

TAKE OUT SADDAM

—WASHINGTON—

To those of us with a memory for American military action in the world, the sudden and seemingly increate controversy over whether to rid Iraq of Saddam Hussein is another example of public persons frivolling with serious matters. Of course, after all the hand-wringing and strutting subsidies, we are going to take out Saddam Hussein. He is a dangerous man whose treacherous ambitions have made the most dangerous place on earth—the Middle East—even more dangerous. For three or more memorable decades during the last half of the 20th century the most dangerous place on earth was the geography near the Iron Curtain. American military might has saved Europe and much of the world from the domination of tyrants and the incineration of nuclear war. We had no other option but to resist the tyrants. We have no option now.

When we stood staunchly against Soviet might, “hawkish” America was the butt of ridicule. Poets and playwrights satirized our generals and our hard-line politicians. Their plays and films look foolish now that the Cold War has been concluded peacefully, the American policy of resistance having been vindicated. When we chose to resist the Soviets in 1947 they possessed the most powerful army on earth and the world’s largest empire. Now we face roaming bands of suicidal terrorists and, in a backward country, a malevolent dictator. Saddam will never have the Soviets’ nuclear arsenal, but his nuclear, biological and chemical weapons would be a grave menace to the world. Moreover he is more apt to use it than the eminently more rational Soviets were to use theirs. It is only a matter of time before we do the rational thing and oust him.

Yet from nowhere the hand-wringers have emerged. I am not thinking of the anti-war elements on the left. They have been pretty much marginalized. Their instinctive anti-Americanism gives them away. Their record of false prophecies and of futile diplomatic panaceas has discredited them with the American people. But over the last two weeks we have seen the emergence of such hand-wringers as Brent Scowcroft, Congressman Dick Armey and in the media, *The New York Times* and its

confrères. In a refrain that we have heard before, they depict those who would eliminate Saddam as cowboys and war hawks unmindful of coalition-building and the long-term consequences of toppling Saddam. They raise the specter of another Vietnamese quagmire.

The sudden controversy puts me in mind of the very same controversy that preceded our last attack on Iraq in 1991. In the most august circles, the hand-wringers were wailing. I well remember a CNN television show where I was surrounded by the likes of Al Hunt, Mark Shields and Pat Buchanan, all prophesying endless war if we hit Saddam. Even Robert Novak seemed hesitant. My response then was the same as my response today, to wit: “If Saddam is so powerful, how is it that Israel has remained in existence?” Why has Saddam not conquered the lands Alexander the Great took with an army on foot? I was never invited back on that show and the false prophets of our doom have never acknowledged their error.

Today Saddam is vastly weaker than he was in the early 1990s. His appetite for weapons of mass destruction is as great as ever. And the Middle East is possibly even more incendiary than it was before our first attempts at “regime change.” America is going to have to act. There is no doubt that we shall consult our allies. Nor is there any doubt that we shall demonstrate the prudence that we have customarily demonstrated when using our military might. The poets and the playwrights’ satirization of “hawkish” America is precisely the opposite of the truth.

STILL THE SAME

—WASHINGTON—

There is a habit of mind, among pundits and TV’s talking heads, of apprising Americans of how they “feel” or what they “think” about this or that. Frankly, when I hear one of these mind readers making such a presumptuous asseveration, I reach for the remote. How about you? Do you feel an urge to rebel when, say, the marmoreal Dan Rather solemnizes, “Today, Americans as a people, are feeling (fill in the blank)?” The other day I heard the goggle-eyed Larry King intone that September 11 changed us

PUBLIC

BY R. EMM



Americans “forever.” I wondered if his equivalent, speaking to a radio audience in December 1941, ever said anything like that. I also wondered what precisely Larry meant.

It is unlikely that any event, no matter how momentous or tragic, can change the essential qualities of a people. During the first decades of our history Thomas Jefferson, the authors of the *Federalist Papers* and other wise American scribes occasionally referred to “the genius of the people.” Every nation’s people have a genius, and those who wrote our Constitution and early laws did not think that genius was a plastic or ephemeral thing. They would doubt Larry King’s easy pronouncement that Americans are fundamentally different today from what we were anterior to September 11.

I know that among public figures it is common to claim that after the tragedy of a year ago, we as a people “will never be the same,” or some variation thereof. I have tried to discover the origin of this cliché and the best I can do is trace it back to a *Washington Post* story dated September 28, 2001. The story quotes Attorney General John Ashcroft as he put down the telephone after receiving word of the attacks on the World Trade Center. To those seated around him he said, “Our world has changed forever.” From there it is a short journey to Larry King’s formulation that Americans have changed forever.

The sentiment is doubtless well intentioned, but what does it mean? It means there is a new patriotism in the land, which is all to the good, but there has always been a love of country in the Amer-

ISSUES

R R E L L , J R .



ican land. The problem has been that throughout the 20th century it was chic to snicker at that patriotism. I have just finished reading an advanced copy of a biography of the critic and wit, H. L. Mencken. He was famous for snickering at American patriotism, as the new book, *The Sceptic: A Life of H.L. Mencken*, by Terry Teachout, makes clear. What is even clearer is that many significant literary and political figures of the first half of the last century applauded his snipes, and even more, his disparagement of America.

There was an energetic anti-Americanism then. It was relatively harmless until evil people exploited it for their own propaganda purposes, for instance the Nazis, the Communists and more recently the Islamicists. Long before September 11, I tired of this anti-Americanism. When it comported with the anti-American propaganda of the KGB and its dupes, it was no longer amusing, and those who continued to espouse it were either very stupid or nihilists. A laugh or two at some American excess is one thing, but to portray America as a malign civilization is just the opposite of the truth.

Today America is the good country that it has always striven to be. Its faults should surprise no one, and its virtues—given the dark side of human history—are amazing. In as much as America has changed since September it is a reversion to certain qualities of the past. As I have said there is a return to patriotism. There is also a return to citizenship, to the idea of the good citizen. That is even more beneficial than patriotism.

During the 1990s, when some politicians lied in office with impunity, and we now know some accountants and corporate executives deceived the public, some of us called for a return to the study of civics, which is to say the study of the rights and responsibilities of the good citizen. The study of civics is not returning to the classrooms, busy as they are with sex education classes, anger management seminars and other conscience-raising bilge. Yet an awareness of the responsibilities of citizenship seems to be spreading through the land. As American citizenship stresses freedom and responsibility, that seriousness about citizenship will only make for a freer America. If that is the great change of which Larry speaks, I am for it; but it is not all that new.

FAT CITY PROHIBITIONISTS

—WASHINGTON—

How did the Prohibitionists take the news? I am thinking of the Prohibitionists, who are patrolling our diets and lifestyles always with their loyal servitors, the trial lawyers, at their side. The news I have in mind is that George W. Bush, arch-typical middle-aged Americano, has just passed his physical with glowing marks. His heart rate is that of a varsity athlete, 44 beats a minute. He runs 7-minute miles. His total cholesterol level is 177, considered in the “desirable” range. His body fat is 14.5 percent. He achieved all this without benefit of the Prohibitionists, and despite an occasional cigar.

The vigorous President has taken personal responsibility for his diet and his lifestyle. He did not need the Prohibitionists’ remonstrances. He once drank too much. Without benefit of the Prohibitionists he cut out the booze and picked up the personal-training regimen. The consequence is that he is fit, beyond the dreams of any Prohibitionist or trial lawyer. Yet these congenital snoops tell us that there is the Other America. It is a land where “obesity in children has tripled in the past 20 years. A staggering 50 percent of adolescents in some minority populations are overweight. . . . Heart attacks may become a disease of young adults.” That is how two health busybodies from Yale University and Harvard Medical School put it in *The Washington Post* in June.

Their solution is to hound the food industry. They want it to cut back its lobbying, its advertisements to children and its distribution of foods they deem unwholesome. And the campaign will get worse. In New York City this summer, lawyer Samuel Hirsch filed a class-action lawsuit against McDonald’s, Burger King, Wendy’s and KFC Corporation, claiming his client became obese and ill because of the delicious products of these profitable corporations.

Those who predicted that these Prohibitionists’ campaigns against tobacco would spread to other industries have been vindicated. Now it is the fast-food industry whose executives will be called before government bodies. Company documents will be scrutinized and the industry demonized, which is not that difficult. Is there an industry in the land that does not have critics insisting that the industry is up to no good?

There will also be the public statements of the woebegone of this Other America. The trial lawyers and Prohibitionists will come up with such sad sacks as Caesar Barber, the complainant in Hirsch’s suit. He says of his numerous health problems, “I trace it all back to the high fat, grease and salt, all back to McDonald’s, Wendy’s, Burger King.”

Allow me to recommend to Mr. Barber the splendid figure of Our President. He is precisely Barber’s age, 56. He took stock of his health a decade or so back and did not need lawyers or Prohibitionists to tell him what was necessary. He demonstrated personal responsibility and he is now in the pink. He did not need more government regulation and higher excise taxes to direct him toward a better diet and toward exercise.

Ironically, if the tobacco scenario taught us anything, the result of what the Prohibitionists demand will be not be a leaner but a more corrupt American. Regulated industries are always subject to the corrupt practices of pressure groups. Preying on the disparity of onerous taxes on tobacco, organized crime is now extending its grip on tobacco sales. Just as the Prohibitionists of the 1920s were the Mafia’s best friend, history is repeating itself. When the states start imposing more regulation and taxes on junk food, the opportunities for corruption will multiply.

— CONTINUED FROM PAGE 12 —
any regression study or Herfindahl index. What is incomprehensible is that antitrust regulation can still find intellectual support among (some) conservatives and (most) liberals, despite its sorry economic record and special-interest transparency.

Dom Armentano
Professor Emeritus in Economics
University of Hartford

PS: I am the author of *Antitrust & Monopoly: Anatomy of a Policy Failure* (Independent Institute, 1998) and *Antitrust: The Case for Repeal* (Ludwig Von Mises Institute, 1999).

Thanks for reminding me why I opposed Robert Bork's nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court. Bork's statist attacks on a woman's right to choose abortion, pornography (the Gilder piousness about protecting children is a hoot—these kids know more about sex at 12 years old than many of us did at 18 some years back), his espousal of national I.D. cards and antitrust put him squarely in the Oliver Wendell Holmes-Brandeis collectivist tradition.

Ayn Rand always said that conservatives were the worst political element in the country—pragmatist, unprincipled and statist to the core. TAS has proved that for many years. H.L. Mencken—who vociferously opposed U.S. intervention in both World Wars—would never stop laughing at Boy Tyrrell's Israel First policy. Like other Tory wannabes (George Will comes to mind), your "conservatism" consists of upholding Frankie The Crip's Warfare-Welfare-State New Deal. I can understand why the aging Rockefeller Republican Gilder bought you clowns out.

One final note: The picture of the Clintons and the ball-

sniffing dog was a real touch of class. Thank you, Boy Tyrrell.

Michael P. Hardesty
Oakland, California

Two comments on your 2002 July/August issue of *The American Spectator*:

1) Your cover article "It's 10 PM Do You Know Where Your Supreme Court Is?" brought to mind the aphorism: Under precisely controlled conditions of law and precedent, the federal judge will rule as she damn well pleases; and 2) Lawrence Henry's piece, "Drugs and Me—and You," rightly suggests that the liberal Democrats' health-care plan can be summarized as "Go home, take two aspirin and die."

Peter Theron
Via e-mail

Bombs Away

You mention homicide bombings ("Public Nuisances," TAS July/Aug 2002) and ask "Why did other aggrieved peoples not think of this useful expedient?" Because Muslims are the only ones with the instruction manual—it is called the Koran. A random sampling:

Sura 2:
Fighting is obligatory.
Sura 3:
Allah may choose martyrs from among you.
Sura 4:
The unbelievers are your sworn enemies.
Sura 9:
Those that have fought for Allah's cause are promised gardens of eternal bliss, where they shall dwell forever.

A literal acceptance is what fuels the zeal of Islamic militants.

D.R. Vollmar
Oakdale, California

Harvard Bites Back

In your July/August issue, George Gilder makes the astounding claim that "Ivy League colleges

don't make very important contributions to the American economy anymore. Their kids all become lawyers and Left politicians and socialist professors and nihilist writers. Many of them believe in Marxism and astrology and sexual liberation and become miserable, poor and divorced within a generation."

Like many claims of this sort, it is often hard to find evidence (as opposed to anecdotes) one way or the other. This leaves talking heads like Gilder free to spout off, untethered by the facts. Well, I am writing to offer some facts. Two months ago I attended my 25th reunion at Harvard College (class of 1977). The reunion included a well-attended seminar reviewing a longitudinal study of the class, conducted every five years since graduation. The main conclusions were: (a) the class has an off-the-charts low divorce rate (about 20 percent, versus 45 percent or so in the general population of college-educated people of similar age); (b) the class has a very high median annual income (about \$200,000 per person); (c) a surprisingly high percentage of the female graduates, and most wives of the male graduates, were not working (and both husband and wife were happy about it); and—here I have to give it to Gilder—(d) the class has off-the-charts liberal politics (not mine, but I am trying to report faithfully what the study showed).

I don't know whether my class is representative of other Ivy League classes of the same vintage, but that's a better bet than Gilder's preposterous assertions.

I don't recall if the study said much about specific career choices or contributions to society or the economy, but my college class included Bill Gates and Steve Ballmer, the current or former heads of several substantial corporations, many extremely

accomplished venture capitalists, investors and investment bankers. The aggregate reunion gift for the class was about \$35 million (a record), and included about 10 gifts of \$1 million or more. I suspect Gilder would agree that ability to make sizable donations correlates with high earnings and wealth.

Josh Brain
New York, New York

George Gilder (Harvard '61) replies: I never denied that Harvard graduates are so rich and smart that they can afford for a while the confiscatory tax rates, environmental phobias, feminist delusions and legal oppressions that they foist on their fellow citizens. They can even condone the banishment of ROTC from campus and disdain the self-defense of both their country and Israel without incurring any loss in the precious pelf they continue to pump into the pits by the Charles. But depression impends and war approaches. Perhaps their fellow citizens will become less indulgent in time. Perhaps the Harvard leftists are not so smart as they think.

Computers Get Smarter. Can We?

In reference to Roger Schank's article, "Info-Topia," (TAS, July/August 2002), today's students call up information from computers with dizzying speed. But can they think? Sadly, I find their writing to be shallow, unoriginal and little more than clichés strung together like Christmas lights to form an argument. Reading, memorializing (useful when learning the Bible) and writing cause students to think, make connections, learn analytical skills and allows them to find their own "intellectual" voice.

I'll gladly trade my computers for your collections of the classics.

Lawrence Swickard
Blue Springs, Missouri

Black Listed Cancer Treatment Could Save Your Life

Baltimore, MD— As unbelievable as it seems the key to stopping many cancers has been around for over 30 years. Yet it has been banned. Blocked. And kept out of your medicine cabinet by the very agency designed to protect your health—the FDA.

In 1966, the senior oncologist at a prominent New York hospital rocked the medical world when he developed a serum that “**shrank cancer tumors in 45 minutes!**” 90 minutes later they were gone... Headlines hit every major paper around the world. Scientists and researchers applauded. Time and again this life saving treatment worked miracles, but the FDA ignored the research and hope he brought and shut him down.

You read that right. He was not only shut down—but also forced out of the country where others benefited from his discovery. That was 35 years ago. How many other treatments have they been allowed to hide? Just as in the case of Dr. Burton’s miracle serum these too go unmentioned.

Two-Nutrient Cancer Breakthrough...

Decades ago, European research scientist Dr. Johanna Budwig, a six-time Nobel Award nominee, discovered a totally natural formula that not only protects against the development of cancer, but people all over the world who have been diagnosed with incurable cancer and sent home to die have actually benefited from her research—and now lead normal lives.

After 30 years of study, Dr. Budwig discovered that the blood of seriously ill cancer patients was deficient in certain substances and nutrients. Yet, healthy blood always contained these ingredients. It was the lack of these nutrients that allowed cancer cells to grow wild and out of control.

By simply eating a combination of two natural and delicious foods (found on page 134) not only can cancer be prevented—but in case after case it was actually healed! “Symptoms of cancer, liver dysfunction, and diabetes were completely alleviated.” Remarkably, what Dr. Budwig discovered was a totally natural way for eradicating cancer.

However, when she went to publish these results so that everyone could benefit—**she was blocked by manufacturers with heavy financial stakes!** For over 10 years now her methods have proved effective—yet she is denied publication—blocked by the giants who don’t want you to read her words.

What’s more, the world is full of expert minds like Dr. Budwig who have pursued cancer remedies and come up with remarkable natural formulas and diets that work for

hundreds and thousands of patients. *How to Fight Cancer and Win* author William Fischer has studied these methods and revealed their secrets for you—so that you or someone you love may be spared the horrors of conventional cancer treatments.

As early as 1947, Virginia Livingston, M.D., isolated a cancer-causing microbe. She noted that every cancer sample analyzed (whether human or other animal) contained it.

Six-time Nobel Nominee's Two-Nutrient Cancer Breakthrough Revealed

This microbe—a bacteria that is actually in each of us from birth to death—multiplies and promotes cancer when the immune system is weakened by disease, stress, or poor nutrition. Worst of all, the microbes secrete a special hormone protector that short-circuits our body’s immune system—allowing the microbes to grow undetected for years. No wonder so many patients are riddled with cancer by the time it is detected. But there is hope even for them...

Turn to page 82 of *How to Fight Cancer and Win* for the delicious diet that can help stop the formation of cancer cells and shrink tumors.

They walked away from traditional cancer treatments...and were healed! Throughout the pages of *How to Fight Cancer and Win* you’ll meet real people who were diagnosed with cancer—suffered through harsh conventional treatments—turned their backs on so called modern medicine—only to be miraculously healed by natural means! Here is just a sampling of what others have to say about the book.

“We purchased *How to Fight Cancer and Win*, and immediately my husband started following the recommended diet for his just diagnosed colon cancer. He refused the surgery that our doctors advised. Since following the regime recommended in the book he has had no problems at all, cancer-wise. If not cured, we believe the cancer has to be in remission.”

—Thelma B.

“I bought *How to Fight Cancer and Win* and this has to be the greatest book I’ve ever read. I have had astounding results from the easy to understand knowledge found in this book. My whole life has improved drastically and I have done so much for many others. The information goes far beyond the health thinking of today.”

—Hugh M.

“I can’t find adequate words to describe my appreciation of your work in providing *How to Fight Cancer and Win*. You had to do an enor-

mous amount of research to bring this vast and most important knowledge to your readers.

My doctor found two tumors on my prostate with a high P.S.A. He scheduled a time to surgically remove the prostate, but I canceled the appointment. Instead I went on the diet discussed in the book combined with another supplement. Over the months my P.S.A. has lowered until the last reading was one point two.”

—Duncan M.

“In my 55 years as a Country Family Physician, I have never read a more ‘down to earth,’ practical resume of cancer prevention and treatments, than in this book. It needs to be studied worldwide for the prevention of cancer by all researchers who are looking for a cure.”

—Edward S., MD

“As a cancer patient who has been battling lymphatic cancer on and off for almost three years now, I was very pleased to stumble across *How to Fight Cancer and Win*. The book was inspiring, well-written and packed with useful information for any cancer patient looking to maximize his or her chances for recovery.”

—Romany S.

“I’ve been incorporating Dr. Budwig’s natural remedy into my diet and have told others about it. Your book is very informative and has information I’ve never heard about before (and I’ve read many books on the cancer and nutrition link). Thanks for the wonderful information.”

—Molly G.

Don’t waste another minute. There are only a limited number of books in stock—and unless order volume is extraordinarily high we may not be able to print more life-saving copies. Claim your book today and you will be one of the lucky few who no longer have to wait for cures that get pushed “underground” by big business and money hungry giants.

To get your copy of *How to Fight Cancer and Win* call **1-888-821-3609** and ask for **code Z179** to order by credit card or visit our website at www.agorahealthbooks.com/spec2. Or write “Fight Cancer—Dept. Z179” on a plain piece of paper with your name, address, phone number (in case we have a question about your order) and mail it with a check for \$19.95 plus \$4.00 shipping to:

Agora Health Books
Dept. Z179
P.O. Box 977
Frederick, MD 21705-9838

If you are not completely satisfied, return the book within one year for a complete and total refund—no questions asked. This will probably be the most important information you and your loved ones receive—so order today!

©2002 Agora Health Books, LLC

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW YORK TIMES

Book reviewer Dinitia Smith longs for the good old days, centuries before sex education, safe sex and colonic irrigation:

Sappho's poetry is filled with a golden eroticism. It is redolent of Attic sunshine, the sweet smells of the Aegean, Grecian meadows.

It is an eroticism from an ancient time when lines between homosexuality and heterosexuality were blurred, before distinctions were made and fear and prohibitions came into place.

It is said that Sappho died for love of a younger man, Phaon, a ferry boat captain, that she threw herself off a cliff because of him.

But that is probably a lie.

[August 26, 2002]

CROSSFIRE

Live, on TV, the Jonathan Swift of punk liberalism:

PAUL BEGALA, CO-HOST: Good evening and welcome to *Crossfire*. Tonight, a group of self-delusional right-wingers in a heavily armed compound in Waco, Texas, surrounded by federal agents. Branch Davidians? No, the Bush economic summit.

[August 13, 2002]

THE WASHINGTON POST

Richard Cohen, drunk and disorderly, on the op-ed page of the renowned Post of Washington:

Is it time for an intervention? I ask this because such anger, such intolerance, such rage, such a compulsion to denigrate and to distort is hardly based on any reality. If, as Coulter says, liberals control the media and much of the animal and plant kingdoms, then how is it that the president du jour and others of recent times—Eisenhower, Nixon, Ford, Reagan and Bush the Elder—happen to be conservatives? I must be miss-

C U R R E N T

ing something here.

Such harrumphing says something not only about Coulter but about her audience. Who are the people who read such tripe, who listen to talk radio and its chorus of conservatives (nary a liberal on the air) and who buy books such as the one under examination today?

What explains their rage and, while I am asking questions, could you think of another commentator—especially one on the left—who could have written what Coulter did about Muslims and go on to best-sellerdom? Being conservative is like being criminally insane: You can't be held accountable.

[August 15, 2002]

THE SYRACUSE POST-STANDARD

Hillary Clinton turns into a nocturnal Florence Nightingale to trouble the sleep of American heroes:

In her speech Monday to the Democratic Leadership Council in New York City, Senator Clinton spoke of accompanying President Bush on his July 19 trip to Fort Drum.

"And I told the president on the way there—it was nice being back in Air Force One talking to the president about the soldiers that I'm proud to represent—and I said that some of them had been injured in Operation Anaconda and I had heard that they had been (evacuated) out of Afghanistan to Europe and then to Walter Reed, so I went out to see them late one night after the Senate was done and went room to room talking to them and asking them how they were."

[August 4, 2002]

THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

For distinguished columnist Matt Miller the Vast Right-Wing Conspiracy continues to haunt the hallways of



American history, arm in arm with McCarthyism:

When the Texas Rangers were sold in 1998, while Bush was governor, his partners, Conason reports, "fattened his payout six times over by awarding him additional shares in the team at the time of the sale that brought his 1.8 percent share up to 12 percent." This boosted Bush's return on a borrowed \$600,000 investment from about \$2.5 million to \$15 million. Anyone think it's time to better understand what that was all about?

If Democrats who'd made fortunes from Bushlike patterns of crony capitalism were in the White House during a crisis of corporate integrity, does anyone doubt that Richard Scaife would have scrambled the jets months ago and bankrolled mountains of American Spectator exposés?

[July 10, 2002]

THE WASHINGTON POST

Proof that George W. Bush really knows how to hurt East Coast bon vivant Mary McGrory, as displayed by the outraged gal in her therapy column:

And his anti-Eastern, anti-Atlantic Coast bias breaks out, as in that strange outburst the other day about people who unaccountably prefer sea breezes to the dead heat of central Texas.

The president told Associated Press reporter Scott Lindlaw, who was permitted to follow him on his