Confirmation of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, 2006 / Confirmation should be filibustered

Position: Confirmation should be filibustered

This position addresses the topic Confirmation of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, 2006.

For this position

"Democrats looking for a clear message on national security cannot afford to miss this opportunity to block the nomination of a man who personifies the failed Bush foreign policy. After all, it shouldn't be beyond our capacity to have a UN ambassador who is both pro-Israel and capable of fostering good relations with the rest of our allies while keeping Iraq on his front burner."

From He's Baaaack: John Bolton ... Still Bad for America, by Arianna Huffington (The Huffington Post, August 31, 2006) (view)

"Has it occurred to the geniuses running foreign policy for the Bush administration that the world isn't a Fox News show -- that rude spokespeople do not serve American interests?"

From Get the hook for John Bolton, by Froma Harrop (The Providence Journal, August 2, 2006) (view)

Against this position

"Bolton has a superb record and to deny him would send a dreadful message to the world that the president is not in charge of U.S. foreign policy. Even uglier, it would be doing the bidding of Kofi Annan and the secretary-general's enforcer Mark Malloch Brown, who has cozied up to the Democrats in the hope of dumping Bolton."

"U.N. members see American reform proposals not as ways to improve the organization but as hidden attempts to enhance U.S. power. This helps explain why Bolton has largely failed to achieve his stated goals — or much of anything else."


"So, will Democrats with broader ambitions -- such as Sen. Hillary Clinton -- now go through the exercise of a purely partisan filibuster to deprive the United States of a representative who, according to his U.N. colleagues, has been calm, firm, forthright and effective?"


"Indeed, most of the criticism aimed at Bolton has nothing to do with him. More than anything else, it represents an effort to set the political stage for the upcoming midterm congressional elections in November."

From A defeat for Bolton could undercut US policy, by Thomas M. Boyd (The Boston Globe, August 1, 2006) (view)

Mixed on this position

No results
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