

JULY 30, 2007

The American Conservative

Getting Immigration Right

How the Conservative Consensus Tipped

Iraq: Withdraw to Win

Santorum's Enemies List

Religious Right Still Relevant?



BABY BUST

I read with great interest the review of Walter Laqueur's book in which Theodore Dalrymple discusses a subject that appears quite regularly lately: Europeans not having enough children to sustain their societies (June 18). In what appears to be a criticism, Dalrymple states: "They [Europeans] seem to care more about the ozone layer and carbon emissions than they do about the continuation of their own species. Or perhaps bringing up children interferes with what they conceive to be the real business of life: taking lengthy annual holidays in exotic locations and other such pleasures." As a woman of childbearing years and of European extraction, I must take exception with this characterization.

During the 1980s and '90s, the received wisdom here in the West bemoaned the evils of overpopulation. Just as environmental conscientiousness is being touted today as the new religion, the message being sent in decades past was that it was pure selfishness and conceit to procreate. Second-wave feminism also contributed to the decline by devaluing motherhood in an attempt to bolster women's potential in competition with men.

So it is rather ridiculous to criticize those of us who were taught that we were being considerate of the Earth by reducing our family sizes when in fact the real threat is coming from the large families of our enemies in the Muslim world. Let's call a spade a spade: in order to combat the threat of Islam, we need to have more children who will hopefully espouse the democratic values we purport to hold dear, at least for ourselves, although we allow foreigners to carve out their own repressive cultural communities in the name of multiculturalism.

I would dearly love to have more than the two children I already have, but cannot afford to do so and still maintain a rather conservative middle-class standard of living. I wonder just how many children Dalrymple has?

HEIDI SCHMIDT

Via e-mail

ERIC WHO?

James Antle's piece on antiwar Republicans facing primary challenges gives far too much weight to former staffer Eric "Dondero"'s alleged intention to oppose Ron Paul in the primary (July 2). Eric "Dondero" Rittberg is a walking joke. (Why Eric chooses to drop his real last name and use his middle name as his last is a matter of interesting conjecture.)

I know Eric personally. He was an activist and has done some good grassroots work over the years. However, he is also as phony as a bureaucrat's good intentions, a loose cannon who shoots off his mouth at inappropriate times.

His bookshelves are full of libertarian tomes that he has never, to anyone's knowledge, read, quoted, or referenced in any way. His only claim to fame was that Ron took years to get rid of him. Moreover, he has no credibility with the Libertarian Party, not that their concept of credible means much. He has no following, no money, and no ideology other than libertine-ersatz-libertarian war-mongering.

Dr. Paul has been legitimately criticized in the past for making horrible personnel decisions. Nadia Hayes, the 1988 campaign manager who stole hundreds of thousands of dollars but was never charged, and Eric are his two most glaring mistakes.

If you want to investigate a mystery, try to find out why no one in Ron's campaign is paying the slightest bit of attention to the activists in Texas who are championing

at the bit to help the national effort but cannot get a phone call returned from the D.C. office. It seems that even Ron's own organization is subject to the vicissitudes of bureaucracy, which does not bode well for his administration, should he win.

LONNIE BRANTLEY

Via e-mail

UNDERESTIMATING PC

Political correctness is a critical topic, so it's a shame that John Derbyshire bungled it in his July 2 cover story. The problem is that although he does mention that PC is traceable to the communist-backed Frankfurt School, he softens this by a) trying to divide PC into a strong and a weak form and b) making it seem that the weak form evolved due to a need for America to "refine its manners."

The fact is that PC is poison deliberately injected into American life by cultural Marxists. Their specific goal was to debase the family, religion, and country to the point where society breaks down and its members come to hate it. Then according to Marx, this will allow the communists to seize power and begin their march to utopia.

Perhaps the reason Derbyshire can't get a better grip on the true corrosiveness of PC is because he is an atheist. This renders him insensitive to the main thrust of the cultural cancer, namely the killing off of God in the minds and hearts of the people. If cultural Marxists succeed in doing this, all else will fall into place for them.

PETER SKURKISS

Stow, Ohio

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.