

Let's see if I've got this straight. Two-thirds of the American people think the war in Iraq was a mistake and want to end it. It's the main reason they returned both houses of Congress to Democratic control last November. Reflecting the will of the people, both houses of Congress have prepared legislation that ties continued funding for the war to a scheduled withdrawal of our forces. The president has promised to veto this legislation. Since there are still enough Republicans in both the House and Senate *who do not reflect* the will of the people, his veto will not be overturned. According to 'Roveian' logic the resultant interruption in war funding will prove that the Democrats do not support our troops. Right!

What it will prove, actually, is that we have a king, not a president. A king needn't concern himself with the "will of the people," or be bothered by "checks and balances." He has the divine right and inspiration to rule by fiat, or, in the modern parlance, "his way or the highway."

But king or no, when he vetoes the Democrats' Iraq War legislation, it is he, and not the Democrats, who will be proven to have not supported the troops. With one deft sweep of his royal quill he will proclaim that he would rather interrupt funding for our troops than accept the will of the people. Not that it matters. Like checks and balances, accountability is not part of the royal equation.

T. M. Liston