

POLITICO's daily debate with policymakers and opinion shapers

The Arena

Sep. 11, 2012 / Roger Pilon

Is Mitt Romney cornered on national security?

The charge from the Obama camp - echoed, of course, by the mainstream media - that Romney is "cornered on foreign policy" has grown from a single fact - that he didn't mention "Afghanistan" in his convention acceptance speech. What nonsense! It's akin to the singular obsession with his taxes - while the nation spirals into economic decline and out-of-control debt.

Thus we find POLITICO's Mike Allen and Jim Vandehei writing this morning that "For Romney, according to top [unnamed] Republicans, the danger is that he has dug an even deeper hole for himself in an area that was already an Obama strength and looks oblivious to the concerns of a crucial Republican constituency - military families and veterans." An Obama strength? He's got one accomplishment - dispatching Osama bin Laden - and that rested on intelligence put in place long before he ever took office.

Meanwhile, he spends most of his time campaigning, as he has for years, while American soldiers continue to die at the hands of the very people we're supposed to be helping. And for what? Does anyone know what those deaths are supposed to be accomplishing? Is anyone in the mainstream media asking that question?

Let's remember that, unlike Romney, Obama hadn't a shred of executive experience when he took office. And the record speaks for itself, in both foreign and domestic policy. But you have to [put it together yourself](#). The mainstream media won't do it for you.