

[MEDIA]

LET'S INVADE CHILE NEXT!

National Review editor Rich Lowry recently provided a novel justification for invading Iraq: Saddam Hussein is a *fascist!* In a recent column the young editor of the venerable journal laid it out: "Saddam's militaristic, one-party ideology bears a strong resemblance and has direct intellectual connections to fascism... So Saddam is less Che Guevara (a romantic, anti-colonial figure) and more Augusto Pinochet."

Except we remember when Augusto Pinochet, the Chilean authoritarian ruler who ousted Salvador Allende's Marxist government in a bloody 1973 coup, was defended and appreciated by *National Review*—because, among other things, right wing authoritarian governments tended to evolve into democracies, (Chile, Spain, Portugal, Korea, Taiwan, etc....) and more importantly because *they were on our side* in the great struggle of the era, against communism.

Perhaps most of those who now work for the magazine have little recollection of or interest in such arguments and wisdom from the past. (Who was James Burnham anyway?) But someone should.

[GUILT]

SORRY WHITE FOLK

On August 22, the *Philadelphia Daily News* tried to do a good deed for the community. The paper printed the mugshots of 15 suspects wanted for murder, hoping to facilitate their arrests. It worked; one man hiding in North Carolina turned himself in, and police apprehended another on a tip. For its trouble, however, the paper earned not praise but scorn. All of the photos it had run were of minorities. That none of the 41 murder suspects identified by the police was white did not stop race hucksters from demand-



ing the editors' resignations. The editors kept their jobs, but not without groveling, including an Orwellian apology by a *Daily News* editor for printing the "literal truth." Stating what should be obvious, Hiawatha Bray, a black reporter from Boston, summed it up: "No newspaper editor has any business apologizing for writing truthfully about an issue of obvious public concern just because it upsets some members of the public. Get a grip, you guys."

[IMMIGRATION]

TAN MEXICANO COMO GRINGO

"As Mexican as American": that's how publicist Leonel Sosa glowingly described Tony Garza to the Mexico City daily *Reforma* after President Bush nominated his Texas political ally as ambassador to Mexico. Garza's Senate confirmation hearing on September 5th shows Sosa's confidence isn't misplaced. Garza endorsed an immigration deal that ensures an "orderly, secured and legal" influx of

Mexicans "tied to our labor needs" (as defined by employers, not Americans without jobs). While denying support for amnesty, Garza said we need "some sort of earned legalization ... that allows the path to citizenship." He's right—that's no mere amnesty. It's giving away U.S. citizenship to people who break into our country. Who will Tony Garza, the grandson of Mexican immigrants, represent in Mexico City: Americans or a Mexico pushing for open borders? His confirmation performance suggests the answer, and maybe it's significant that his featured picture on tonygarza.com shows him shaking Vicente Fox's hand. Let Bush reward his friend by sending him somewhere else. Why ask for divided loyalty in those who are appointed to advance America's interests? Not for the first time, George W. Bush is Hispandering at the nation's expense.

—Howard Sutherland

[ECONOMICS]

THE CHINA FANTASY (CON'T.)

The marks are in for China's progress toward fair trade since its U.S.-chaperoned admission to the WTO. Apparently the promise of wide open markets was just that—a promise. According to the Chamber of Commerce, which gleefully championed the PRC's bid, "It's too early to issue sweeping judgments." But their new report runs short on gold stars. Agriculture: delay tactics, export subsidies, and various schemes to keep the Chinese market closed to foreign goods. Intellectual property: "rampant" violations. Services: Insurance and commercial banking still closed to foreign investment. Seems our "strategic partner" is slow to convert to the free trade faith—or perhaps just prefers its end of the \$84 billion U.S.-China trade imbalance.

[CULTURE]

THE STORK CAN BRING THEM

Hollywood is all for maximum freedom of speech but thinks some messages are a little too much for tender suburbanite sensibilities. Like the ad campaign by the American Society for Reproductive Medicine. The ASRM ads were designed to inform people in their 20s and 30s that their near term decisions may have long term consequences, like infertility. The ads targeted smoking, obesity, STD's, and of course that inescapable fact that fertility belongs mostly to the young. One ad evoked the biological clock: a baby bottle shaped like an hourglass.

In an impressive display of unity, some of the nation's premier cultural guardians closed ranks. Movie theater chains AMC Entertainment Inc., Loews Cineplex, Century Theatres, and many shopping malls refused the ads. A spokesman Viacom Outdoor explained that mall managements prefer "mall friendly" and "happy environment" graphics.

Commented Dr. Michael Soules, of the University of Washington, "Apparently gratuitous violence and sexually provocative advertising are okay but talking about a public health issue that affects 6.2 million American men and women is not."

[CONGRESS]

A FEW PRUDENT MEN

Outgoing House Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-Tex.) made waves last August when he said he opposed a war with Iraq. Republican Senators Dick Lugar (Ind.), Chuck Hagel (Neb.) and Larry Craig (Idaho) soon joined in with varying degrees of skepticism. While the loudest, those four are not alone among Capitol Hill conservatives.

Rep. John Duncan (R-Tenn.), also a

conservative, said he was duped when he got behind the Iraq war a decade ago. Duncan says Iraqi military might was exaggerated then. "Let us not exaggerate [Hussein's] strength this time," Duncan asked on the House floor June 5. "If he starts to attack us, I will be the first to support a war effort, but please let us not provoke war."

The most principled conservative in Congress is also the most purely libertarian and anti-war member: Rep. Ron Paul (R-Tex.). Paul understands the warfare state as an extension of the welfare state and rejects publicly the claim that attacking Iraq would make us safer.

While no conservative, Rep. Chris Smith (R-N.J.) is a staunchly pro-life Catholic with a passion for human rights. Smith fears a war with Iraq would yield little gain at great cost of innocent Iraqi life. Favoring removal of the dictator Hussein, Smith believes there may be a way to depose him without spilling so much blood. Staffers indicate he would get fully behind the President if Bush presented a detailed plan showing how to quickly and cleanly do the job.

While others, including International Affairs Committee Chairman Henry Hyde (R-Ill.) have voiced doubts, Hill staffers speculate that most of the doubting right-wingers are looking for an excuse to jump into line with the War Party once the President really snaps his fingers.

—*Timothy Carney*

The American Conservative welcomes letters to the editor. Submit letters 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.

The American Conservative

Editors

Patrick J. Buchanan
Taki Theodoracopolus

Executive Editor

Scott McConnell

Managing Editor

Kara Hopkins

Assistant Editor

Matthew Alexander

Literary Editor

Joseph Scotchie

Office Manager

Veronica Yanos

Publishing Consultant

Angelo Matera

Advertising Manager

Peter Lenahan

Newsstand Consultant

Rande Davis

The American Conservative, Issue 1, Vol. 1, October 7, 2002 (ISSN 1540-966X) is published 24 times per year, biweekly (except for double issues in January and August) for \$29.95 per year by The American Conservative, LLC, 1300 Wilson Blvd, Suite 120, Arlington VA, 22209. (703) 875-7600. Periodicals postage pending at Arlington, VA, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *The American Conservative*, P.O. Box 10829, Riverton, NJ 08076-0829.

Subscription rates: \$29.95 per year (24 issues) in the U.S., \$34.95 in Canada (U.S. funds), and \$49.95 other foreign (U.S. funds). Back issues: \$5.00 (prepaid) per copy in USA, \$6.00 in Canada (U.S. funds). For subscription orders, payments, and other subscription inquiries—by mail: *The American Conservative*, P.O. Box 10829, Riverton, NJ 08076-0829. By phone: 1-800-579-6148 (outside the U.S./Canada call 1-856-786-9042). Via the web: www.amconmag.com. When ordering a subscription please allow 4-6 weeks for delivery of your first issue and all subscription transactions. This issue went to press on September 19, 2002. Inquiries to the editor should be sent to letters@amconmag.com.

After the War

“Though the object of being a Great Power is to be able to fight a Great War, the only way of remaining a

Great Power is not to fight one.” So wrote British historian A.J.P. Taylor in 1961.

All the 20th century empires forgot the lesson and all perished of wounds suffered in Great Wars: the Ottoman, Russian Austro-Hungarian, and German empires in World War I, the Japanese in World War II, the French and British the morning after.

Comes now the turn of the Americans. Guided through the Cold War by conservative statesmen like Eisenhower and Reagan, America rejected Churchillian romanticism and, even in the face of horrors like the butchery in Budapest in 1956, refused to risk the Great War. But now a triumphalist America has begun to behave like all the rest.

If Providence does not intrude, we will soon launch an imperial war on Iraq with all the “On-to-Berlin!” bravado with which French *poilus* and British Tommies marched in August 1914. But this invasion will not be the cakewalk neoconservatives predict. More likely, it will be the “bloody mess” of which Tony Cordesman warns.

Yet America will not be defeated by an Arab pariah state with an obsolete air force, a dozen 400-mile missiles, a population a tenth of ours, an economy 1% of ours, and neither satellites nor smart bombs.

Indeed, all 22 Arab nations have a total GDP smaller than Spain’s. None can defeat us, and any that resorts to a weapon of mass destruction invites annihilation. And before any hostile Arab or Islamic regime can acquire an atomic weapon, the War Party wants

to exploit this window of opportunity to smash them all.

But what comes after the celebratory gunfire when wicked Saddam is dead? Initially, the President and War Party will be seen as vindicated by victory and exhilarated by their new opportunity. For Iraq is key to the Middle East. With Iraq occupied, Syria will be hemmed in by Israeli, American, and Turkish power. Assad will have to pull his army out of Lebanon, so Sharon can go back in and settle scores with Hezbollah. Iran will be surrounded by U.S. power in Turkey, Iraq, the Gulf, Afghanistan, Central Asia, and the Arabian Sea.

This is the vision that intoxicates the neoconservatives who pine for a “World War IV”—a cakewalk conquest of Iraq followed by short sharp wars on Syria and Iran. Already Israel is tugging at our sleeve, reminding us not to forget Libya.

What is wrong with this vision? Only this: Just as Israel’s invasion of Lebanon ignited a guerrilla war that drove her bloodied army out after 18 years, a U.S. army in Baghdad will ignite calls for *jihād* from Morocco to Malaysia.

Pro-American regimes will be seen as impotent to prevent U.S. hegemony over the Islamic world. And just as monarchs who collaborated with Europe’s colonial powers were dethroned by nationalists in Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad, Tripoli, Teheran and Addis Ababa, pro-American autocrats will be targeted by assassins.

A burst of gunfire could convert Jordan, Afghanistan, or nuclear-armed Pakistan into an enemy overnight.

And with Israelis generals blabbing about pre-positioned U.S. weapons and Bibi Netanyahu listing for Congressional committees all the Arab nations we must attack, Al Jazeera does not need shoe-leather reporting to let Islam know on whose behalf America has come to crush their armies and occupy their capitals.

Once in Baghdad, how do we get out? If the Kurds rebel to create a nation, will U.S. troops help Turks crush them? If the House of Saud falls, will it be succeeded by social democrats or Bin Laden’s fanatics?

To destroy Saddam’s weapons, to democratize, defend, and hold Iraq together, U.S. troops will be tied down for decades. Yet, terrorist attacks in liberated Iraq seem as certain as in liberated Afghanistan. For a militant Islam that holds in thrall scores of millions of true believers will never accept George Bush dictating the destiny of the Islamic world.

With our MacArthur Regency in Baghdad, Pax Americana will reach apogee. But then the tide recedes, for the one endeavor at which Islamic peoples excel is expelling imperial powers by terror and guerrilla war. They drove the Brits out of Palestine and Aden, the French out of Algeria, the Russians out of Afghanistan, the Americans out of Somalia and Beirut, the Israelis out of Lebanon.

Twelve years ago, this writer predicted that George Bush’s Gulf War would be “the first Arab-American War.” The coming war will not be the last. We have started up the road to empire and over the next hill we will meet those who went before. The only lesson we learn from history is that we do not learn from history. ■