

>> Peter Robinson: Welcome to Uncommon Knowledge, I'm Peter Robinson. Joining us today, Norman Podhoretz, for 35 years editor and chief of Commentary Magazine. Mr. Podhoretz began his life as a public intellectual on the left. He then broke ranks, becoming one of the founders of neo-conservatism. Today he would appear on any short list of the most influential conservatives in the country. The author of many books, including Breaking Ranks and Ex-Friends, Norman Podhoretz is most recently the author of World War IV: The Long Struggle Against Islamo Facism. Giving the conflict its name; I'm gonna quote you to yourself - all of this comes from World War IV. "The great struggle into which the United States was plunged by 9/11 can only be understood if we think of it as World War IV." Explain your thesis.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I see the war in which we are engaged as the third in a succession of totalitarian challenges to the civilization called the liberal democratic order of which we are the leading part, and the first of course came from the right in the form of Nazism, which we took on and defeated in World War II. The second came from the left in the form of Communism, was embodied most powerfully in the Soviet Empire, we took that on and defeated it in what I now in retrospect think should be called and seen as World War III. And now we have another totalitarian challenge. It comes out, it's ultimately from the seventh century but Islamo fascism has distinguished from Islam the religion as a political movement that was born in the twentieth century; strongly influenced both by Nazism and Communism because when the Germans moved into the Middle East during World War II, the what I now call Islamo fascists ... I learned a lot about how to operate politically and after World War II the Russians moved into the area and you could say they did graduate work with the Russians after having learned the basic lesson of totalitarian political action.

>> Peter Robinson: You have no trouble distinguishing Islamo fascism then, from Islam proper. Despite all the polls that indicate that the Muslim countries tend to be most opposed to the United States and particularly in the Arab Muslim countries most in favor of Al-Qaeda and so forth, you don't view it as a case ... the question is can you put a box around Islamo fascism or does it fade off with blurry edges into the greater body of Islam?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I think there are blurry edges and depending on which expert you believe, anywhere from say 10 to 15 percent of the Muslim's worldwide would be either active or passive sympathizers or supporters of Al-Qaeda and other such organizations. Well that's a 125 to 200 million people, and I think that's probably a reasonable guess. I think the rest of them are, they're ordinary people who want to live their lives as best they can and get the best break they can for their kids. They're not all eager to be martyrs and they're not all thugs and murderers.

>> Peter Robinson: Another question about the nature of the enemy here. Let me put to you two enemies. During World War III - the Cold War, Soviet Union, Khrushchev tells Nixon we will bury you. The Soviet Union remains officially committed to a worldwide Communist revolution until 1990. They leave that on the books until 1990 - an enemy that wishes our destruction. The IRA in Northern Ireland has a limited goal - they want

the Brits out of Northern Ireland. They don't want to destroy Britain. They don't care about Britain. They have a limited specific goal. If this is a spectrum, where does Islamofascism fit?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Oh they're unquestionably on the absolutist end of the scale; they want to bury us, no question about it. What they dream of is the restoration of an Islamist worldwide caliphate in some cases, in many cases; extending their version of Islam not only to the areas that once belonged to Islam, what they called the realm of Islam, which ...

>> Peter Robinson: Which would include Spain?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Go all the way up through Spain, but beyond. They certainly have designs on Western Europe and you can see it already happening through the Muslim immigrant populations in every country in Western Europe. And we are the great Satan by which they mean not only that we're evil, but that we, like Satan, are the tempters and that makes us doubly dangerous and they fear that so long as we are around living the kind of lives we live and commanding the kind of power we do, we will stand as an obstacle to any expansion of their own influence and their own beliefs.

>> Peter Robinson: So this is not a group of people, ultimately we can hope to contain or wait out or simply live with. You'll remember of course Ronald Reagan's famous remark about the Soviet Union, the Cold War, that we win and they lose. Containment may be an intermediate strategy but that's the way this war is going to end.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I don't even think containment can be an intermediate strategy in this particular war. I don't think you can contain an enemy that is first of all, not concerned about national boundaries. For not just Islamofascists, but for any Muslim, the nation state is of no account. What counts is the realm of Islam and this is transnational. And then in addition you have these people who are not only ready to die but eager to die, they are positively suicidal - literally suicidal. How do you contain people who don't care about defending a homeland and don't care about whether they get killed, so long as the cause prevails?

>> Peter Robinson: George W. Bush and Harry S. Truman, quoting once again from World War IV. "By the time Reagan became president, we had been fighting World War III - that is the Cold War - for 33 years. By contrast we started to fight World War IV only after Bush entered the White House. In this respect it was not Reagan to whom Bush should have been compared, but Harry Truman."

>> Norman Podhoretz: That's exactly right.

>> Peter Robinson: Explain that.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I think that Truman was, at this stage of World War III, even less popular than Bush. His ratings were in the low 20's. He was considered ... I remember, I was there, he was considered one of the worst presidents we had ever had.

He was derided; there was almost universal contempt for him. Now everyone looks back and says Truman was a great president, why, because Truman recognized the Soviet threat, the dimensions of the Soviet threat at a time when many people were poo-pooing it. He designed or signed off on a strategy for dealing with that threat, which ultimately led to a victory in World War III. I think Bush has done exactly the same thing with respect to Islamo fascism. He has recognized that for the threat it is, he's recognized the nature and dimensions of the threat, and he too has signed off through a presidential doctrine on a strategy for dealing with that threat. The Bush doctrine outlines such a strategy just as the Truman doctrine yielded containment as the strategy for World War III.

>> Peter Robinson: Now let me push you around ... as if you can handle it. Harry Truman wanted to contain the Soviets and wait them out. This is what George ... fundamentally the policy of containment right? Reagan comes along and ramps up the pressure but even he essentially accepts containment. That's not what George W. Bush wants to do. This Democratization, his intention as outlined in the second inaugural address, is to transform the politics of the entire region. That's not Harry Truman, it's Woodrow Wilson. It's internationalism, idealism, and it's unrealistic.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I don't think it is unrealistic. My way of paraphrasing the essence of the Bush doctrine is to make the Middle East safe for America by making it safe for Democracy. I don't think that's an unrealistic long range strategy. In fact I find it impossible to believe ... well let me give you an analogy with World War III. The policy of detente, which I was a very strong critic of that Reagan rejected explicitly, was based on the supposition that the Soviet Empire was gonna last forever and therefore we had to make our peace with it. I always argued, why do we assume that the Soviet Empire is the only empire in history that's gonna last forever? All the others crumbled. And I feel the same way about Islam and the culture of the Arabs. Why do we have to assume that they will forever be able to resist the forces of modernization and Democratization that have been sweeping over most other parts of the world? I don't think they can, especially at a time when you've got globalized cultural influences through the internet, through television.

>> Peter Robinson: Brent Scowcroft, national security advisor to the first President Bush, you quote him in World War IV as a proponent of the so-called realist school. You've already argued you don't think it is realistic, but you quote an exchange between Scowcroft and Condoleezza Rice. I believe, I'm quoting Scowcroft here, "I believe", Scowcroft declared, "that you cannot with one sweep of the hand or the mind, cast off thousands of years of history. You're not going to Democratize Iraq." Now let me expand on the thesis a little bit as I understand it. A thousand years of history, no Arab democracies - Lebanon for about 15 years during the 1970's, but there is some deep resistance within this culture to democracy. So when George W. Bush says we're gonna democratize the entire region, that's an overreach. We ought to be willing, but doesn't necessarily argue against your thesis that we need to pursue World War IV. I'm trying to see if I can get a nuance here; we ought to be willing to settle for what Mark Stein has referred to as the least bad government in the Arab world. We don't have to transform

Iraq into a democracy, we just need to take out Saddam Hussein and establish fundamental order.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Yeah well that was Lyndon Johnson's idea. He's a son of a bitch but he's our son of a bitch. That basically was our policy for the last 50 years in the Middle East, and what it brought us was not stability but a lot of wars and the dependency on the oil of the region, and finally 9/11. What's more, Scowcroft is wrong about thousands of years, well even if you go back 7 centuries it's not thousands of years. But the despotisms of the Middle East, including Saddam Hussein's regime, we're not created by Allah or Mohammad. They were created by the British and the French after World War I. They have shallow roots not deep roots, and they are certainly susceptible of change and reformation and even as we've seen already in two cases, radical transformation in a relatively short time.

>> Peter Robinson: The study of the history of the region, therefore impresses one not with the durability and permanence of the political order that we see on the ground, but with it's malleability, it's recent origin - that's the argument.

>> Norman Podhoretz: That's what I'm saying.

>> Peter Robinson: Go ahead and study history, what you'll discover is that this is all the recent creations.

>> Norman Podhoretz: That's right and I also take my wisdom here from Bernard Lewis who's the greatest living authority on the culture of the Arabs and of the Muslim world generally, who says that it is simply untrue that the culture of the Arabs or the religion of Islam are incompatible with democracy broadly defined as consensual government, representative government of some kind. And he has said flatly, and it's terms even more extreme than I've used, either we bring them freedom or they destroy us. Now that's Bernard Lewis talking.

>> Peter Robinson: The facts on the ground; I want to get to the battle of ideas here at home in a moment, but first the battle in Iraq. We invade in March 2003, within 3 weeks Baghdad is fallen - big victory. 2007; Petraeus goes over, surge begins early in the year, here we sit at the end of the year and within a matter of months Petraeus changing tactics, some increase in troops, pacified Anbar, pacified most of Baghdad and making enormous headway elsewhere - big victory. What went wrong in between?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well it took a while for us to figure out how to deal with this particular kind of insurgency. I mean it took Lincoln 3 years to find Sherman and Grant, took George Bush 3 years to find Petraeus, but the point I would make is - and it's an interesting pervaded tribute to the soundness of the democratization strategy - that the enemies of the strategy both within Iraq and outside, were so convinced that there was a serious danger of it's succeeding that they were all blowing themselves up in order to head it off. I don't think the resistance would have been so ferocious if it was self evident that this thing couldn't work. So you had a coalition of diehards, Baathists, hoping for

restoration of Shiite militias bent on revenge and against any kind of unification, and Jihad is from outside; all of them threatened by the prospect of a democratic Iraq. And the fact that they felt threatened and were fighting so hard is a tribute to the soundness of the strategy and the viability of it.

>> Peter Robinson: At the end of this program I'd like to ask you about the candidates for president, what kind of commander in chief each might make; but let's talk for a moment about George W. Bush as commander in chief and the question is how Americans ought to assess him, what lessons they ought to learn from his period in office as we choose a new commander in chief. Let me set it up with two contrasting images of warfare: one is the Normandy invasion. Our mutual friend Victor Davis Hanson often points out, that although we look back on the Normandy invasion as a great moment in American history, all kinds of things went wrong and in particular the intelligence had failed to notice the hedgerows that began only a couple hundred yards from the beach; thousands of Americans got killed because they couldn't fight their way out of the hedgerows - a simple point that was totally overlooked and was obvious from aerial reconnaissance, they just didn't notice. Item one. Item two: is Abraham Lincoln going over to the Winder Building from the White House, which is where the military telegrams came in, and Lincoln is constantly reading, constantly pushing his commanders, fires one commander after another until he gets to Grant. Okay, the point of this is that under one of these things happen, and mistakes will be made, it takes a while to learn as you go. On the other you have a more proactive commander in chief than it seems to me George W. Bush has been. George W. Bush has said any number of times during this period when things were going badly, I asked the commanders on the ground if they have what they need, if the answer is yes I'm content. Lincoln never said any such thing. Lincoln would never have framed any such statement in a sense. So what kind of standards do we apply? What do we learn from this experience?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Look, I revere Lincoln but he did not fire McClellan. What's more, he rehired him after firing him, and Lincoln was the greatest president we ever had, one of the greatest men who ever lived, and he made a lot of mistakes; certainly as commander in chief, even though he was proactive. He wasn't proactive enough, you can say from that point of view - should have fired McClellan earlier. In any event, but as for the issue of mistakes being made - well I've often said and I say in the book, the mistakes made in Iraq assuming they were all mistakes as a ledge rather than judgment calls, it might have gone worse even the other way; are chump change compared to the mistakes that were made in World War II, and not just the Normandy invasion ... 800 by the way, Americans were killed in training exercises for the Normandy invasion, training exercises. The Battle of the Bulge is an even worse example where you had intelligence, aerial photographs of German tanks massing in the Arden. The intelligence people absolutely refused to believe, said it was all phony, it's ridiculous, they're not gonna mount an offensive now. We had boys going in there without proper boots, without proper winter clothing, there were thousands of cases of gangrene as well as something like 20,000 Americans killed in a few days, and God knows how many wounded and captured. And what was the Battle of the Bulge represented as in 1940? All Americans knew about it was that the commanding general, being asked to surrender, that he said

'nuts'. I think he said something more obscene than that, but it was burglarized. But nothing, nothing that has gone wrong in Iraq or Afghanistan is comparable to the calamitous era of the Battle of the Bulge, and there are 10 other examples one could cite. So what do you say about this? If you look at World War IV, including the Iraqi campaign, with some descent historical perspective and you look at Bush's performance - and Bush is not Lincoln and Bush loathes to interfere with the military because of the horrible example of Lyndon Johnson who interfered too much. So he reacted in the other direction, but just seems to me that by any reasonable historical standard the conduct of this war has been a triumph, not a disaster. And if you look at what's happened in 3 or 4 years in Afghanistan and Iraq, it's not perfect, it's not over, but enormous strides have been made and again, certainly by comparison with the time it took to win victories in prior wars.

>> Peter Robinson: From the facts on the ground abroad to the battle here at home. Let me quote again from World War IV. "Whether the American people will discharge the responsibility that 9/11 imposed on us, will ultimately be answered by the outcome of this great war of ideas at home; a war so ferocious that some of us have not hesitated to describe it as a kind of civil war." Civil War? Explain that term.

>> Normal Podhoretz: Well I mean by this that I don't remember, even during the Cold War when it got pretty rough and I have the scars to prove it, an atmosphere, political situation has polarized the one we're in now in which you have almost ... it's almost impossible for one side to talk to the other let alone to reach some kind of agreement or consensus. We have 2 contending theories of what we're up against, what we've been up against since 9/11. They are irreconcilable, totally. One of them is the one that I adhere to, mainly that this is a World War comparable to World War II, World War III, that we either win it or our civilization is doomed, that we have to do what's necessary. The other side says nonsense, this isn't a war - yeah they're terrorists, they are as John Carrey put it, a nuisance like prostitution and illegal gambling; it will always be with us. But it doesn't have to disrupt our lives, we can live with it. We can deal with it the way we dealt with it before 9/11, with the cops and the courts. And to treat these people as formidable enemies, to dignify them beyond what they deserve, they certainly do not merit a military response. Now these are incompatible views of where we are, and roughly I don't know what the proportions are, but about half the country seems to believe in one theory, about half seems to believe in the other. That's what I call in the world of ideas a civil war.

>> Peter Robinson: The half that subscribes to the notion that you oppose, dominates the media though.

>> Norman Podhoretz: That's right, oh absolutely.

>> Peter Robinson: I found some, to me, some of the most compelling reading in World War IV; perhaps although I lived through it, I wasn't old enough to be paying attention, deals with the 60's. You describe a meeting you had and the parallels between then and now. You describe a meeting you had with Lyndon Baines Johnson in the Oval Office; you went in to tell him that public opinion was starting to turn against him. He pulled out

a list of poll results to show you that public support was still behind him and the war in Vietnam. Now let me quote you: "but in an almost unbelievable and probably unprecedented development, public opinion had ceased to count. Indeed as the Ted Offensive in 1968 revealed ..." Ted is where the big push by the North Vietnamese and they lost. "... as the Ted Offensive revealed, reality itself had ceased to count". Has reality ceased to count in Iraq?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Not yet.

>> Peter Robinson: Tease out that parallel.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I think I yield to no one in my detestation of the liberal and left media, but I have to say since the tide has been turning, the surge, Petraeus' strategy, even the New York Times and Washington Post and some others have been forced to recognize and acknowledge it.

>> Peter Robinson: The heat is off Norman Podhoretz even in Manhattan?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well, no, not at all - but they've tried to downplay it, but they've been forced at least to let it be known and you now see a turn in public opinion on the war.

>> Peter Robinson: One other quotation from World War IV here, there's a cultural political point. You quote Keynes' famous remark that practical men are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Then you argue that during the 60's practical men, such as administrators and bureaucrats, were the slaves of the lead opinion. "All they needed to do was read the New York Times or switch on their television sets, or go to the movies and drip by drip the material was absorbed into their heads. By this process could a minority win out over a majority, or to put it another way, could culture trump politics?" Here's a question about the new media. Does the rise of FOX News, National Review Online, Commentary - of course you edit it but Commentary now has a website ... Rush Limbaugh. Can we say at least this much, that we will not see culture trump politics, the public opinion of the sort of the centrist opinion of the country? That's unlikely to happen again in this ... in World War IV.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I think the question is still unresolved. It's not as one sided a fight as it was in the 60's, and the institutions you mentioned restore a certain balance of power but it remains the case that in the world of ideas, the left still has control of many of the key institutions. They have their Garrisons and the Universities and the entertainment industry, and so on. But I take heart from the fact that because of the internet and the blogger sphere, this Dan Rather business, the phony documents that ...

>> Peter Robinson: In the election of 2004?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Yeah, well was exposed within 24 hours. I believe that 5 years ago, that would have spelled the doom of George Bush's candidacy and by the time it was

exposed as fraudulent, it would have been too late. So at least you have the opportunity to fight back in a way that was not possible in the past, when the Times wouldn't even publish letters to the editor for example. There was no way of answering Walter Cronkite. I mean Walter Cronkite came on the air after Ted and he said, we've lost, and he was regarded, he was Dan Rather's predecessor. He was regarded as the great sort of neutral authority, of course we now know and most of us knew then that he was a big left wing liberal. He's come out of the closet since he left that job, but Walter Cronkite said we've lost and - we lost. I mean that was it.

>> Peter Robinson: Iran - couple of views. You talk about Iran in World War IV but mostly Iraq. Let me quote from an article you wrote in the Wall Street Journal. "It now remains to be seen whether this president, George W. Bush, will find it possible to take the only action that can stop Iran from following through on it's evil intentions toward us and toward Israel. As an American and as a Jew, I pray with all my heart that he will." And the title of that article was The Case for Bombing Iran ... view point one. View point two: retired general, John Abizaid, former commander and chief of the central command which means this is the man who ran the war in Iraq for several years ... for a couple years. "There are ways to live with a nuclear Iran."

>> Norman Podhoretz: The idea that we can live with a nuclear Iran is a kind of fullback position taken by people who, up until very recently, were saying yes it's true, we must prevent Iran from getting the bomb but we can do it through diplomacy and sanctions. My argument all along has been that nothing will work with military action. They now agree with that except that they rule military action out, so now the fullback position is, well okay we can live with it. Nobody was saying a few months ago that we could live with it. The only debate was how we can stop it. My view is we cannot live with it, you cannot contain Iran for the reasons I gave earlier about the indifference to nation state, that this kind of Muslim ... Ayatollah Khomeini said, I say let Iran go up in smoke so long as Islam prevails. And other Islamic Iranian leaders have said much the same thing.

>> Peter Robinson: You an Iran of regime which in itself has ... it is dedicating an entire nation to the mentality of the suicide bomber.

>> Norman Podhoretz: That's right and we know that they didn't hesitate to send a million children into their deaths in the Iran Iraq war. So I don't think you can contain them, and what's more my view is that if we do permit Iran to get the bomb, there will be within a very short time, a nuclear war. Not necessarily all over the world, but they will either hit Israel or the Israelis will have to preempt and hit them and somebody will use their weapons.

>> Peter Robinson: As a military matter ... first of all, you've read deeply, you've talked to all kinds of people, how close are they to getting a bomb?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well there are many ... the complacent theory is 5 years or even 10. The alarmist theory is less than a year, which they will pass the point of no return - doesn't mean they have the bomb yet but it would mean that hitting them would release

too much radiation. So I think the only responsible course is to accept the low ball estimate because if you're wrong, it will be catastrophic.

>> Peter Robinson: Can the Israelis do this on their own? Is there any chance of that?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well there are differences of opinion there too. There was a study by some guys at MIT some months ago saying the Israelis could do it, but only if nothing goes wrong.

>> Peter Robinson: The mission has to be perfect.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Yeah, we can do it and even if some things go wrong. If we don't do it, I believe Bush will do it before he leaves office, but if we don't do it I don't see how the Israelis cannot take the matter into their own hands. They can't sit there and allow a country to get nuclear weapons when it's president has said that we're gonna wipe you off the map.

>> Peter Robinson: Alright, you're causing my blood to run cold here. Let me frame this up and make sure that I understand. In your view, although there's a dispersion of estimates about how far they are from getting a bomb, the only responsible course is for the man in charge of defending the nation, the president of the United States, to assume the closest reasonable estimate which is less than a year at this point. In your judgment it will be the duty of George W. Bush before he leaves office, to destroy the Iranian nuclear program by whatever means he has to use. Is that correct?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Yes. What's more, he himself has said something similar. He said in public several times, if we allow Iran to get the bomb, people 50 years from now will look back at us the way we look back at the men who negotiated the Munich Agreement in 1938 and say, how could they have let this happen? And now I don't know why he would put himself in the historical dock like that if he was intending to be ... and he has said this at least twice in public and similar things in private. So now it may be that he will be persuaded that there's enough time and he can kick the can to the next president, but my guess is and based on a reading ... my reading of his character and his determination and his courage, that he will do it.

>> Peter Robinson: Alright. Short answers. I'll name a candidate, you tell me which candidate would most ... I want a sentence on each of them.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Okay.

>> Peter Robinson: ... would most vigorously, robustly prosecute World War IV? Barack Obama.

>> Norman Podhoretz: No. I think he doesn't even understand that it's a war.

>> Peter Robinson: Hilary Clinton.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Hard to say, I think it's conceivable that the awesome responsibilities of power might concentrate her mind.

>> Peter Robinson: Well let me pause on Hilary Clinton; go back to short answers in a moment, but let me pause on her. Dwight Eisenhower's elected, Republican Eisenhower is elected in 52 to succeed the Democrat Truman. That's a good moment for America because at that moment, World War III - the Cold War becomes a bipartisan enterprise which it remains until the end. Isn't there an argument that in 2008 we need such a moment?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Oh yes we do.

>> Peter Robinson: It would be good for the country if Hilary Clinton were elected president?

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well only if I were sure that she would do what I would hope she would do, then I'm not sure.

>> Peter Robinson: You're not at all sure about that.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well 2012 maybe, okay. [laughter]

>> Peter Robinson: Alright, back to short answers. Fred Thompson.

>> Norman Podhoretz: I think he probably would be okay, but I'm more impressed by the character he plays on Law and Order than by Fred Thompson himself. I think what's more, his reputation ...

>> Peter Robinson: Norman, remind me never to cross you would you please? Mitt Romney.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well he walks the walk, he talks the talk, and I'm not sure he would be up to walking the walk.

>> Peter Robinson: Mike Huckabee?

>> Norman Podhoretz: No. Again, he's a very charming and amusing fellow. I don't see he has any chance at all of winning and it's hard for me to imagine that he would prosecute the war in a way that I think is necessary.

>> Peter Robinson: John McCain.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well he probably would. I admire him very much and I think he's in many ways a great man, but he's very inconsistent in his views. He's been very, very good on Iraq. I haven't heard him say anything about the war in general, what I call

World War IV, some people say the long war. And I'm not entirely certain as to where he stands on ...

>> Peter Robinson: So your view of John McCain is that once we're committed to battle, he knows he wants to win but you're not sure he's a strategic thinker for this. Alright, and then Rudy Giuliani.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Well I'm supporting him enthusiastically and I don't have the slightest doubt that he would prosecute World War IV with the intelligence, with the vigor, with optimism, and with a kind of - strange as it may seem - good cheer, that is the kind of quality you need in a wartime leader. He's the only one of all the candidates, well except maybe for Huckabee, who is a doer. They're all so grim. He's a kind of happy warrior and that's one of the qualities he has in common with Ronald Reagan, whom he does not otherwise resemble but he's optimistic about this country, he won't even contemplate the possibility of cutting back and running and losing. And he knows exactly what the stakes are.

>> Peter Robinson: Norman Podhoretz, thank you very much.

>> Norman Podhoretz: Thank you Peter.

>> Peter Robinson: For Uncommon Knowledge, I'm Peter Robinson, thanks for joining us.