

America's reluctance to support peacekeeping efforts. After Somalia, the White House issued a set of stringent conditions for American participation in—and even support of—any U.N. peacekeeping mission. The conditions were so stringent, in fact, that, if followed to the letter, they would prevent the dispatch of any peacekeeping mission ever. They demanded, for example, an exit strategy—a certainty that a mission could be accomplished in a limited time. The first test of these conditions came in Rwanda in May 1994, when Albright pressured the Security Council into delaying the dispatch of 5,000 peacekeepers until the Secretary General could assure them the new conditions could be met. No one can be sure if the peacekeepers could have prevented it, but thousands of Rwandans died in tribal slaughter during the delay.

Now, it seems that the U.N. can act only on those matters that the United States deems necessary for domestic political reasons. The U.N. was called upon to replace the American troops in Haiti and, as we have seen, to take on the dangerous job of separating the Serbs and Croats in Eastern Slavonia. Where U.S. interest is less evident—the future Somalias and Rwandas—the U.N. will likely do little.

That is especially true in an election year. Although 77 percent of Americans support the country's membership in the U.N. (according to a recent Gallup poll), Bob Dole is trying to score points by proclaiming that as president he would never let Boutros-Ghali decide where to send American troops (implying that Clinton did). The United States, of course, has veto power in the Security Council, and it is absurd to think that Boutros-Ghali could send U.S. troops anywhere without American consent. Dole also knows that the United States has committed troops to very few U.N. missions and that the Clinton administration has no intention of offering more. Yet the Dole attack may net some votes simply by jogging memories over the U.N.-U.S. failure in Somalia.

There is no danger of the United States pulling out of the U.N. A swell of public opposition would meet any serious attempt by American officials to do anything so radical. But the United States is pursuing policies that are bringing the U.N. to its knees. That is a startling phenomenon. Most Americans are not aware of it, and those who are do not seem to care. □

## The Washington Monthly

### JOURNALISM AWARD

APRIL 1996

**Greg Garland**  
*The Baton Rouge Advocate*

Baton Rouge entrepreneur Ambassador Lil Barrow-Veal was supposed to get below-market real estate from the federal government and use the housing to help the homeless. Instead, as Garland discovered, Barrow-Veal found more deserving recipients: her friends, relatives, and colleagues.

**James S. Kunen**  
*Time*

Kunen looks at the widespread rollback of mandatory school busing laws and, by extension, the "failure" of integration. "White flight" and growth in minority populations have segregated our schools and our cities, and caused bitter fights over school funding. America, Kunen gloomily suggests, may be returning itself to a doctrine of "separate but equal," with the support of blacks who once fought against it.

**Nicholas von Hoffman**  
*The Washington Post*

Americans think of "McCarthyism" as a witch hunt perpetrated by an evil man; von Hoffman contends that during the 1930s and 1940s, the American Left was more closely allied with Marxism-Leninism than it wants to remember. And although liberals properly decried the excesses of anti-communism, recently released evidence shows that communist sympathizers—as well as an array of agents employed by Moscow—had indeed penetrated the American governing establishment.

The Monthly Journalism Award is presented each month to one or more newspaper, magazine, radio, or television stories (or series of stories) that demonstrate a commitment to the public interest. We are particularly interested in reporting that explains the successes and failures of government agencies at all levels and of other institutions such as the media, corporations, unions, and foundations that contribute to the existence or solution of public problems. Please send nominations (including two copies of the article or broadcast text) to Monthly Journalism Award, 1611 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20009. Nominations for stories run in June or July are due August 15.

# The Best and Worst of Bob Dole

*He's left 35 years of footprints*

**BY JOSHUA WOLF SHENK**

**B**y this point, you probably know all about Russell, Kansas, the war wound, and the “mean streak.” In an era of personality politics, Bob Dole’s personality has been combed over by the very best. We know he’s a consummate dealmaker, but that he hates to be boxed in. He’s a smooth politician and fiercely loyal, but has an acerbic wit that sometimes gets him in trouble. We know about the great lines (“He could just fly over Kansas in Air Force One,” he said when asked if he wanted Nixon to campaign for him) and the disastrous ones (“Democrat wars,” “Stop lying about my record”).

Most of all, we know that Bob Dole really, really wants to be president.

But Dole’s personality offers little clue as to what he’d do if he achieved that goal. On the campaign trail, the ex-senator says he’s no Bill Clinton. But what would he do if he sent Clinton back to Arkansas and—a distinct possibility—led a White House backed by a Republican Congress?

Fortunately, Dole has left 35 years of footprints. A freshman House member at the dawn of the New Frontier in 1960, he won a Senate seat in 1968, chaired the Finance Committee in the early ’80s, and was the Senate Republican leader from 1985 until he stepped down last month.

What follows are the high and low moments of those 35 years. At his best, Bob Dole is a fiscal conservative who understands that “sacrifice” means more than cutting programs for the poor, and a skeptic of government activism who nevertheless sees the dangerous excesses of an unfettered marketplace. At his worst, Bob Dole is obeisant to the extreme fringes of his party and to wealthy campaign contributors, eschewing tough choices in favor of political advancement.

Obviously, this list reflects certain interests and viewpoints. And no one article can include all of the hundreds of issues Dole has faced in his career. But the facts are revealing nonetheless.

Paradoxically, one revealing element is that clear patterns are difficult to discern from this record—indeed, on many issues Dole has gone to both extremes. Which is the real Dole: the man who inveighs against a gas tax, or the man who voted to

*Research assistance provided by Tim Kasulis, Jason Morgan, Amanda Ripley, and Celeste Tarricone.*