

MAY 21, 2007

# The American Conservative

## Globalization Bites

**Can You  
Trust What  
You Eat?**



**AL-QAEDA'S WAITING GAME**  
Michael Scheuer

---

**ONE NATION, DIVISIBLE**  
Carol Iannone

---

**BUCKLEY'S PARADISE LOST**  
Robert W. Merry

## PRINCIPLED STREET-FIGHTER

W. James Antle III has it wrong (“The War Party,” April 23). Those of us who share the entire spectrum of conservative domestic policies don’t give them up just because of our emphasis on the urgency of winning this war. We think that if there is a Republican candidate out there who is really serious about winning the war on terror—as is Rudy Giuliani—then we must put all other issues temporarily aside, if necessary.

You correctly identify Giuliani as “ruthless,” and that is exactly what we need both to win this war abroad and to defeat its lily-livered critics at home. President Bush has muddled aspects of the occupation and has not thoroughly put this country on a war footing. Giuliani will fix that. He is a great communicator and teacher, which is partly why is he is a great leader. And he will win.

Don’t forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt did not abandon his New Deal policies just because there was a war to be won. Had he lived after victory—and been re-elected to a fifth term in 1948—is there any doubt that he would have returned to his domestic agenda promptly, the nascent Cold War notwithstanding?

Giuliani is hardly a liberal. As mayor of New York City, he enraged liberal partisans up and down the line. He will forge ahead with the thick skin so necessary to win this war and defeat its critics, and at the same time, he will appoint judges who will advance a conservative domestic agenda.

President Bush’s father didn’t lose conservative support simply because he forfeited his “no new taxes” pledge. He lost that support, which he really never had to begin with, because he never supported that point of view. He was your typical “country club” Republican. Rudy

Giuliani is hardly that. He is a principled, tough street fighter—just what this country needs before it becomes totally feminized and defeated on all issues, domestic as well as foreign.

This is no “fool’s bargain,” and that is a very condescending way to characterize the views of those of us who want very much to win this war, advance our policies, and turn the court around. But we know that we won’t have much to discuss if we are forced to wear burkhas, eat hummus, and live by *sharia*. And neither will Mr. Antle.

J.H. COHEN  
*New York, N.Y.*

### *W. James Antle III replies:*

I might find your commitment to keeping me free of *sharia*, burkhas, and hummus more persuasive if it entailed something other than overthrowing one of the most secular governments in the Middle East, creating a power vacuum that has been filled by Shi’ite and Sunni radicals, aiding al-Qaeda’s recruitment, and leaving us less capable of credibly deterring Iran.

And despite my admiration for Rudy Giuliani’s performance as mayor, I’m afraid that your decision to reduce the domestic conservative agenda to tough talk, machismo, and an ability to irritate Manhattan’s hard Left shows a similar lack of discernment.

### HAGEL’S PHILOSOPHY

“Can a war skeptic lead the GOP?” your April 9 headline asks. Not if he’s Chuck Hagel. Even if Senator Hagel seems prescient on the Iraq War, his voting record on another issue disqualifies him in the minds of many conservatives.

Hagel and Sen. Mel Martinez of Florida crafted the compromise in the infamous McCain-Kennedy amnesty/doubling of legal immigration bill that

passed the Senate last May in a 62-36 vote.

According to Americans for Better Immigration’s report card, Chuck Hagel has a “D” immigration voting record. The Senate average is “C.” Fellow Nebraska Sen. Ben Nelson, a Democrat, has a “B.”

TOM SHUFORD  
*Lenoir, N.C.*

## SAVAGE WARS OF DEMOCRACY

What a fine article Scott McConnell wrote on the Algerian war—incisive, accurate, and salutary (April 23). I spent five years in Morocco as a teacher (1957-62) and came back to France just in time to enjoy the daily contact with armed soldiers every time I went to my bus stop in Cours de Vincennes. As a Brit, I was welcome in Morocco and could go anywhere without danger. Thanks to our politicians on both sides of the Atlantic, I doubt I could do that now.

I have long felt that De Gaulle’s initiative was the only possible one. Why do we always insist that our kind of democracy is the only alternative when the evidence is clear that this is not so? I remember hearing a speech in which your first lady got very exercised about the terrible way women were treated in Afghanistan under the Taliban, yet today nothing seems to have changed outside Kabul. And does the treating of women as equals mean that pre-war Iraq had some virtues?

GEOFFREY VITALE  
*Via e-mail*

---

*The American Conservative* welcomes letters to the editor. Submit by e-mail to [letters@amconmag.com](mailto: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.