

sured America Online and MSN to turn over the records of how millions of people had used their computer search engines. Google resisted similar federal demands, but the feds recently turned up the heat. The Justice Department claims the information is necessary to produce evidence to justify reintroducing the Child Online Protection Act, which has been struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Technology expert John Dvorak suggests that it is plausible that the government is gathering up the search histories for purposes unrelated to child-porn crack-downs.

The combination of the phone-call data and the online-search records would go a long way to creating Total Information Awareness (TIA). When the Bush administration first pushed TIA as a ticket to safety in 2002, a public uproar awoke Congress and forced the administration to formally shelve efforts to track almost every area of people's lives. But the feds apparently ignored any congressional orders to cease and desist.

The terrorist surveillance program is the result of a personal edict issued by the president. What other National Security Presidential Directives might Bush have issued? How many laws must be violated before citizens recognize that the government is fundamentally lawless? ■

James Bovard is the author of the recently released Attention Deficit Democracy and eight other books.

Tell your friends about
The American Conservative ...

the magazine for
thinking conservatives

www.amconmag.com

Khaddafi's Carrots

While the Bush administration touts its diplomatic success in Tripoli, it refuses to offer Palestinians a similar package.

By M.J. Rosenberg

PERHAPS IT IS BECAUSE I just read a brother's beautiful memoir about one of the Pan Am 103 victims, but I am not overly impressed with the decision to welcome Libya and its leader, Muammar Khaddafi, back into the family of nations. That book tells the story of a young Jewish American, David Dornstein, who was 25 when Libyan agents blew up the plane on which he was returning from Israel by way of London. He died along with 269 other passengers, including 189 Americans. Many were college kids coming home following a semester abroad, four days before Christmas.

But now we are told that all is forgiven. It has, after all, been 18 years since those students, tourists, and business travelers were blown out of that fuselage. Many survived the explosion and the two-minute plunge, only to die on impact. Imagine.

Nevertheless, the Bush administration argues that because Libya has abandoned its nuclear-weapons program, it is a worthy U.S. partner.

It is, no doubt, a good thing that Libya has decided not to develop weapons of mass destruction and especially not nuclear weapons. And it is certainly good news if the Libyans are actually helping in the anti-terrorism struggle. But there is some debate about how advanced Libya's WMD program was to begin with, while there is no debate about the fact that Libya's human-rights record is abysmal. In 2003, the State

Department said it was "unconscionable" that Libya was chairing the UN Human Rights Commission and used its presence, quite rightly, as an argument for abolishing the Commission.

As for terrorism, House International Relations Committee Chairman Henry Hyde has it exactly right: "Libya's continued failure to resolve outstanding claims for past acts of terrorist aggression ... will serve as a stumbling block in the path toward" normalization of relations.

Then there is Khaddafi's anti-Semitism. When he came to power in 1969, Khaddafi confiscated all Jewish property and cancelled all debts owed to Jews. For almost 40 years, Libya has been at the forefront of nations that traffic in both terrorism and virulent anti-Semitism.

But, supposedly, that has now changed. Tom Lantos, ranking Democrat on Hyde's committee, who calls himself "the leading voice in Congress for normalizing relations with Libya," thinks so. Welcoming the Bush administration's Libyan policy, Lantos said, "The world is a far safer place as a result of these actions. I hope that rogue states such as Syria and Iran will learn the lesson: responsible behavior means much better relations with the United States." Lantos conceded that there are still problems with Libya, but "establishing full diplomatic relations" as a first step will "open up more avenues for action on these matters...."

Wait a minute. The United States, and particularly Congress, never applies that

kind of common-sense logic to the Palestinians. Even when Mahmoud Abbas was in power, he was told that before we even considered addressing his needs, he would first have to implement a laundry list of reforms reaching into every aspect of Palestinian affairs—and then U.S. auditors would certify that he actually did what he promised.

Lantos was one of the leading members of Congress demanding that Palestine evolve into a veritable Vermont before he would even consider allowing the president to ask Israel to ease the burdens of the occupation. Libya, on the other hand, gets what it wants first as an incentive for further good behavior.

Why is it that oil-rich Libya is forgiven for committing one of the worst crimes ever perpetrated against Americans while the Palestinians—even after the PLO recognized Israel and Mahmoud Abbas ended the intifada—are repeat-

were still maps in social-studies texts that didn't show Israel.

During the year between Abbas's election and the predictable Hamas win (predictable because you didn't have to be Metternich or Kissinger to understand that if Abbas could not "deliver," he would be displaced by Hamas), neither the United States nor Israel did very much at all to help him succeed. Prime Minister Sharon, though proclaiming him a "partner," refused to negotiate with him.

As for Hamas, under legislation now pending in Congress, in order for the Palestinian Authority to qualify for relations with and aid from the United States, it would have to publicly acknowledge Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, purge from its security services individuals with ties to terrorism, dismantle all terrorist infrastructure, confiscate unauthorized weapons,

perhaps appropriately, we are looking the other way.

I will not argue that we should do the same with Hamas. Unlike Libya, Hamas has not abandoned terrorism. But Libya did not reform in a day either. The United States worked for years to encourage changes in Tripoli. But the same government officials who adopted such a generous attitude toward Libya are vigorously promoting legislation which simply punishes Palestinians without in any way encouraging the Palestinian regime to evolve.

Were all the carrots eaten by Libyans? Was all the ability to see nuance in complicated international situations used up?

Right now, the Israeli government is closely following a serious debate within Hamas about if, and how, it could meet international conditions relating to accommodation with Israel. And, as Prime Minister Olmert has said, Israel is devising ways to provide essential aid directly to the Palestinian people while bypassing Hamas. As he has said again and again, Israel does not want innocent Palestinians to suffer; he simply wants essential aid to get to Palestinians without going through Hamas. But Congress is utterly indifferent, busily crafting bills to penalize all Palestinians whether identified with Hamas or not. Luckily, the Knesset takes a more humane approach.

Again the difference between the treatment of Libya and of the Palestinians is striking. Muammar Khaddafi's rantings were regularly scanned for positive aspects by an oil-hungry Congress and world.

But the Palestinians have got nothing to sell. Nothing, except maybe peace and security for Israel, and vastly improved U.S. standing in the Middle East. ■

M.J. Rosenberg is Director of the Israel Policy Forum's Washington office and a former editor of AIPAC's Near East Report.

UNLIKE LIBYA, HAMAS HAS NOT ABANDONED TERRORISM. BUT LIBYA DID NOT REFORM IN A DAY EITHER.

edly given a list of hoops they must jump through if they are to achieve any semblance of normalization of relations with the United States, let alone an independent state?

I am not referring to Hamas. I am referring to the Palestinian Authority when it was run by President Mahmoud Abbas. Every time some imam in Hebron gave a nasty anti-Semitic speech, legions of representatives and senators issued statements of denunciation of Abbas for not controlling the clergy. If Abbas's enemies planted a bomb, Abbas was blamed for not successfully disarming enemies who had more firepower than Abbas had. After Abbas cleaned up Palestinian textbooks to delete anti-Semitic references, he was told that his efforts were not good enough; there

arrest and bring terrorists to justice, destroy unauthorized arms factories, thwart and pre-empt terrorist attacks, fully co-operate with Israel's security services, halt anti-Israel incitement in media, schools, and mosques (and replace these materials, including textbooks, with materials that promote tolerance, peace, and coexistence with Israel), ensure democracy, the rule of law, and an independent judiciary, and guarantee the financial transparency and accountability of all government ministries and operations. The president would have to certify that all of the above conditions are met.

Needless to say, those requirements are not being imposed on Libya. For now, focusing on Libya's failings does not serve American interests and so,

Dynasty Through Diversity

Why the Bush administration is so adamant about amnesty

By Steve Sailer

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH paid lip service to toughening border enforcement in his May 15 speech on illegal immigration. Yet his showcase recommendation of sending 6,000 National Guardsmen to the Mexican frontier would merely station, on a 24/7 basis, one man about every 2.5 miles. And anyway, as Bush admitted, “Guard units will not be involved in direct law-enforcement activities.”

The president displayed more genuine enthusiasm for promoting the remarkably lax Senate immigration bill, which Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation estimated would bring in 103 million new immigrants over the next 20 years. (It has since been amended down to merely 66 million newcomers.) The impact of such rapid, radical change on working-class wages, public-school quality, affirmative action, social tranquility, and the popularity of political correctness would be dire.

The president’s patent insincerity about controlling illegal immigration has catalyzed the realization among a growing number of conservatives that the Bush administration’s governing principles, such as they are, are at best only superficially conservative. Their common denominator is a lack of what Edmund Burke emphasized as a key conservative virtue: prudence.

The foreign, domestic, and economic policies of President Bush can be summarized as: invade the world, invite the world, in hock to the world. As far as grand strategies go, this is not the most seamless. There are palpable contradic-

tions in combining pugnacity abroad with welcoming tens of millions of foreign newcomers at home while borrowing hundreds of billions from overseas to fund our budget and trade deficits.

How did the Bush administration wind up with such clashing priorities?

The orgy of indebtedness with which the administration is saddling future generations of Americans is a byproduct of the president’s politically motivated profligacy. Increasing spending is popular among powerful interest groups. And so is cutting taxes. Why not do both at once? Why pay today what you can put off until tomorrow—or the next president’s term?

More mysterious remain the precise reasons behind the administration’s conversion from its 2000 campaign promise of a “humble” foreign policy that abstained from nation-building to its wildly ambitious neoconservative ideology of 2003.

In contrast, Bush’s desire to boost immigration has never been in doubt. While the president contended in his speech that his terms as a border-state governor prove that he grasps the importance of enforcing illegal-immigration laws, never during his 12 years in office has he displayed much eagerness to catch aliens.

The “comprehensive immigration reform” of 1986 granted amnesty to 2.7 million illegal aliens combined with staunch employer sanctions to eliminate the incentive for future illegal immigration. Unfortunately, politically powerful employers soon began corrupting the

enforcement process. Still, the nadir of negligence was not reached until this administration. In 2004, only three employers were fined.

In the placid months before 9/11, Bush’s highest priority, after tax cuts, was working out with Mexican president Vicente Fox an immigration deal—although what he asked Fox to sacrifice, if anything, was never made clear. The president of Mexico wanted to dispose of his surplus uneducated poor, and the president of the United States wanted to acquire them, perhaps on the theory that global dominance in the 21st century goes to the country with the most manual laborers.

Then 9/11 demonstrated that open borders were a dangerously naïve fantasy, so Bush put his Mexican immigration quest on the backburner until January 2004. When his combination of an amnesty that we aren’t supposed to call an amnesty and a jaw-droppingly unlimited guest-worker program was rejected by House Republicans as political suicide, Bush bided his time until the Senate took up his favorite subject this year.

Why does Bush long for more immigration? Good question. The motivation of Bush’s close ally in this quest, Sen. Ted Kennedy, who also introduced the epochal 1965 immigration liberalization legislation and the 1990 Diversity Visa Lottery bill, has always been obvious: more immigrants mean more Democratic voters. For a Republican politician, though, the rationalizations have to be more subtle—or possibly just more confused.