CLEARING THE AIR

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the article by Charles Goyette (Feb. 2). While the article is disappointing and factually inaccurate, I defend his right to express his opinion. Charles has never been told by me or anyone in management to alter his position on the war.

In fact, on Feb. 10, 2003, he thanked me on the air for supporting him. An irate listener had protested Charles's views on the war and referred to KFYI as the "traitor station." My response, which Charles read on the air, was this: "Thank you for writing. I don't tell our hosts how to think. Dissent is healthy. It allows our listeners to hear a range of perspectives so they can draw their own conclusions. What sets our nation apart from others like Iraq is that we allow free exchange of viewpoints." Charles followed this with, "Nothing like management that backs you up."

I not only defended Charles's right to express his views, I assisted in efforts to market him as "the only conservative talk show host in America against the war." There weren't a lot of nibbles because, frankly, there wasn't a lot of sympathy for his views. At one point I asked Charles to take his scheduled vacation a day early so I could have a break from the tidal wave of complaints. Charles did not protest. In fact, he apologized for creating such a stir and then e-mailed me while on vacation to ask if he could take a few extra days.

Charles understood that his views might affect his ratings but proceeded anyway. While his ratings went up from winter to spring 2003, his 4-7 p.m. show underperformed other key programs. We made a business decision to hire Tom Liddy and Austin Hill for afternoons and move Charles to nights. This was a strategic move to add a hot new show in the afternoon while providing listeners with the only live, issues-driven night talk show in the Valley. Months later, we can say with confidence that our moves are working. Ratings are up across the board, and Charles's status as a talk host on 550 KFYI is unchanged. LAURIE CANTILLO Program Director, KFYI *Phoenix, Ariz.*

Charles Goyette responds:

Ms. Cantillo should know that the war didn't begin until March 19. It was thereafter that Clear Channel Regional Vice President Alan Sledge, in "you will do so" language, instructed me to refrain from expressing myself about the war and to transform my show from one of opinion to one of information only. I declined his kind offer.

I am afraid that this is all tempest-in-ateapot business for most readers, and the larger point, about the entire nation —media executives included—being consumed by war hysteria on the basis of misleading representations, may be lost.

But one quick point for the sake of my professional reputation: Cantillo presents demographics out of context to suggest that I somehow underperformed in the ratings, in the same quarter for which Clear Channel actually paid me a bonus for ratings performance! Ironically, the new quarterly ratings have just been released. KFYI has turned in its worst ratings in well over a year, down overall 25 percent since I was moved out of prime time, with the "hot new show in the afternoon" collapsing even more dramatically.

CROSSOVER APPEAL

I'm a confirmed progressive and am working for the Dean campaign. I have also recently become a subscriber to your magazine because I find myself agreeing with much of what you say.

I'm fascinated by the thought that there is some convergence between liberals and conservatives. What I detect is that there is a movement to institutionalize power in the hands of a few in this country. That movement is erroneously called "neoconservatism," which I suspect is designed to imply some sort of meta-conservative philosophy. However, it simply smacks of fascism, if one is to abide by the definition of the term.

It's too bad Pat Buchanan is not running for office. I think a lot of disenchanted conservatives would prefer him over Bush. Actually, all of us would. CHRISTOPHER ALAN *via e-mail*

GOOD-BYE GOP

In 1960, I voted for the first time for JFK and for the last time for any Democrat. That is about to change.

As a conservative I believe in all the things you do and have appreciated your efforts at representing true conservatives. I never was part of the countryclub Republican Party, and today's party could not be further from my beliefs.

I see little difference between arriving at Marxist socialism on Monday with the Democrats or Tuesday with the Republicans. Next November I will send the Republican Party a message. I am voting Democratic. Not only will the Republicans lose my vote, they now must find another vote to offset my Democratic vote. I am persuading other conservatives to vote in like manner. The sooner the Republicans can no longer pose as an alternative to the Democrats, the sooner this nation can return to being a constitutional Republic. BILL RILEY

Moses Lake, Wash.

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 February 16, 2004 / Vol. 3, No. 3



[COVER] Amnesty Insanity

BY HOWARD SUTHERLAND President Bush throws an immigration party—and the whole world is invited. Page 7

[HISTORY]

Fathers Knew Best

BY THOMAS E. WOODS JR. The founders' words refute the "nation of immigrants" myth. Page 11

[ECONOMICS]

Spending Like a Drunken Democrat

BY PETER EAVIS Bush's big-government "conservatism" drives America toward a fiscal abyss. Page 13

[DEFENSE]

Feeling a Draft

BY DOUG BANDOW Conscription threatens to make a comeback, as imperial burdens overstretch the All-Volunteer Force and sap American military might. Page 16

COVER ILLUSTRATION: CHRIS HIERS

COLUMNS

6 Patrick J. Buchanan: Mexifornia Goes National

31 Taki: Art Criticism, Israeli-Style

NEWS & VIEWS

4 Fourteen Days: A Less Perfect Union; Saddam vs. Osama; Mutiny at the War College

19 Deep Background: Traffic Stop; Al-Qaeda Catches a Break; Rove Says No War in '04

ARTICLES

9 Tom Tancredo: Amnesty is a legislative dead letter.

10 J.P. Zmirak: Bargaining for immigration reform

21 Richard Cummings: How George Plimpton waged the cultural Cold War

ARTS & LETTERS

23 Steve Sailer: Benicio Del Toro in "21 Grams"

24 Paul Gottfried: America the Virtuous by Claes G. Ryn

26 Cicero Bruce: The First Grace by Russell Hittinger

28 Jonathan Chaves: G.K. Chesterton, Poet

29 Anthony Gancarski: The contemporary fiction racket

[POLITICS] A SORRY STATE

In his State of the Union address, President Bush wisely chose a rhetorical strategy of attack—a smarter course, surely, than trying to explain why so many of the things he highlighted in his last State of the Union turned out to be false. So no mention of Iraq's uranium purchases, no delving into the detailed compendium of anthrax and botulinum and mobile bio-weapons labs with which Bush had regaled previous audiences.

Now Bush stresses Iraq's "liberation"-and, of course, democracy. So naturally the president took a stab at those who are skeptical that Jeffersonian democracy can be transplanted in the Middle East: he believes, "God has planted in every human heart the desire to live in freedom," and Americans will fight a "forward strategy of freedom" in the Middle East. The language is attractive and good for applause. But one can clap harder if one forgets that Paul Bremer and the Iraq occupation team are now fighting a desperate effort to blunt the Iraqi Shi'ites' call for direct elections, soon. The Bush administration (rightly) fears that the freely elected Iraqi leader a Shi'ite-dominated electorate will produce will not be compliantly pro-American.

[MILITARY] **TRAHISON DES CLERKS**

Many might have called the invasion of Iraq a "detour" from the legitimate War on Terror, "a strategic error of the first order," an "unnecessary preventive war." But they do not teach at the Army War College's Institute for Strategic Studies. Jeffrey Record does, and in a courageous paper posted on the college's Web site, he argues that this "war of choice ... has created a new front in the Middle East for Islamic terrorism and diverted attention and resources



"IT'S NOTHING, MR. PRESIDENT ... JUST SOME MORE IRRATIONAL CRITICISM FROM LEFT-WING KOOKS AND WEIRDOS ..."

away from the security of the American homeland against further assault ..."

Tumbled through the Fox cycle, the counter-spin was predictable, "This chap is an analyst. ... he's not part of the actual War College itself. And there are lots of studies that come out. ... It is not the opinion of the War College."

But Record is no low-level drone. He's a visiting professor from the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base who worries that the force he trains has been brought "to the breaking point." He has written six books on military strategy, and the War College's commandant personally authorized this piece.

Gauzy visions of global democracy may suit Beltway ideologues for whom a strategic conflict is two cocktail parties on a single night. But those charged with building utopia where blood and mud meet are growing increasingly skeptical-and because of the honor that comes with their uniforms are unafraid to say so.

[SPIN] **CASE DISMISSED**

It is perhaps too much to hope that the Weekly Standard's next cover will read, "Reversed On Appeal," but recent intelligence breakthroughs make a mockery of that magazine's triumphant Nov. 24, 2003, headline, "Case Closed." The charge was collaboration between Saddam's Iraq and Osama's al-Qaeda. The smoking gun was to be a secret Pentagon memo, written by Undersecretary of Defense Douglas Feith and slipped to the Standard to complete the neocon spin cycle.

Trouble is, Saddam didn't get the memo. A message written by him after his ouster, and found by the military after his capture, tells a rather different story. Even as jihadis crossed the border to join the resistance, Iraq's former president preached caution to his faithful. "Mr. Hussein apparently believed that the foreign Arabs, eager for a holy war against the West, had a different agenda from the Baathists, who were eager for their own return to power," reports the New York Times. And according to CIA interviews with senior al-Qaeda prisoners, the other side of the putative partnership was equally wary. The Times again: "[B]efore the American-led invasion, Osama bin Laden had rejected entreaties from top lieutenants to work jointly with Mr. Hussein."

A Saddam-Osama alliance, and the association with 9/11 it conjured, was a central argument in the protean case for