THE REAL COHN

In "The Real McCarthy" (April 25), Ralph de Toledano states that Sen. Joseph McCarthy was "brought down" by lies (unspecified) he made to cover up for Roy Cohn. He states that Cohn was "the most reprehensible individual I have ever known personally." As a friend of Senator McCarthy and Roy Cohn for many years, I am compelled to refute these scurrilous comments.

Toledano's opinion of Cohn is exactly the opposite of the opinion held by Senator and Jean McCarthy, J. Edgar Hoover, Cardinal Francis Spellman, and the approximately 800 people who attended a memorial in his honor at Town Hall, New York City. His close friends included many religious; law-enforcement personnel such as the top officials of the FBI; and prominent members of the media, e.g., William Safire. He was godfather to five children, an indication of the respect in which he was held by those who really knew him.

Toledano states that he and other friends "turned away" from Senator McCarthy when he "was a sick and despairing man." The "reprehensible" Roy Cohn did not "turn away." He remained his close friend and unfailingly defended McCarthy at every opportunity.

Senator McCarthy and Roy Cohn were as one in their opposition to communism. As a result they both suffered great injustices in defense of their country. Every senator, congressman, and counsel who effectively investigated communism was maliciously and relentlessly castigated in the media and academia. Toledano should know better than to blame Cohn for bringing down Joe McCarthy. ALLAN SCHNEIDER

Spring Valley, N.Y.

Ralph de Toledano replies:

In defending the indefensible and attacking my "scurrilous" appraisal of Roy Cohn, Allan Schneider plays hob with the record. He may resent my comments, but I was there, as a friend of Senator McCarthy and as a newsman covering in depth the so-called McCarthy era. Since then, most of McCarthy's strongest advocates have been in agreement that Cohn did more harm to the senator than his enemies in the media and the Democratic Party.

Mr. Schneider argues that my opinion of Cohn is "exactly the opposite" of that allegedly held by others, including Jean McCarthy, Joe's wife. Jean was my friend and that friendship continued after Joe's death. Privately, she was convinced that Roy was a pernicious influence on Joe. J. Edgar Hoover did not confide in me, but never in my relations with the FBI was there a word of approbation from the bureau for Roy—in fact, the opposite.

I did "turn away" from McCarthy politically—much because of Roy—but not personally. After his death, Jean McCarthy tried to get me to write a book about her husband. She was convinced that Roy, always a Democrat, was largely responsible for urging Joe to extend the "20 years of treason" to include the Eisenhower administration, thereby launching a war not only with the White House but with his Republican colleagues in the Senate—an act of political suicide.

Allan Schneider's loyalty is to Roy Cohn. Mine is to the record.

COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATIVE

Thank you for printing Matthew Scully's "Fear Factories" (May 23). When friends learn that I don't eat animals or animal products, they often look at me like I'm from another planet. But once I learned what goes on in the factory farms and slaughterhouses, I chose to eliminate my complicity with these egregious industries. Some consider my vegan diet to be "radical," but I think what is truly extreme is the institutionalized cruelty inflicted upon billions of animals simply to save a few pennies.

Don't believe what you've been told by the meat industry and the media. Vegetarians, vegans, and animal activists are not all left-wing communist abortionists. Some of us are compassionate conservatives who simply believe that extending kindness to animals makes for better human beings. STEWART W. DAVID

Asheville, N.C.

AS ST. FRANCIS SAID ...

I just finished reading your article by Matthew Scully and was moved to tears by this thoughtful and profound piece of journalism. Conservatives who practice good, sound ethics should feel the inherent wrong in cruelty to God's creatures most acutely. It is our responsibility as the dominant species to be good stewards to those weaker than us who require our protection.

Saint Francis of Assisi said it best: "If you have men who will exclude any of God's creatures from the shelter of compassion and pity, you will have men who will deal likewise with their fellow men."

This letter is coming from a liberal, and this article made me realize that there is still hope that we can find common ground and work together to address some ethical dilemmas. Conservatives and liberals alike should care about the fates of others, whether the others are human or animal. TINA SANTUCCI via e-mail

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 June 6, 2005 / Vol. 4, No. 11



The Good Strategist

BY SCOTT MCCONNELL George F. Kennan was more than the architect of America's Cold War victory, he was the last of a line of gentlemen statesmen. Page 7 $\,$

[WAR]

Trigger Man

BY ANDREW J. BACEVICH In service of his messianic vision, Paul Wolfowitz marries certainty in the righteousness of American actions with confidence in the efficacy of American arms. Page 11

[CAMPUS]

Muzzling Mideast Studies

BY ANDERS STRINDBERG The new political correctness in the academy comes not from the liberal Left but from neoconservatives. Page 14

[CULTURE]

On the Right Track

BY WILLIAM S. LIND Real conservatives should cherish America's railways and the way of life they support. Page 18 $\,$

COLUMNS

6 Patrick J. Buchanan: Putin's Perspective35 Taki: Douglas Feith rewrites history.

NEWS & VIEWS

4 Fourteen Days: GWB Outspends LBJ; Blair's Big Lie—and Bush's; Revisiting the Good War

25 Deep Background: Chalabi & Friends (in Iraq); Chalabi & Friends (at the Pentagon); North Korea's Nukes

ARTICLES

20 Nicholas von Hoffman: Dual-national politics undermines sovereignty.

 $22\,$ Christina Hoff Sommers & Sally Satel: The cult of self-esteem comes for the children.

26 Jon Basil Utley: Proportional representation creates dysfunctional democracies.

ARTS & LETTERS

28 Steve Sailer: Paul Haggis's "Crash"

29 Thomas E. Woods Jr.: Wilson's War: How Woodrow Wilson's Greatest Blunder Led to Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, and World War II by Jim Powell

31 Philip Jenkins: God's Politics: Why the Right Gets It Wrong and the Left Doesn't Get It by Jim Wallis & Exodus: Why Americans Are Fleeing Liberal Churches for Conservative Christianity by Dave Shiflett

33 Justin Raimondo: The Woman and the Dynamo: Isabel Paterson and the Idea of America by Stephen Cox

COVER PHOTOGRAPHS: HULTON GETTY PHOTO ARCHIVE, REUTERS PHOTO ARCHIVE. COVER ILLUSTRATION: MARK GRAE

[BUDGET] W'S GREAT SOCIETY

It used to be simple: you voted Republican if you wanted less government and pulled the lever for Democrats if you were looking for a handout from Washington. But reality has a way of dispelling comforting fiscal platitudes. According to a study by the Cato Institute, George W. Bush has presided over the biggest inflation-adjusted increase in federal spending since Lyndon Johnson tried to build his Great Society with our tax dollars.

That's right, Bush managed to outspend Bill Clinton. The federal budget's share of the economy grew from 18.5 percent when Clinton left office to 20.3 percent four years later. Total government expenditures rose 33 percent during Bush's first term. Even if you exclude defense and homeland security, Bush is still the biggest-spending president in 30 years, and his reputedly tightfisted fiscal 2006 budget proposal which doesn't leave a single cabinetlevel agency smaller than when he took office and is likely to be ignored by Congress—does not change his ranking.

Speaking of Congress, Cato reports that spending on the 101 largest programs Gingrich's revolutionaries vowed to eliminate when they rode into town in 1995 has risen by 27 percent. Congress has also spent \$91 billion more than Bush requested on domestic programs. The president's veto pen conveniently went missing each time. Wanted: a fiscally conservative party in Washington.

[ALLIES]

LIES & THE LYING LIARS

On the morning of July 23, 2002—eight months before the invasion of Iraq— British Prime Minister Tony Blair plotted a war. He would later tell his country, "We have not got to the stage of military action ... we have not yet reached the point of decision." He lied. Earlier this month the *Times* of London published the secret minutes of Blair's July 23 war council, which tell the real story—how Blair and President Bush had already set themselves on war with Iraq.

Blair's advisors at the meeting, including his foreign secretary, Jack Straw, and his attorney general, Lord Goldsmith, warned him that (in Straw's words), "Saddam was not threatening his neighbours, and his WMD capability was less than that of Libya, North Korea or Iran." In Goldsmith's opinion, a war for regime change would be illegal under international law.

But the decision was already made. "When the prime minister discussed Iraq with President Bush at Crawford in April [2002]," the documents report, "he said that the UK would support military action to bring about regime change." And that, according to another participant at Blair's conclave, MI6 chief Richard Dearlove, was just what Bush had in mind: "Bush wanted to remove Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD," he said in the report.

Blair has now won a third term, albeit with a greatly reduced parliamentary majority—the Tories, themselves committed to support the war, provided the British public with little alternative on the election's top issue. We suspect, however, that British voters will not soon forget the duplicity that cooked up the Iraq War—and Americans should not forget it either.

$[N \to O C O N S]$

PIPES'S INQUISITION

A good place to trace the intellectual decline of neoconservatism is the career of Daniel Pipes, the principal Islamic scholar among the neocons. Pipes frequently emphasizes the distinction between "Islamism"—a militant, viciously anti-American, al-Qaeda-type ideology—and the broader Muslim religion. It is of course an important distinction, as crucial as one made in the last century between "communist" and "social democrat."

But Pipes seems to have forgotten about it or at least is now using it in a deliberately false way. His website recently posted an item—"Is Grover Norquist an Islamist?"—designed to smear the well-known Republican advocate of lower taxes. Norquist committed what Pipes apparently considers a grave crime: earlier this month he married, in an eclectic wedding presided over by Rabbi Daniel Lapin, a Palestinian woman named Samah Alrayyes. In response to a reporter's question about whether he had converted to his bride's Muslim faith, he said it was a personal matter.

So Pipes shifted into high defamation gear. Norquist, he wrote, has ties to several "Islamist" groups. He once gave a speech at the Council on American Islamic Relations. He helped found the Islamic Free Market Institute, a group run by a well connected Washingtonian of Palestinian ancestry, Khaled Saffuri. A TAC editor spoke there earlier this year, sandwiched on the program between Sen. George Allen and Newt Gingrich, and none had the slightest reason to think they were involved in an "Islamist" project. What Saffuri surely does oppose is Israel's continued occupation of the land that will one day be a Palestinian state. That, one would surmise, is what prompts Pipes to try to smear the group and by association Grover Norquist.

The distinction between extremist Muslims who want to kill Americans and anyone of Palestinian ancestry who wants an opportunity for national selfdetermination is a really obvious one. To see the dean of neocon Mideast experts try consciously to blur this distinction and to turn the useful concept of "Islamist" into a weapon to bludgeon people who might favor a Palestinian state should tell us all we need to know about the agenda of today's neoconservativism.