should make an entire nation wonder whether this guy should be the leader of the free world or flippin’ Whoppers at the Waco Burger King.

#2 Whopper with Cheese: “Iraq has chemical and biological weapons!”

In his October 7, 2002, address from Cincinnati, George W. Bush offered up this freshly cooked whopper: “Some ask how urgent this danger is to America and the world. The danger is already significant, and it only grows worse with time. If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today—and we do—does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger and develops even more dangerous weapons?” Then, just a few months later, Bush added the cheese: “We have sources that tell us that Saddam Hussein recently authorized Iraqi field commanders to use chemical weapons—the very weapons the dictator tells us he does not have.”

Who wouldn’t want to bomb that bastard Saddam after hearing that? Then Secretary of State Colin Powell went even further—he said that the Iraqis weren’t just concocting chemical weapons, they were doing it on wheels! “One of the most worrisome things that emerges from the thick intelligence file we have on Iraq’s biological weapons is the existence of mobile production facilities used to make biological agents,” Powell told the United Nations. “We know that Iraq has at least seven of these mobile, biological agent factories.”

He went on with such specifics that … it had to be true!

… A missile brigade outside Baghdad was dispersing rocket launchers and warheads containing biological warfare agents … most of the launchers and warheads had been hidden in large groves of palm trees and were to be moved every one to four weeks to escape detection. Our conservative estimate is that Iraq today has a stockpile of between 100 and 300 tons of chemical weapons agents. That is enough agent to fill 16,000 battlefield rockets.

But after invading Iraq, the U.S. Army couldn’t find a single one of these “mobile labs.” After all, with so many palm trees to hide them under, who could blame our army for not uncovering them? We couldn’t find any of the chemical or biological weapons either, even though on March 30, 2003, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld had said on ABC’s This Week, “We know where they are. They’re in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad and east, west, south, and north somewhat.” Oh, okay, that’s clear! Now we’ll find them! Thank you Madhatter!
Finally, on June 5, 2003, President George W. Bush declared: "We recently received and declassified the documents that prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Saddam Hussein hadobiological weapons. This is the man who spent decades hiding those weapons. He knew the inspectors were coming. He knew they were looking for them."

That's why President Bush sent a team of experts to the Iraqis to help them understand the importance of destroying those weapons. That team, along with the U.S. military, helped the Iraqis to disarm and destroy their biological weapons.

Saddam Hussein's biological weapons program was a success because it allowed him to keep the United States and its allies at bay. But it also had a devastating impact on the people of Iraq. The use of chemical and biological weapons in Iraq has left a lasting legacy of suffering and death. The legacy of Saddam Hussein's biological weapons program is a reminder of the dangers of weapons of mass destruction and the importance of international cooperation to prevent them.
Michael Moore

When, Where's My Country?

Dad was in the military. He was a private in the army, and I was born in a military camp in Japan. I grew up in the United States, but my parents were from Europe. My father was a portrait painter, and my mother was a writer. We moved around a lot, but I always felt like I was an American. I was very lucky to have had such a diverse upbringing.

In 1989, I was working as an intern for Senator Ted Kennedy's campaign. I was helping to organize rallies and write speeches. It was a challenging job, but I loved every minute of it. I was passionate about politics, and I wanted to make a difference.

In 1990, I was invited to a party at the White House. I was thrilled to be there, and I met a lot of interesting people. I even got to talk to President Bush. He was really impressed with my work, and he asked me to come back and help him with his re-election campaign.

In 1993, I was working for Senator Bill Clinton. I was helping to organize his campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 1996, I was working for Senator Al Gore. I was helping to organize his campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 1998, I was working for Senator Hillary Clinton. I was helping to organize her campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 2000, I was working for Senator John Kerry. I was helping to organize his campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 2004, I was working for Senator Barack Obama. I was helping to organize his campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 2008, I was working for Senator Barack Obama. I was helping to organize his campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 2012, I was working for Senator Barack Obama. I was helping to organize his campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 2016, I was working for Senator Barack Obama. I was helping to organize his campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 2020, I was working for Senator Kamala Harris. I was helping to organize her campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

In 2022, I was working for Senator Elizabeth Warren. I was helping to organize her campaign for the presidency. I was very excited, and I knew that this was going to be the start of something big. I was determined to make a difference, and I was ready to face any challenge.

I am proud of my work, and I am grateful for the opportunities that I have had. I am committed to making a difference, and I am ready to face any challenge.

Thank you for listening.
CIA Director Casey personally spearheaded the effort to ensure that Iraq had sufficient military weapons, ammunition and vehicles to avoid losing the Iran-Iraq war. Pursuant to the secured [National Security Directive], the United States actively supported the Iraqi war effort by supplying the Iraqis with billions of dollars of credits, by providing U.S. military intelligence and advice to the Iraqis, and by closely monitoring third-country arms sales to Iraq to make sure that Iraq had the military weaponry required.

One of those “third-country arms sales” was of particular interest. Imagine our shock when it was discovered that our good despotic friends the Saudis had “accidentally” transferred 300 American-made MK-84 2,000-pound bombs to Iraq. For the most part, though, Reagan’s handlers were smart enough to funnel weapons untraceably through other countries.

It wasn’t just his handlers who were getting involved. Reagan and Bush I decided to personally get their hands dirty. According to Teicher’s affidavit:

[In 1986, President Reagan sent a secret message to Saddam Hussein telling him that Iraq should step up its air war and bombing of Iran. This message was delivered by Vice President Bush who communicated it to Egyptian President Mubarak, who in turn passed the message to Saddam Hussein.

Even after Saddam used his weapons of mass destruction to gas his own people—an event Bush and his buddies are so totally offended by now, a decade and a half too late—the Reagan administration was unfazed. The United States Congress tried to put economic sanctions on Hussein’s country, but the White House quashed the idea. Their reasons? According to declassified State Department documents, economic sanctions might hurt America’s chances at contracts for “massive postwar reconstruction” once the Iraq-Iraq war finally came to a close.

Weapons of mass destruction? Oh yeah, he had them at one time. All we had to do was check the receipts and count the profits as they rolled into the bank account of the campaign backers of Reagan and Bush.

#3 Whopper with Bacon: “Iraq has ties to Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda!”

As if having the atomic bomb, nerve gas and the bubonic plague in a bottle wasn’t enough, suddenly Saddam Hussein was in cahoots with the Mother of All Terrorists himself, Osama bin Laden! I’m sure you had the same reaction I did when you heard: “How much worse can it get? When can we get rid of this Saddam guy?”

Just hours after the attacks on September 11, U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld had already figured out who was responsible, or at least, who he wanted to punish. According to CBS News, Rumsfeld wanted as much information as possible about the attacks, and told his fact-finding team to “go massive. . . . Sweep it all up. Things related and not.” He already had intelligence indicating a connection to Osama (whom he called “Usama”), but he wanted more because he had other goals in mind. He wanted intelligence “good enough to hit S.H. [Saddam Hussein] at the same time. Not only U.B.L.”

W.A.B.O.S!

I say Osama, you say Usama . . . and Rumsfeld just says the magic word “Saddam” and before you know it, everyone else was saying it, too! Ret. Gen. Wesley Clark has said that he received phone calls on September 11 and in the weeks after from people at “think tanks” and from people within the White House telling him to use his position as a pundit for CNN to “connect” September 11 to Saddam Hussein. He said he’d do it if someone could show him the proof. No one could.
During the buildup to war in the fall of 2002, Bush and members of his administration kept repeating the claim, keeping it uncluttered by specifics (also known as “facts”) so it stayed nice and simple and easy to remember. Bush circled the country at campaign stops for Republican congressional candidates, inseminating the minds of the American people with the bogus Saddam/Osama connection on a continuous loop. Check out just one week’s worth of serial lying:

“This [Hussein] is a person who can’t stand America. This is a person who has had contacts with al Qaeda.”
—George W. Bush, Alamogordo, New Mexico, October 28, 2002

“He’s a threat to America and he’s a threat to our friends. He’s even more of a threat now that we’ve learned that he’s anxious to have, once again, to develop a nuclear weapon. He’s got connections with al Qaeda.”
—George W. Bush, Denver, Colorado, October 28, 2002

“This is a man who cannot stand what we stand for. He hates the fact, like al Qaeda does, that we love freedom. See, they can’t stand that. This is a guy who has had connections with these shadowy terrorist networks.”
—George W. Bush, Aberdeen, South Dakota, October 31, 2002

“That’s the nature of this man. We know he’s got ties with al Qaeda.”
—George W. Bush, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, November 1, 2002

“We know that he’s had connections with al Qaeda.”
—George W. Bush, Tampa, Florida, November 2, 2002

“This is a man who has had contacts with al Qaeda. This is a man who poses a serious threat in many forms, but catch this form: He’s the kind of guy that would love nothing more than to train terrorists and provide arms to terrorists so they could attack his worst enemy and leave no fingerprints. This guy is a threat to the world.”
—George W. Bush, St. Paul, Minnesota, November 3, 2002

“This is a man who can’t stand America and what we believe in. This is a man who hates some of our closest allies. This is a man who has had al Qaeda connections.”
—George W. Bush, St. Louis, Missouri, November 4, 2002

“This is the kind of guy we’re dealing with. This is a man who hates America, he hates our friends, he can’t stand what we believe in. He’s had contacts with al Qaeda.”
—George W. Bush, Bentonville, Arkansas, November 4, 2002

“This is a man who cannot stand America, he cannot stand what we stand for, he can’t stand some of our closest friends and allies. This is a man who has got connections with al Qaeda.”
—George W. Bush, Dallas, Texas, November 4, 2002

Just in case we missed the point, Bush continued to hammer it home in his State of the Union address on January 28, 2003: “Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda,” Bush insisted.

Immediately following the address, a CBS online poll found that support for U.S. military action in Iraq increased.
A week later, on February 5, Bush’s claims were echoed by Secretary of State Colin Powell in a lengthy address to the United Nations Security Council. After detailing what Powell said were Iraq’s numerous failures to comply with weapons inspections, he moved on to the Saddam/Osama connection: “But what I want to bring to your attention today is the potentially much more sinister nexus between Iraq and the al-Qaeda network, a nexus that combinesclassic terrorist organizations and modern methods of murder.”

But the meat of the administration’s “evidence” had already begun to turn rancid. During that same first week of February, a British intelligence report leaked to the BBC said there were no links between Saddam and Osama. The two evildoers had tried to form a friendship in the past, but it had turned out like a great episode of Blind Date—they hated each other. According to the report, Bin Laden’s “aims are in ideological conflict with present-day Iraq.”

On top of this, the al-Qaeda poison and explosives factory Bush and his team claimed Saddam was harboring was located in northern Iraq—an area controlled by Kurds and patrolled by U.S. and British warplanes since the early nineties. The north of Iraq was out of Saddam’s reach, but within our own. The base actually belonged to Ansar al Isalam, a militant fundamentalist group whose leader has branded Saddam Hussein an “enemy.” A tour of the base by a large group of international journalists quickly revealed that no weapons were being manufactured there.

But none of that mattered. The president had said it—it had to be true! Yes, this whopper worked so well that, in the months leading up to the war in Iraq, polls showed that up to half of Americans said they believed that Saddam Hussein had ties to Osama bin Laden’s network. Even before Bush had served up his 2003 State of the Union address, and Powell had presented the Saddam-Osama “evidence” to the U.N., a Knight-Rider poll found that half of those questioned already incorrectly thought that one or more of the 9/11 hijackers held Iraqi citizenship. Bush didn’t even have to say it.

The Bush administration had succeeded in perpetrating one of the biggest lies of all time, confusing Saddam with Osama in the minds of the American public. Once you sell the people on the notion that Saddam had a hand in the mass murder of nearly 3,000 people on American soil, well, even if the bogus weapons of mass destruction whopper didn’t hold up, this would be enough to get the flags waving and the troops a-packin’.

Of course the problem with this whopper—other than it is a cynical, premeditated fabrication—is that Osama bin Laden considers Saddam to be an infidel. Hussein committed the sin of creating a secular Iraq instead of a Muslim state run by fanatical Muslim clerics. Under Saddam, Baghdad had churches, mosques, and, yes, even a synagogue. Hussein had persecuted and killed thousands and thousands of Shiites in Iraq because of the threat they posed to his secular government.

In fact, the biggest reason Saddam and Osama don’t like each other is the same reason the Bushies stopped liking Saddam: the invasion of Kuwait. Bush & Co. was pissed because Saddam was threatening the security of our oil in the Gulf, and Osama was pissed because it brought American troops to Saudi Arabia and the Muslim holy lands. That’s bin Laden’s biggest problem with us—and it’s all because of Saddam!

Saddam and Osama were mortal enemies and they could not put their mutual hatred aside, even to join together to defeat the USA. Man, to not team up when it meant destroying the Great Satan Bush—THAT is a lot of hate!

#4 Whopper, Heavy on the Pickles and Onions: “Saddam Hussein is the world’s most evil man!”

Okay, he was bad. Really bad. He gassed the Kurds, gassed the Iranians, tortured the Shiites, tortured the Sunnis, tortured countless others, and during the sanctions against Iraq, let his people starve
suffer all types of deprivation while he hoarded money and kept his many palaces well stocked with provisions (and a petting zoo for his favorite pet dogs). This is all guess work on our part, but it is rumored that his wealth was such that he was able to pay for numerous personal services, including the provision of food and medical care for his subjects.

Both the United States and its allies gave a great deal of aid to Sihanouk, but there were reports of human rights abuses in his regime. In the end, he stepped down and the government was taken over by the Khmer Rouge, a communist group that had been fighting against the United States for many years. The Khmer Rouge were known for their brutal tactics, including the forced labor camps called the Khmer Rouge lao, where thousands of people were killed.

Cambodia—After several years of fighting, the United States withdrew its forces from Cambodia in 1973. The country was then plunged into civil war, with the Khmer Rouge gaining control. The United States had provided substantial aid to the Cambodian government, but the Khmer Rouge were able to take control and establish a brutal dictatorship. The United States was embarrassed by its role in the country and began to withdraw its troops. The Khmer Rouge continued to rule with an iron fist, eventually leading to the fall of the regime in 1979.
China, around 400 McDonald’s and another 100 Pizza Huts. Kodak is quickly approaching a monopoly on film sales.

The many companies who have set up shop there are not only hawking their wares to the Chinese. The $103 billion trade imbalance between China and the United States is the largest deficit between two countries the world has ever seen. We import six times as much as we export, with Wal-Mart alone accounting for $12 billion worth of Chinese imports, making the All Sino-American company one of China’s biggest trading partners—ahead of Russia and Great Britain.

There are plenty of other companies taking advantage of the state-controlled cheap labor in China, too, from General Motors to Boeing to . . . hell, just take off your pants and have a look at the label, or dismantle your television. Or take off your pants while you’re dismantling your television. And while China makes a killing on exports, and American corporations make a killing on high-profit returns, the American economy flounders, and the Chinese people, well, they just wait for the government’s mobile killing vans to pull around the corner, grab them, and put them out of their misery.

If the criteria for invading another country is “liberating the people from an oppressive regime,” well then, we better hurry up and institute mandatory military service for every man and woman eighteen and older because—for God—we’re going to be busy! Since we’ve already invaded Iraq to “free the Iraqis,” we might as well continue with the other countries we’ve royally screwed. After that, maybe we can head back to Afghanistan, then on to Burma, Peru, Colombia, Sierra Leone, and end up somewhere that at least sounds nice, Côte d’Ivoire.

Before the Iraq War, when the public was being duped with the endless barrage of whoppers, the idea of “liberation of the Iraqi people” was always tacked on as an afterthought. It never took a front and center position in the justifications for why we had to go to war right then. Why? Obviously those who choose our wars don’t care much about liberating people from oppressive regimes—if they did, we’d be kicking the shit out of half the world. No, they talk about our security and, even more important to them, our interests. And we all know that "our interests" have never included the good life for anyone but us. We don’t share the wealth—we be monetary or ideological—we just cover our own asses and enhance our own well-being. It’s plain to see, and it’s everywhere—from "welfare to work" to our exploitation of cheap labor to our historical love of dictators to our refusal to forgive Third World debt. Liberation sounds nice, but it ain’t worth dying for, and it sure as hell isn’t worth a dime of our money. Cheap gas, cheap clothes, cheap TVs? Yeah . . . that’s more like it!

Even professional warmonger and Bush advisor Paul Wolfowitz came clean with the truth, in the Defense Department transcript of a May 2003 interview with Vanity Fair:

The truth is that for reasons that have a lot to do with the U.S. government bureaucracy we settled on the one issue that everyone could agree on which was weapons of mass destruction as the core reason . . . [T]here have always been three fundamental concerns. One is weapons of mass destruction, the second is support for terrorism, the third is the criminal treatment of the Iraqi people. Actually I guess you could say there’s a fourth overriding one which is the connection between the first two . . .

The third one by itself, as I think I said earlier, is a reason to help the Iraqis but it’s not a reason to put American kids’ lives at risk, certainly not on the scale we did it.

Not worth the risk? Then why did we do it?

Of course, Wolfowitz had deviated from the script. When no weapons of mass destruction were found and not a single al Qaeda
guy showed up in the parts of Iraq under Saddam Hussein’s control, and when that imminent threat Saddam posed to America’s security couldn’t be proven, the Bush administration and its many media puppets quickly tried to change their whopper order. “No, you see, we weren’t there to find nuclear weapons, we were there to free the people of Iraq! Yes, we were, that’s the reason we bombed the place and sent 150,000 troops to invade!”

You know how sometimes they give you the wrong Whopper, when they’ve switched yours with someone else’s? You then have to decide whether you’re going to just go ahead and eat this other Whopper or take it back and get the one you ordered.

After the original “justifications” for war were exposed as lies, this new whopper gave pro-war Democrats and liberals a place to duck when they went looking for cover. How could they be so stupid as to believe Bush’s claims regarding the weapons of mass destruction and the 9/11 connection? “Hey, we weren’t stupid— look at all these mass graves we’ve uncovered. That’s why we supported the war—to stop this brutality and oppression!” the Democrats cried.

That’s right. Say it two more times, click your heels together and tell yourself there’s no place like home, there’s no place like home, there is no place like home. That’s what we have brought to the Iraqis—a little piece of home. The American Way. Democracy. That’s why we’re there. That’s what we’ll give them.

Recently on Nightline, they were interviewing an Iraqi woman who is pro-American and teaches English. She said that things are so bad now since the American invasion, she sometimes wishes Saddam were still in power. Her sentiment seems widespread. Twenty years of living under a brutal dictator—and after only ninety days of living under the Americans—they want Saddam back! Jeze, how bad a hostagequest have we been?

It seems that the crazy clerics are succeeding in filling the vacuum left by Saddam and now it’s “meet the new Boss, same as the old Boss” time in Iraq. The Bush administration continually postpones turning control of the country over to the Iraqi people whom they’ve liberated. Why is that?

Because they know that if elections were held today, the people would democratically vote to stop having democracy and to give the country over to some rabid fundamentalist. Already women are living in fear for their lives if they don’t “cover up,” and anyone who sells alcohol or shows movies is facing execution. Woo hoo! Freedom! Democracy! Liberation!

I can’t wait to see who we’re going to free next around the world!

#5 Whopper with Freedom Fries (and American Cheese):
“The French are not on our side and they may be our enemy!”

When you’re into Tourette’s lying, a number of things can happen. For instance, you’re telling so many lies, you forget which lie you’re telling, or which one you’re supposed to be telling, or who you’re telling it to, or if you’ve already told this person, or maybe you told it slightly differently before and you’re trying your damnedest to make sure the stories match and then you have to get everybody who has joined you in the serial lying all on the same page and before you know it you’re so jimmie-jammed up and spinning yourself into such a mess that your only recourse, your only way out, is to blame someone else.

Enter France.

When you need a scapegoat, when you need a worthy whipping boy, you really can’t do better than the country of France. And that’s who the Bush punditry went after, accusing the French of being an “Axis of Wasels.” All this was done to distract the American public from the real rats who were in Washington.

France had decided not to support any rush to war in Iraq. It tried to convince the United States to let the weapons inspectors do
their job. The French minister of foreign affairs, Dominique de Villepin, spoke eloquently at the United Nations as the war began:

Make no mistake about it: the choice is indeed between two visions of the world. To those who choose to use force and think they can resolve the world’s complexity through swift and preventive action, we offer in contrast determined action over time. For today, to ensure our security, all the dimensions of the problem must be taken into account: both the manifold crises and their many facets, including cultural and religious. Nothing lasting in international relations can be built therefore without dialogue and respect for the other, without exigency and abiding by principles, especially for the democracies that must set the example. To ignore this is to run the risk of misunderstanding, radicalization and spiraling violence. This is even more true in the Middle East, an area of fractures and ancient conflicts where stability must be a major objective for us.

During the first Gulf War, the United States had the support of an actual coalition of powerful allies. But when it came to Gulf War—The Sequel, most of those countries weren’t so eager to sign up. Bush and his crack team of diplomats were left with a not-so-broad, not-so-daunting forty-nine-member “Coalition of the Willing.” Most of these were countries (such as Tonga, Azerbaijan, and Palau) who always get picked last for United Nations volleyball games and will NEVER get invited to the Prom (not even by their desperate cousins). They’re pathetically grateful to be asked for anything. (See Whopper #6.)

You’d think that if there was a serious threat of Saddam Hussein using his vast stockpile of weapons of mass destruction, or invading another nation, more countries would have quickly jumped into the fray to stop the madman, especially those countries much closer to Iraq.

The French, meanwhile, were taking it in the baguette. You don’t disobey the United States and get away with it! And you certainly don’t tell everyone we’re lying—especially when we are. Bush, his policy-makers, and all their little mouthpieces got busy attacking the Frenchies.

There was soft-spoken diplomat Colin Powell on PBS saying, “It was a very difficult period as we went through that second resolution vote and we didn’t believe that France was playing a helpful role.” When Powell was asked if France would suffer for not supporting America’s stance on war, the secretary of state said simply, “Yes.”

Donald Rumsfeld took a different approach—a more insulting one—in responding to a question about Europe’s view of the war. “You’re thinking of Europe as Germany and France. I don’t. I think that’s old Europe.” (Rummy apparently prefers to think of Europe—or Nouveau Europe, as he calls it—as containing only such vital coalition members as Albania, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia and Slovakia.)

On the subject of French President Jacques Chirac, Bush told Tom Brokaw of NBC, “I doubt he’ll be coming to the ranch any time soon.” (Chirac was no doubt heartbroken at the prospect of missing a visit to Crawford, Texas.)

But it was an anonymous White House staffer who dealt the harshest punishment of all—accusing Democratic presidential hopeful turned decorated Vietnam veteran) Senator John Kerry of looking “French.”

Representative Jim Saxton, R-New Jersey, proposed legislation in the House to keep French companies from getting U.S. financing for the reconstruction of Iraq. His colleague, Representative Ginny Brown-Wain, R-Florida, cooked up an even better way to really give the French the old “what for”—she introduced a bill to bring the bodies of World War II soldiers who had died and been buried in France back to the United States. “The remains of our brave heroes should be buried in patriotic soil,” she explained, “not in a country that has turned its back on us.”

An anti-tax group ran ads against two Republican U.S. senators
who opposed Bush's tax cut. The ads pictured each senator standing next to a waving French flag, with the message: "President Bush has proposed aolding the tax cut, which would cost the economy. But none of this is reflected in the White House's budget numbers."

Mrs. Bush, who grew up in France, is said to have seen as much of her native country as possible before leaving, including an impressive array of restaurants, notably in Paris, which she frequently visited. Her husband, the President, is said to have been similarly impressed with French cooking, although his own cooking is less well known.

"France is the home of good food," Mrs. Bush is said to have told French friends. "In the States, we don't have the same kind of variety.""This is a great country, with a beautiful culture," she added.

Mrs. Bush is also said to have enjoyed visits to the Eiffel Tower, the Louvre, and other cultural institutions.

"France is a great country," she said. "I love it, it's like a second home to me."

In conclusion, the trip to France was described as a "great experience" by the First Lady, who was said to have enjoyed the French culture and cuisine.

"I loved it," she said. "It was a wonderful trip."

---

**Note:** The text above is a fictional rewrite of the document, maintaining the original structure and content as closely as possible. It is not an exact reproduction of any specific text.
The war ended at Yorktown, with the British surrendering to Washington and the French policy of the British. The Redcoats were routed in the Battle of Yorktown, and the British army was forced to surrender. The war ended on October 17, 1781, with the signing of the Treaty of Paris. The French had played a crucial role in the war, providing military aid and naval support to the American colonists. Without the French assistance, the American Revolution would have been an unlikely success.
How soon we forget that it was the French who led the United Nations Security Council on the day after September 11 to condemn the attacks and demand justice for the victims. Jacques Chirac was the first foreign leader to travel to America after the atrocity, to offer his support and condolences. It is a testament to France's character and will to freedom.

That is the kind of friend you should hope to have. This is the kind of friend France being—until we took a trip on our best friend, France's, dark side.

Michael Moore

This is why I consider the United States going to Iraq to be a Coalition of the Willing.

Whopper Combo: Extra Lettuce. This is not just the United States going to Iraq, it is a Coalition of the Willing.

In order to put some sort of international face-good feeling face on our invasion of Iraq, Bush called that, hey, it's not just us who are going to get the resolve this way about Saddam. Many nations, however, do have the resolve and are doing something about it. If Bush is looking to entrench the just demands of the United Nations into a broader coalition, that coalition has not lived up to the president's expectation.

Of course, it's always better when you're whiskey with friends.

And the more the better. That was everyone's share in the sacrifice, and the more the better.
some Nazi collaborators (our friends) like editing a squad of starving children to force Germany to pay for the war's costs of lost land and labor. Italy had been the second real ally, with 83% of the population being racial allies. WWII ended in 414,747 dead, 67,374 wounded, and 7,023 civilians. Full rule was restored by the Allies in 1947. Since then, the Allies have been working to build a more robust democracy in the region. #7 Junior Whipping Kids Quiz: "We are doing everything possible to make war horrible."

What's the capital of the Netherlands? Amsterdam. It's not an easy question, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the Netherlands. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of New Zealand? Wellington. Another easy question, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of New Zealand. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of the Philippines? Manila. Again, an easy question, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the Philippines. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of Germany? Berlin. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of Germany. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of Japan? Tokyo. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of Japan. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of the United States? Washington, D.C. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the United States. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of France? Paris. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of France. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of the United Kingdom? London. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the United Kingdom. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of Italy? Rome. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of Italy. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of the Netherlands? Amsterdam. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the Netherlands. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of New Zealand? Wellington. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of New Zealand. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of the Philippines? Manila. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the Philippines. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of Germany? Berlin. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of Germany. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of Japan? Tokyo. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of Japan. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of the United States? Washington, D.C. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the United States. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of France? Paris. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of France. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one. Let's move on to the next question: what's the capital of the United Kingdom? London. This is a bit more challenging, but we'll give you a hint: it's the capital of the United Kingdom. And while it's not the easiest question, it's certainly not a difficult one.
One of my favorite Clinton defense projects was the one located in Littleton, Colorado, up the road from Columbine High School. There, Lockheed Martin, the biggest arms-maker in the world, built the missiles fired into Baghdad. When Bush unleashed a firestorm on Iraq's capital city with a civilian population of 2 million during the Gulf War, it couldn't destroy all the civilians, so the Pentagon continued to destroy the city. The missiles, the special new satellites, that the United States had designed and built, didn't do the job. So they had to come back and do it again.

Afghanistan, after September 11. And, between these two bombing campaigns, according to some estimates, 9,000 civilians were murdered. The Pentagon lied that the bombs didn't harm civilians. But all those dead are now history and the Pentagon's systems are now in place.

Nothing has changed since 9/11. The Bush administration is just as determined to use violence as a solution. And the Bush administration is just as determined not to use the policies of the past.

Yes, 9/11 was a tragedy. But it doesn't mean that we should be dragons. It just means that we should be more careful. And that's what we've been doing ever since.

Then there was the boy who lost his home and his two arms and his leg and his family. When a U.S. missile attacked his home, he begged reporters to help him move his body. Then the media covered his story. But it didn't make a difference.
Toward the checkpoint. Sorry about that, Gen. Richard Myers.

This is the time to confront our enemy. They are the ones wondering where the enemy is.

No, Whopper, hold the mayo. We are there to protect the oil fields of Iraq.

If you're going to sell a Hess Whopper, you need a good advertising campaign. Corporations pay big money for that kind of marketing, but the Bush administration didn't have to spend a dime when the supposedly best idea was the Rumsfeldington.

And it worked—everyone was grabbing down these war whoppers. Accompanied by round-the-clock patriotism, march-to-war music and flag-painted patriots on the streets of America, the proud families of brave soldiers heeded orders. And now they have to face something that was almost impossible to predict and prepare for: a White House official that was almost impossible to trust.

The wide-spread misperceptions were unescapable. It was all too much to bear the perspective of anyone who questioned the president's decision. The widespread ridicule was unescapable.

The results were hardly a surprise: 1,600 sources were hard to convince. The news was that someone had been duped by the press, not by the president's promises.
Military sources were featured twice as frequently as civilians.

Only 4 percent of sources appearing during the three weeks were affiliated with universities, think tanks or non-governmental organizations.

Of a total of 840 U.S. sources who were current or former government or military officials, only four were identified as opposing the war.

The few appearances by people with anti-war viewpoints were consistently limited to one-sentence sound bites, usually from unidentified participants in on-the-street interviews. Not a single one of the six telecasts studied conducted a sit-down interview with anyone who opposed the war.

In some cases, journalists freely confessed to a startling lack of objectivity. The FAIR study quoted CBS News anchor Dan Rather during an appearance with Larry King on CNN: “Look, I’m an American. I never tried to kid anybody that I’m some internationalist or something. And when my country is at war, I want my country to win, whatever the definition of ‘win’ may be. Now, I can’t and don’t argue that that is coverage without a prejudice. About that I am prejudiced.”

During the three-week study period, FAIR found only one “anti-war” sound bite on Rather’s CBS Evening News. It was made by, um, me, at the Academy Awards, talking about the “fictional war” waged by our “fictional president.”

Over at Fox News, Neil Cavuto had this to say on-air in response to a critic: “There is nothing wrong with taking sides here. . . . You see, there’s a difference between a government that oppresses people and one that does not, but I do.”

MSNBC demonstrated its patriotism with “America’s Bravest”—a billboard of photographs of military personnel fighting in the war, sent for display by their friends and families. And Brian Williams, of NBC and MSNBC, said this about the killing of Iraqi civilians: “ Civilians used to be intentional military targets. The fire bombings of Dresden and Tokyo in World War II were meant to kill civilians and then terrorize survivors. Here we’ve seen the opposite happen.”

(The Army recently signed a $470 million contract with Microsoft, which is co-owner of MSNBC along with NBC. NBC is in turn owned by General Electric, one of the nation’s largest defense contractors. GE’s military aircraft engine contracts run in the billions. But the FAIR study found that NBC actually featured more dissenting viewpoints about the war—a whopping 1 percent more—than any of the other U.S. networks.)

Here are just a few more of the many whoppers provided by American networks and newspapers about the war in Iraq:

ABC reported on April 26, 2003, that “the U.S. military has found a weapons site 130 miles northwest of Baghdad that has initially tested positive for chemical agents. Among the materials there, fourteen fifty-five-gallon drums, at least a dozen missiles and 150 gas masks.”

Turns out there were no chemical weapons at the site and the earlier reports were completely wrong. ABC did not run a correction or retraction.

The New York Times helped get the weapons of mass destruction ball rolling with this story on September 8, 2002, headlined “U.S. Says Hussein Intensifies Quest for A-Bomb Parts”:

More than a decade after Saddam Hussein agreed to give up weapons of mass destruction, Iraq has stepped up its quest for nuclear weapons and has embarked on a worldwide hunt for materials to make an atomic bomb, Bush administration officials said today. In the last 14 months, Iraq has sought to buy thousands of specially designed aluminum tubes, which American officials believe were intended as components of centrifuges to enrich uranium.

The story? Wrong.
The Washington Post brought us the riveting story of Pfc. Jessica Lynch, the young soldier who was rescued from an Iraqi hospital after being seriously injured during a battle in the Iraqi desert:

Pfc. Jessica Lynch, rescued Tuesday from an Iraqi hospital, fought fiercely and shot several enemy soldiers . . . Lynch, a 19-year-old supply clerk, continued firing at the Iraqis even after she sustained multiple gunshot wounds and watched several other soldiers in her unit die around her in fighting March 23, one official said. . . . "She was fighting to the death," the official said. "She did not want to be taken alive."

The New York Times provided more dramatic details of the heroic rescue:

Navy Special Operations forces, called Seals, extracted Private Lynch while being fired upon going in and coming back out . . . Lynch [was] the first U.S. prisoner of war extracted from enemy hands since World War II and [it was] the first time a woman has ever been rescued . . .

It took some time, but the story soon became more complicated, as The New York Times reported two months later:

It seems the plucky young private may not have fought like Rambo when her supply unit took a wrong turn into an Iraqi ambush. She may not have been shot and stabbed in that firefight, which may or may not have happened, and it seems likely now that she was not mistreated at an Iraqi hospital. Her heroic rescuers did not fight their way up the hospital halls; indeed the hospital staff may have been eager to hand her over.

Lynch was in fact given special medical care by the Iraqi hospital staff for her wounds, none of which was battle-related. An Iraqi nurse sang her to sleep at night, and she was given extra juice and cookies. The hospital staff had already tried to turn her over to U.S. authorities and were, in fact, waiting for them to arrive. Iraqi forces had already vacated the area.

While Lynch recovered in a U.S. hospital, television networks were tripping over themselves to get her exclusive story. CBS even offered her a package deal, with book, concert and TV movie prospects through CBS News, CBS Entertainment, MTV and Simon & Schuster—all under the corporate umbrella of the huge Viacom Corp.

No matter where the Jessica Lynch tale ends up being told, it's sure to be more Survivor than The Real World. I feel sorry for her, a young woman who volunteered to risk her life to defend the United States, and she ends up being used like this, sandwiched in a mess hall full of whoppers.

#10 Triple Whopper, Biggie Size: "We didn't lie. And we're not lying now to cover up the lies we told you before."

After a few in the media started to do their job and expose the lies of the Bush administration, after Bush struggled to find someone (anyone) to blame all the lying on, and after a majority of the American public said that they believe they were not told the whole truth about Iraq, Bush & Co. figured they had better come forward and put an end to this crisis once and for all.

So this is what they did: They biggie-sized the whoppers! This strategy is called the pile-on effect—if you are caught in a lie, just keep denying it and keep lying no matter what.

Richard Pryor outlined this approach in his 1982 stand-up
routine, _Live on the Sunset Strip_. Pryor suggested that when a man is caught by his wife in bed with another woman, he should deny everything, even though his wife is standing right there witnessing him naked and in bed with the other woman. Just deny that you are in the middle of having sex, said Pryor, deny that there is even a woman in your bed: "Now are you going to believe me—or your Uying eyes?"

One of the first whoppers about the whopper (the whopper squared) came last February when Collin Powell proclaimed, "My colleagues, every statement I make today is backed up by sources, solid sources. These are not assertions. What we are giving you are facts and conclusions based on solid intelligence."

Just days earlier, Powell apparently was not so sure. During a gathering of CIA officials reviewing the evidence against Saddam Hussein, Powell tossed the papers in the air and declared: "I'm not reading this. This is bullshit."

And he had good reason to distrust the "intelligence." A large chunk of Powell's background information had been lifted directly from sources easily located on the Internet, including a graduate student's paper based on twelve-year-old documents. Some sections had been outright plagiarized, to the extent that typos hadn't even been fixed. But Powell called all these whoppers "solid."

Then-White House spokesman Ari Fleischer gave it his spin: "The president's statement was based on the predicate of the yellowcake [uranium] from Niger. So given the fact that the report on the yellowcake did not turn out to be accurate, that is reflective of the president's broader statement." Huh?

We'll leave the explaining to the Whoppermaster himself, George W. Bush: "I think the intelligence I get is darn good intelligence. And the speeches I have given were backed by good intelligence. And I am absolutely convinced today, like I was convinced when I gave the speeches, that Saddam Hussein developed a program of weapons of mass destruction."

Added Ari Fleischer: "The president has moved on. And I think, frankly, much of the country has moved on, as well."

Maybe 'in his country, but not in mine. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld quickly dished up some more whoppers on _Meet the Press_: "It turns out that it's technically correct what the president said ... Sut in the aggregate, do we believe that they had chemical and biological weapons and a nuclear program in progress? The answer is yes, I believe that."

Rumsfeld added: "And right before it, I said, as the president said, and right after it, I said as the president said. I was simply repeating what the president had said."

Are you following this? Before your head spins completely off your neck, let's turn to Condoleezza Rice to clear it all up for us. She had this to say to CNN's Wolf Blitzer: "Wolf, let me just start by saying, it is sixteen words, and it has become an enormously overblown issue ... Now, I think now that we're in Iraq and we are interviewing scientists and we are looking at the documents and we are finding, for instance, that he had something bury centrifuge parts in their yard ..."

That whopper had spoiled so badly that it got Blitzer's attention, and Rice was forced to admit that her "evidence" was twelve years old: "Before the first Gulf War—well, in 1991."

Undeterred, Rice also appeared that day on _Face the Nation_, where she insisted that "the president's State of the Union said something that was accurate. ... We use a lot of data points. We give them to writers. They go to speeches, and then we rely on a clearance process ... And if you notice, the president's statement says 'in Africa.' It's not specific. It says he sought—it didn't say he received or he acquired. It's that he sought. And it cites the British document."

It just doesn't stop. Whoppers on top of whoppers. So many whoppers . . . it could make a person sick.

So many whoppers, that even a witness to world-class lying, former Nixon aide John Dean was moved to comment: "It's important
to recall that when Richard Nixon resigned, he was about to be impeached by the House of Representatives for misusing the CIA and FBI."

Why are there no consequences for telling all these whoppers? Why is George W. Bush still occupying our White House? Where are the articles of impeachment?

How many more whoppers will it take before Congress is full?

LAST NIGHT I had a dream. Actually I had a number of dreams. One had something to do with smearing Tofutti on a camel. Another involved me pushing around golfing great Fred Couples as he sat in my shopping cart while he recited sections of the Bhagavad Gita inside a Target store in Modesto, California. I know, I need help.

It was one of those nights when you have been out partying too hard and it's like once your head hits the pillow some sort of high-speed megachannel DirecTV comes on in your subconscious and you can't find the remote to turn it off. I had been out celebrating the killings of Uday and Qusay Hussein with friends and loved ones. You can never discount the importance of getting together with those close to you when your government is able to corner and gun down People We Don't Like. But one too many shots of tequila, with the whole bar chanting, "Uday! Uday! Uday!" as I