



Michael Medved's diatribe against Libertarian voters (SCAN, January/February) condemns Libertarians because they don't study opinion polls to determine who can win before they vote. For Medved, ideas are beside the point.

The Libertarian Party, unlike the Republican and Democratic parties, is based on a consistent, coherent, and principled political philosophy. For the millions of Americans who cast Libertarian votes, the validity and wisdom of Libertarian principles count for more than their popularity.

Republican "principles," on the other hand, can be hard to discern. When the GOP wants votes in steel belt states, its support for free trade goes out the window. When the Republican leader, Senator Lott, finds himself in political hot water, he grovels for support on BET and reverses his position on affirmative action.

Under both Democratic and Republican leadership, government has grown rapidly, reliably, and relentlessly. For principled, consistent support of less government and more liberty, I'll keep voting Libertarian.

Brian Fenton
Atlanta, Georgia

I loved Oriana Fallaci's "How the West Was Won—and How It Will Be Lost" (January/February). Finally, someone is speaking the truth with the same passion that hundreds of thousands of Americans feel. What is happening is a cultural and religious war. I pray she speaks more, writes more, and that thousands rise up

to join her to save our country and the world from militant Islam.

Shirley Kozlowski
Midland, Texas

Many of the articles in your January/February issue express distress at the progress in the war against terror. Our nation is already moving in the right direction thanks to the historic majorities achieved by President Bush and Republicans at the polls. At the President's urging, Congress took meaningful action in passing a homeland security bill and providing terrorism insurance. Both initiatives had been stalled before the election in the Democratic-controlled Senate, but have now moved forward because a majority of Americans supported Republicans at the polls.

Henry Rhyné
Gastonia, North Carolina

I enjoyed Eli Lehrer's article on the Arlington County, Virginia police ("Arlington Fights Terror," January/February 2002). It pretty much describes the status of every police department I'm aware of: struggling to get prepared, frustrated with the federal government, but still motivated and dedicated.

Chris Pascoe
Brighton, Michigan

Scott Johnson's comments ("Better Unsafe Than (Occasionally) Sorry," January/February) about David Harris' book are wrongheaded. Among other things, the non-racial-profiling system he faults did, in fact, identify most of the 9/11

hijackers. It was the fault of airport security personnel and the airlines that they were not stopped.

James Lee
New York, New York

The personal attack on me in Scott Johnson's article contains inaccuracies, distortions, as well as a breathtaking slander: that I am responsible for the success of the September 11 attacks. All of this from a writer who never even bothered to talk to me, which could have at least saved him from making many of the errors in the piece.

David Harris
University of Toledo, Ohio

Scott Johnson responds:

The article is not a personal attack on Professor Harris; it is fair comment on his book. I am not aware of any factual errors and he does not cite any. Harris also does not mention the excerpt from his book that accompanies the piece; it allows him to speak in his own words. In any case, the suggestion that I should have talked to him before critiquing his article lacks a basis in any journalistic practice. Besides, on March 7, 2002, I attended two presentations by Harris in the Twin Cities. After the first of his talks I commented as a panelist. Following the second presentation, I debated him. I regret Professor Harris has taken offense, but he is a voluntary participant in a serious debate and can expect his controversial claims to be engaged and refuted by a concerned public.

