

18/12/2000

Bush avenges Dad's humiliating defeat

Abdullah Ahmad

THIRTY-SEVEN years ago, a Texan was President. He was Lyndon Baines Johnson, the only American President who ever visited Malaysia. I was an intern in his office when he was Vice-President and accompanied Tun Razak to the White House when he became President at the height of Indonesia's Konfrantasi against us.

Johnson, whatever commentators and biographers have written about him, was a good friend of this country. Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra, on Tun Razak's suggestion, agreed to rename the Felda scheme in Labu, Negri Sembilan, Kampung LBJ, to commemorate the President's visit there.

Then in 1988, another Texan (George W. Bush Sr who was defeated by Bill Clinton in 1992) and now his son is in the Oval Office.

On the eve of polling (November 6) I wrote in this column that George W Bush would win what appeared to be a neck-and-neck race, the closest Presidential election since 1960. It was as Dan Rather, the famous broadcaster, said, "this race is as tight as a too-small bathing suit on a too-hot car ride back from the beach."

The man who actually robbed Gore of his chance was Ralph Nader, the Green Party candidate, who commented that "you can't spoil a system that's spoilt to the core."

The George Bushes now join the John Adamases as the only father-son occupants of the Oval office.

Yet, for its faults, democracy in the US is immensely strong, and it has survived the five torturous and demeaning weeks that have made the 2000 Presidential Elections an object of bewilderment and derision across the globe.

I voted, as indeed did Malaysia, for Bush simply because I believe he will start his tenure in the White House on January 20 2001 without an inherent prejudice against Malaysia. Malaysia-US bilateral ties are expected to be enhanced if, as Dr Mahathir Mohamad said, the new President would scrupulously observe the tradition of not interfering in the domestic affairs of another sovereign and independent nation.

For sure, Kuala Lumpur will not erupt into party mode just yet. But we are guardedly optimistic.

President Bush can advance US interests and strategic alliances, even promote democracy and expand free trade generally with a balanced policy based on political realism. I am not deluding myself that Bush does have his own foreign policy priorities. But for as long as his administration and he respect our sovereignty, he deserves our co-operation and support. We are not, objectively speaking, poles apart and there are not too many political positions that each finds hard to stomach. Malaysia being a small nation, is rather insignificant in overall US foreign policy though not unimportant for US strategic and commercial interests.

After all, Malaysia is the US' 11th biggest trading partner. I expect, at the very least, Washington's tone will be more diplomatic as it strives to promote strong defence, democracy against failed leaders with failed policies and state organised-terrorism.

As far as I am concerned, Bush won Florida all along. For sure, ultimately the Presidency was decided by a 5-4 US Supreme Court decision, apparently reflecting the judges' own political allegiances. Now, Malaysians know there are politicians in black robes! Two of the four Supreme Court justices who dissented, David Souter and John Paul Stevens,

were appointees of Republican Presidents, George Bush Senior and Gerald Ford respectively, whilst Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer were appointees of President Clinton. Of the five who gave the Presidency to George W Bush, three were appointed by Reagan and one each by Nixon and Bush Senior.

I was interviewed by an American Radio station and I stated that the American election was flawed and a farce that had taken the shine out of American democracy. It did not convey the best image of American democracy to the developing world. President Bush should bring new realism in international relations by accepting that America cannot be the world's moral guardian, especially when it is quite clearly arbitrary with whom it chooses to take the moral high ground.

The Bush Administration, with General Colin Powell as his chief foreign policy advisor, will more or less continue the previous administration's policy towards Malaysia, although it is too early to say for certain. Perhaps Bush will put less pressure on human rights than Clinton and concentrate for a while on improving American democracy that has suffered in the past five weeks. Bush's victory is a big boost for big business, the defence industry and special interest groups (oil and tobacco). It is a disaster for environmental politics and the United Nations.

One must not forget that it was Bush Senior who proclaimed the "New World Order" to underscore Washington's world dominance, and it is not impossible for Bush Junior to be more belligerent in projecting US power, ignoring the legitimate interests and rights of other sovereign states and punishing those who do not pretend to accept Washington's policies.

Even a superpower needs friends and must be part of the global community. I do not believe Bush and Powell will unnecessarily push and bully small nations. However, only time can tell. We must make American public opinion our ally. Only American public opinion can contain Bush.

Before Bush starts his foreign adventures, as an escape valve and a means of avoiding any intractable problems at home, he must first deal with the bitter divide in the US political system and the badly bruised judiciary. His slim majority and court-mandated victory should not and cannot be translated as a mandate for radicalism at home or overseas. He has to live with a neatly divided Senate and only with a slim majority in the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, a victory is a victory, regardless the margin. Bush should not feel disadvantaged by public doubt over his victory and legitimacy.

For 36 days Americans, and those of us with access to CNN, were able to watch every laborious detail of Al Gore's desperate and badly advised attempt to sue his way to the Oval office. I have never seen more exhaustive and comical instantaneous responses and counter-responses from various spokespersons on both sides. The process must have been extremely traumatic for both. In the end, even if it was a bit late, Gore did the right thing, indeed the only honourable action left for him to take: concede that he had lost.

I've been lucky enough to have been in the US for three presidential elections, in 1960, 1984 and 1996. The 2000 election more than any previously reflected the effect that television has and will continue to have on politicians and future polls. The electronic media has also introduced a new dimension into politics (not excluding Malaysian politics, and many Malay politicians in particular don't seem to know just quite what to make of this).

Well, even old dogs must learn new tricks if they want to stay in the kennel. Ministers should realise that some of the efforts to use TV cameras to their advantage often appear more funny than awe-inspiring.

Bush, in many ways, came out better on TV than Al Gore. Bush is more

believable and natural than Gore, who always looks awkward, artificial, dull and contrived. The best thing about the 2000 presidential election is it shows how politicised the American judiciary is, in addition to the wicked old Cook County political traditions of corrupt practices, horse trading and secrecy.

The high-minded American cleric or ulamak has been exposed. Having pontificated for years on the superiority of American liberal democracy, he has been unmasked as a practitioner of practical politics and no better than a pragmatic Malaysian politician.

(END)