

COLUMN

Mr. Joost Beversluis



Foto: Rob Philip

And Justice for Al

If at an important election, outdated counting machines come up with a result as close as 0,0001 of the total votes, a recount should be ordered unless an opposite result makes no difference.

Immediately and automatically. The outcome lies within the machines' margin of error. It may be welcomed as a sign of good luck or a best guess until further notice but that's all. A recount, not by reusing the inadequate equipment to be sure, which leaves no option but to do it by hand. And if the 0,0001 winner objects to a manual recount he's either afraid his luck has run out or he anticipates defeat. The first reason makes sense but is insufficient to reject a recount; the latter can only originate in a bad conscience. Now Dubbaya seems no gambler. He put his faith in God who, as he will certainly believe, doesn't play dice. Therefore Dubbaya's cries of objection to a manual recount must have been rooted in apprehension regarding its result. Therefore I humbly suggest that Al Gore probably collected more votes in Florida than did Dubbaya.

Mr Ralph Nader argued they were two of a kind, George W. Bush and Al Gore and that *he* made the difference. Perhaps Mr Nader is right, from his perspective. He certainly made the difference: Mr Nader made Al Gore lose the election, more so than did the rusty machinery in Florida. Many within the US and more in Europe – me amongst them – do see a difference between Dubbaya and Al.

It has always been my firm belief that in order to act democratically you shouldn't just give up power, or the struggle to win it, when you got it all wrong or lost at the ballots. It is the giving up in spite of being right or for trivial reason that, at the same time, is a token of living democracy and keeps the thing alive. How pros-

perous Africa would be if its leaders were in the habit of stepping down when rumour ran rife, or after inquiry it was confirmed, that they had placed a cigar between their mistress' *lips* for fun; or some jocular act of their own choosing. What desolate place it actually is, now that these leaders must be found corrupt, bloodthirsty or maniac or without public support before even considering giving up power.

Al Gore gave a party, a giving up party. According to a photograph I saw in the newspaper, he drank Heineken, which isn't a very good beer, something he must have become aware of next morning. Because, ah... son of a gun, he probably drank too much of it, a misdemeanour Dubbaya will never more commit now that he has seen Jesus and given up drinking.

I hope that, when recovered from his Heineken hangover, Al Gore too was born again, in a more practical way. That he won't give up drinking – apart from just Heineken – but will give up giving up. He beat Dubbaya at the ballots, though pretty much the same type of guy and hindered by Mr Nader. He gave his boss a lesson in democracy by throwing in the towel in spite of being right. That makes him a fine candidate for the 2004 elections, from a European perspective that is.

I bet: even with Mr Nader preaching paradise once again and a united brudda Jeb and Mr Baker III spontaneously and tirelessly manually counting votes in Florida until Dubbaya is one in the lead, Al Gore will beat Bush Jr in 2004, as deservedly as his dad was undeservedly beaten in 1992.

Then, Justice would be done for Al Gore, by Al Gore.

n