

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

Replying to Mr. Buchanan’s column, “Can We Win an Insurgents’ War?” (May 22), I would like to point out that what Bush said he wanted to do was to 1.) achieve regime change and 2.) remove weapons of mass destruction.

As to the first, we accomplished that with the surrender of Saddam to our forces. As to the second, those weapons, if any were there, are not there now, so if we pull out it can’t be said that we “cut and ran” with the job only half done.

It cannot be said that the U.S. was defeated without first saying there was some never announced third objective that we left without accomplishing.

When Reagan went into Grenada, he achieved regime change and got out. When Bush Sr. went into Panama, he achieved regime change and got out. What are waiting for?

JIM WARE

Baton Rouge, La.

WHOSE WAR?

Dan McCarthy ends his exceedingly mild criticism of my comments in *Neoconned! Just War Principles* with this reproach directed against the current Right: “This is the great shame to all of us who call ourselves conservatives, but there is no denying the fact. The rot runs deeper than neoconservatism” (May 8). In fact, I couldn’t agree more with any statement, and a book of mine on the American conservative movement that is now in press underlines and documents the same point. “A Conservative War?” was certainly not conceived to absolve anyone for marching in lockstep behind the fools’ crusade for democracy in Iraq. And I do mention without the slightest sympathy “misguided patriots” and Republican hacks who have rallied to Bush’s foreign policy.

But the focus of my essay is the critical differences between a truly conservative war and the one that the neoconservatives have incited. If the neoconservatives had not captured this administration, those “who supported

the war without prompting from neoconservative censors” would not have this particular struggle to celebrate. In this sense we have all been engulfed in a war fueled by neoconservative ideology. But this should not be interpreted to suggest that other self-described conservatives do not merit scorn for this and other far-leftist delusions and their far-reaching consequences.

Needless to say, I rejoice at Dan’s efforts to warn us about how much ground on the Right our side will have to take back in order to become politically competitive.

PAUL GOTTFRIED

Elizabethtown, Pa.

Daniel McCarthy replies:

Professor Gottfried is very generous, and he is quite right that there is little difference between us on this matter. What distinction there is may be a matter of emphasis: although the neoconservatives were the agitators behind the Iraq War, conservatives more generally—apart from the small remnant of strict noninterventionists and George Kennan realists—have eagerly supported every war waged by a Republican president in modern times. Even without the neocons, had Bush decided to invade Iraq—or a Panama, Grenada, or any other nation of dubious strategic importance—there is every reason to believe most conservatives still would have supported him.

SUPREME COURTIER

In “Conservative Crack-Up,” Pat Buchanan outlines conflicting views as to whether George W. Bush is truly a conservative (April 24). While some of the president’s policies may not pass conservative standards, Pat praises the president with respect to taxes, sovereignty, and Supreme Court appointees Roberts and Alito.

However, the selection of these justices raises difficult questions about what it means to be a conservative. It is one thing to pick justices who “reject the activism of the Warren Court”; it is

quite another matter to favor the Imperial Presidency.

This will not, in my view, be a truly conservative court if it ends up rubber stamping a steady accretion of executive power, along with more and more covert decision-making and unlimited pre-emptive authority. It will not be a conservative court if it infringes on the separation of powers by setting one man above the law.

IRWIN SHISHKO

Chesterfield, Va.

CRACKING CODEWORDS

I think James Bovard hits the nail on the head: “The administration seems to have learned nothing from its democracy debacles of the last four years. But perhaps the rhetoric has all been a ruse. Perhaps invoking ‘democracy’ is simply a smokescreen in pursuit of the neoconservative goal of ‘benevolent global hegemony.’” (April 24).

Considering the extent to which the Bush regime has pulled out all the stops to undermine American democracy—warrantless surveillance, secret prisons, incommunicado detention without charges or trial, torture, assertion of executive authority to defy laws passed by Congress—I can’t for the life of me understand why anyone has been willing to give this crew any credit for being sincere in their pronouncements about democracy abroad.

“Democracy” is just today’s codeword for “pro-American”—it has simply taken the place of the codeword “Free World” as it was used in the Cold War era.

STEVE VINSON

Department of History, SUNY-New Paltz
New Paltz, N.Y.

The American Conservative welcomes letters to the editor. Submit by e-mail to letters@amconmag.com, by fax to 703-875-3350, or by mail to 1300 Wilson Blvd., Suite 120, Arlington, VA 22209. Please include your name, address, and phone number. We reserve the right to edit all correspondence for space and clarity.

Contents

June 5, 2006 / Vol. 5, No. 11

REUTERS PHOTO ARCHIVE



[COVER]

Out of Iraq, Into Darfur?

BY JUSTIN RAIMONDO Those who balked at a campaign to liberate Iraq now want to save Sudan. **Page 7**

[MIDEAST]

Iran: Gulf War III?

BY CHARLES V. PEÑA An attack on the Islamic Republic would send oil prices skyrocketing, but the real price would be in blood. **Page 12**

[POLITICS]

Life Lessons

BY W. JAMES ANTLE III The Democrats have a new abortion strategy: divide and conquer. **Page 15**

[ECONOMICS]

Not So Sweet

BY TIMOTHY P. CARNEY How Big Sugar turned guest workers into indentured servants **Page 23**

COLUMNS

6 Patrick J. Buchanan: Plight of the Palestinians

35 Taki: Revolting Elites

NEWS & VIEWS

4 Fourteen Days: One-Man Supreme Court; Staying the (Golf) Course in Iraq; Multinational Anthem

9 Deep Background: Revenge of Mary McCarthy

ARTICLES

11 Dennis Dale: A day without a Mexican

17 John Zmirak: Wilhelm Ropke balanced liberty and order.

20 Justin Logan: America's incoherent China policy

25 R.J. Stove: Neocons invade Oz

ARTS & LETTERS

28 Steve Sailer: Tom Cruise in "Mission: Impossible III"

29 Rod Dreher: *Look Homeward, America: In Search of Reactionary Radicals and Front-Porch Anarchists* by Bill Kauffman

30 Leon Hadar: *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy From 1940 to the Present* by Christopher Layne

33 Jesse Walker: *Attention Deficit Democracy* by James Bovard

COVER PHOTOS: PHOTOGRAPHER SHOWCASE, REUTERS PHOTO ARCHIVE. COVER DESIGN: MARK GRAEF

[PRESIDENCY]
SCOFFLAW IN CHIEF

A little less than a decade ago, Republicans reminded the country that the president is not above the law in the matter of President Clinton's perjury over his sexual antics. George W. Bush has indeed restored dignity to the Oval Office. Unfortunately, he has not restored the rule of law. Far from it—according to an analysis by the *Boston Globe*, Bush has taken it upon himself to flout no fewer than 750 laws passed since he took office.

Bush subscribes to a novel notion of constitutional jurisprudence that makes the president nearly equal to the Supreme Court in deciding which laws are constitutional. When Bush believes a law encroaches on presidential power—examples include congressional bans on torture and the use of illegally obtained evidence, as well as laws to protect whistleblowers—he either ignores it or issues a “signing statement” reserving the right to ignore it or apply an interpretation clearly at odds with congressional intent.

“This is an attempt by the president to have the final word on his own constitutional powers, which eliminates the checks and balances that keep the country a democracy,” Bruce Fein, a Reagan administration deputy attorney general, told the *Globe*. “There is no way for an independent judiciary to check his assertions of power”—at least within the secretive realm of national-security policy—“and Congress isn't doing it, either. So this is moving us toward an unlimited executive power.”

[IRAQ]
EMBASSY ROW

The *Washington Post* reports that political appointees at the Department of Agriculture recently received an e-mail: “The President has requested that all members of his cabinet and sub-cabinet incorporate message points on the Global War on Terror into speeches.”



PATRICK CHAPPAPE WWW.CAGLECARTOONS.COM

They are to remind audiences that “President Bush has a clear strategy for victory in Iraq”—just the sort of thing seamlessly integrated when discussing farm subsidies.

But coherence is a minor point compared to the greater problem: it's simply untrue. If the new \$592 million American embassy in Baghdad is any indication, far from declaring victory and coming home, the U.S. appears to be hunkering down for the long haul,

The 104-acre compound—comparable in size to Vatican City and ten times larger than a typical embassy—includes 21 buildings behind a 15-foot wall. Since electricity comes on only four hours per day and clean water is problematic in the rest of Baghdad, the embassy will include its own power generator and water purification plant—along with a swimming pool, gym, food court, and six apartment buildings. Four American “superbases” are also planned, complete with neighborhoods for contractors and an indoor golf course—not that we're going to be a permanent presence, the administration still assures. It's all just part of the “clear strategy for victory.”

[IMMIGRATION]
JOSE, CAN YOU SEE?

Illegal immigrants marching under foreign flags, “the Star-Spangled Banner” sung in Spanish to a Latin beat—to Nancy Pelosi, it can only mean one thing: “Hispanics are clearly vested in our country and want to continue to

contribute to the strength of our nation.” So she told the nation in a Cinco de Mayo broadcast, while President Bush called on immigrants to learn English—surprising because during the 2000 campaign he put considerable effort into Hispandering in Spanish. As Kevin Phillips reported in *American Dynasty*, Bush “would drop in at Hispanic festivals and parties, sometimes joining in singing ‘The Star-Spangled Banner’ in Spanish.” Outgoing White House Press Secretary Scott McClellan denied that, saying Bush “couldn't possibly sing the national anthem in Spanish. He's not that good with his Spanish.”

The Spanish version of the national anthem, “Nuestro Himno,” signals more than just that “Hispanics are clearly vested in our country.” It also shows that even the record-producing scion of one of Britain's leading Marxist families knows how to bring in the Benjamins when opportunity calls. The mastermind behind “Nuestro Himno” is Adam Kidron, the son, as *TAC's* Steve Sailer has pointed out, of a man eulogized by Britain's *Socialist Review* as “probably the most important Marxist economist of his generation.” Adam combines his father's passion for Third World causes with an appreciation of capitalism: as well as selling “Nuestro Himno,” he's also purchased Al Sharpton's million-man mailing list for marketing purposes. Sounds like he has the makings of a future Bush “Pioneer”—perhaps as part of a bilingual George P. campaign in 2012.