SHORTER GOP: IT'S OKAY IF MALIKI'S GOVT SUPPORTS INSURGENTS, SO LONG AS IT'S NOT OUR MONEY

I'd like to return to an interchange between Waxman and Condi from the hearing today. Condi made a verygenerousoffer to let Waxman's committee review documents pertaining to corruption. Waxman pointed out that that offer did not allow the committee to discuss what it discovered in those documents publicly.

He raised the example of whether Iraqis were laundering money for use in militias. And Condi admitted that some of the corruption in Iraq contributed to funding militias. "Particularly in the south."

Someone must have been reading the blogs, because the Republicans (in a pretty smart strategy) saved some time for their designated attack dogs, Shays, Cannon, and Davis at the end so they could clarify what Condi meant with that answer (Darrell Issa must be busy in California trying to dilute that state's electoral votes while Rome burns, because this is usually his role on Oversight). At least Davis and Cannon (and I think Shays, though I was in the other room) got Condi to clarify that US money isn't going to Shiite militias who kill our troops. Iraqi money does.

Frankly, I'd sure like to see the accounting (though Condi correctly pointed out that State Department's relevant budget never goes directly to Iraqis, so it really doesn't fund Shiite militias). But consider where that leaves the Republicans.

We are currently providing a great deal of military support for a government that supports

militias—Condi says—that our arch enemy (unless you're Ollie North or Poppy Bush) is also supporting. We're supporting Maliki's government which in turn uses corruption to support pro-Iranian factions.

And that's okay for the Republicans, so long as Maliki isn't launder our own money to support the Shiite militas. Mostly because they have no choice. Stopping such a practice would effectively admit that the war has completely backfired, making our arch enemy (unless you're Ollie North or Poppy Bush) stronger.