

Candidate Rudy Giuliani

Last edited April 14, 2008

[More by Michael DC Bowen »](#)



The Resilient Society by Rudolph W. Giuliani, City Journal Winter 2008

www.city-journal.org/2008/18_1_homeland_security.h...

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the United States has confronted both the deadliest attack and one of the most destructive natural disasters in the nation's history. The term "homeland security" wasn't part of the national debate during the 2000 election. Now, after September 11 and Hurricane Katrina, every American understands that homeland security is at the heart of a president's responsibility.

There have been no fewer than 14 attempted domestic terrorist attacks and nine international plots against American citizens and interests since 9/11, according to reports in the public record. There have been plots to blow up the Brooklyn Bridge and airplanes crossing the Atlantic. Terrorists have conspired to murder American soldiers at Fort Dix and planned to ignite the fuel lines beneath John F. Kennedy International Airport. Not a single post-9/11 plot on U.S. soil has succeeded to date. That is no accident; it is a measure of our increased vigilance as a nation.

The fight against al-Qaida and other terrorist groups will be America's central challenge for years to come. We will achieve victory in what I call the Terrorists' War on Us only by staying on offense: defeating terrorist organizations and hunting down their leaders, wherever they are; helping Afghanistan and Iraq establish stable and representative governments; aiding the spread of good governance throughout the Muslim world; and defeating militant Islam in the war of ideas.

In His Words: Giuliani on Torture - The Caucus - Politics - New York Times Blog

thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/10/25/in-his-own-...

Mr. Giuliani responded: "O.K. First of all, I don't believe the attorney general designate in any way was unclear on torture. I think Democrats said that; I don't think he was."

Ms. Gustitus said: "He said he didn't know if waterboarding is torture."

Mr. Giuliani said: "Well, I'm not sure it is either. I'm not sure it is either. It depends on how it's done. It depends on the circumstances. It depends on who does it. I think the way it's been defined in the media, it shouldn't be done. The way in which they have described it, particularly in the liberal media. So I would say, if that's the description of it, then I can agree, that it shouldn't be done. But I have to see what the real description of it is. Because I've learned something being in public life as long as I have. And I hate to shock anybody with this, but the newspapers don't always describe it accurately."

(Applause)

"If I can't figure out that there's been a significant media bias against this war, then I shouldn't be running for president of the United States."

(Applause)

"Sometimes they describe it accurately. Sometimes they exaggerate it. So I'd have to see what they really are doing, not the way some of these liberal newspapers have exaggerated it."

"Now, on the question of torture. We should not torture. America should not stand for torture, America should not allow torture. But America should engage in aggressive questioning of Islamic terrorists who are arrested or who are apprehended. Because if we don't we leave ourselves open to significant attack."

"And the line between the two is very delicate and very difficult. But we can't abandon aggressive questioning of people who are intent on coming here to kill us. Or killing us overseas. I think that that's the point that the attorney general designate was trying to make."

"And the powers of the president are pretty significant in protecting the national security of the United States. They always have been. So I think what he was also trying to do was protect the powers of the United States to deal with unforeseen circumstances like the hypothetical we were asked during one debate – I've forgotten which one: If there was a terrorist attack on an American city, and it was clear that there were all going to be additional attacks, some of them were going to be nuclear, and they were planned for the next couple of days and one of the people involved in it was arrested, and the head of the C.I.A. came to you and said we have to do certain things to get the information from him, would you authorize it? And I think most of us answered it, yes we would, we would authorize doing whatever we thought was the most effective to get that information."

"The president has to have that kind of leeway. We've got to trust our president well enough to allow that. If we surround this so much with procedure, we're going to have some unforeseen circumstance in which a president's not going to feel comfortable making the right decision, particularly if you have the wrong person there. "

"So I think America should never be for torture. America should be against torture. It violates the Geneva Convention. Certainly when we're dealing with armed combatants, we shouldn't get near anything like that. There is a distinction, sometimes, when you're dealing with terrorists. You may have to use means that are a little tougher."

"And I see, when the Democrats are talking about torture, they're not just talking about even this definition of waterboarding, which again, if you look at the liberal media and you look at the way they describe it, you could say it was torture and you shouldn't do it. But they talk about sleep deprivation. I mean, on that theory, I'm getting tortured running for president of the United States. That's plain silly. That's silly."

"That comes from people who have never investigated a real criminal case, never investigated organized crime. You know how I put hundreds of Mafia people in jail? And I helped to put thousands in Italy in jail? You know how I did it? I did it by electronic surveillance and aggressive questioning. None of them wanted to give me the information. They didn't walk into my office and say, 'I want to tell you about all of those Mafia murders...'"

"They got 'em because we arrested them, we got very significant charges on them, and we questioned them for long, long periods of time. With very aggressive techniques. Never ever tortured anybody. I can tell you that. Would never allow it. Don't know of any situation in which the F.B.I. did it."

"And then, please have a better view of the men and women who serve you in law enforcement and in the intelligence services."

(Applause)

"I know the liberal media paints them like, you know – These are the good guys, not the bad guys. They really are. I mean these are the people who put their lives at risk to protect you and me. These are people of scruples, honor, decency. They don't want to torture anybody. They have no desire to harm anybody. What they are dealing with sometimes are these enormously difficult life and death situations, in which there is a possibility of getting information about a group of troops that are going to be killed, and they're going to have to go tell their mothers and fathers that they were killed and there's a chance maybe of stopping it. Or there are these – I mean, suppose some of the people who were going to do Sept. 11 had been captured beforehand. We sure as heck would want some very aggressive questioning to find out what they knew."

"So let's be careful on how we define this. And, sure we should be against torture. But we should not be against aggressive questioning. And the line between the two is going to require some really difficult decisions about drawing it and kind of trusting each other with the discretion for the president to make decisions about what has to be done in the interests of the American people."

"I have known every American president since Gerald Ford. I knew Richard Nixon, but before he was president. I met him, I didn't know him. I can't say I knew Richard Nixon. But I've known every American president since Gerald Ford. Some Republicans, some Democrats. I can't think of a one that would ever want to see somebody tortured. Also can't think of a one that wouldn't have the courage to make some tough decisions to protect the lives of the American people. And that's the kind of person you have to have as president of the United States."

In Houston, Giuliani Defends Abortion Stance - New York Times

www.nytimes.com/2007/05/11/washington/11cnd-giulia...

In a forceful summation of the substantive and political case for his candidacy, delivered to a conservative audience at Houston Baptist College, Mr. Giuliani, the former mayor of New York, acknowledged that his views were out of line with many Republican primary voters.

But Mr. Giuliani argued that the presidential election should not turn on social issues, but on which party would better protect the nation from terrorism. Mr. Giuliani suggested that his own record as mayor of New York – leading the city after the attacks of Sept. 11 and overseeing a dramatic decline in violent crime during his eight years in Gracie Mansion – made him the most electable of the Republican candidates, no matter his stand on issues like abortion.

Giuliani warns of 'new 9/11' if Dems win - Politico.com

www.politico.com/rogersimon/index.html

Giuliani continued: "The freedoms we have are in conflict with the perverted, maniacal interpretation of their religion." He said Americans would fight for "freedom for women, the freedom of elections, freedom of religion and the freedom of our economy."

Addressing the terrorists directly, Giuliani said: "We are not giving that up, and you are not going to take it from us!"

The crowd thundered its approval.

Giuliani also said that America had been naive about terrorism in the past and had missed obvious signals.

"They were at war with us before we realized it, going back to '90s with all the Americans killed by the PLO and Hezbollah and Hamas," he said. "They came here and killed us in 1993 [with the first attack on New York's World Trade Center, in which six people died], and we didn't get it. We didn't get it that this was a war. Then Sept. 11, 2001, happened, and we got it."

Giuliani warns of 'new 9/11' if Dems win - Politico.com

www.politico.com/rogersimon/index.html

"But the question is how long will it take and how many casualties will we have?" Giuliani said. "If we are on defense [with a Democratic president], we will have more losses and it will go on longer."

"I listen a little to the Democrats and if one of them gets elected, we are going on defense," Giuliani continued. "We will wave the white flag on Iraq. We will cut back on the Patriot Act, electronic surveillance, interrogation and we will be back to our pre-Sept. 11 attitude of defense."

He added: "The Democrats do not understand the full nature and scope of the terrorist war against us."

The American Spectator

www.spectator.org/dsp_article.asp?art_id=11020

Pundits of all political persuasions have been chattering about whether Rudy Giuliani, whose name is invariably modified by the description "social liberal," can overcome the objections of many religious conservatives to win the Republican nomination. Will his assurances to appoint judges in the mold of Roberts, Alito and Scalia be "enough" to put their concerns to rest? Will conservatives overlook social issues in an election focusing largely on foreign policy?

If the definition of "social conservative" is merely a checklist of several hot button issues,

specifically abortion and gay rights, Giuliani is certainly to the left of his principal rivals. He might give assurances to appoint strict constructionist judges and might stipulate that his support of civil unions is not the same as support for gay marriage. However, on these issues he is unlikely to win the hearts of single-issue voters who care passionately about a candidate's beliefs and not just the likely outcomes of a candidate's policies.



But the commentators and consultants may have gotten the questions wrong. The better, at least the more interesting, question is whether Giuliani can establish a new description of what it means to be "socially conservative." Perhaps to be socially conservative means something more than just fidelity to pro-life and anti-gay marriage positions. Giuliani has a convincing argument that he is an ethical or cultural conservative who in the end will protect the values that most conservative Republicans hold dear. What does this mean? It means that he sees the world as a battle between good and evil, and politics as a struggle between decent hard working people and elites who have too little respect for their values -- public safety, respect for religion and public virtue.

Giuliani Has No Real Chance With GOP Voters . . . or Does He? - washingtonpost.com www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007...

His strength in recent national polls and some state polls has already prompted many strategists, including some in rival camps, to reexamine their long-held assumptions about a party that is approaching not only its first nomination battle since the terrorist attacks but also the first since the 2006 midterm elections, which put Democrats back into power in Washington. With President Bush's approval ratings still low, Republicans are looking for a winner.

For many months, McCain has been seen as the closest thing there is to a front-runner in the Republican contest. But Giuliani has emerged not only as the popular choice for the GOP nomination but also as the Republican candidate who is currently most highly regarded by the American people -- Republicans, Democrats and independents alike.

The latest Washington Post-ABC News poll showed Giuliani leading McCain 44 percent to 21 percent, with former House speaker Newt Gingrich at 15 percent and former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney at 4 percent. A month ago, Giuliani's lead was much narrower: 34 percent to 27 percent. Without Gingrich in the field, the most recent poll showed Giuliani's margin over McCain was 53 percent to 23 percent.

A veteran Republican strategist, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to candidly assess the situation, said he is among those who long believed that a Republican with Giuliani's profile would have no chance. He still believes the former mayor faces significant obstacles but said the odds of Giuliani winning the nomination are not as remote as they once seemed.

He gave three reasons: the absence of a strong, tradit

Pajamas Media: Breaking: Steve Forbes Endorses Giuliani pajamasmedia.com/2007/03/breaking_steve_forbes_to...

Knowledgeable Republican sources told Pajamas Media that Steve Forbes will announce this morning at NASDAQ that he's endorsing Rudy Giuliani for the '08 presidential elections.

Additional reports as soon as they're available.

UPDATE: [NY1 confirms](#) — "Forbes will also serve as Giuliani's national campaign co-chair and senior policy advisor for the Giuliani campaign."

The content on this page is provided by a [Google Notebook](#) user, and Google assumes no responsibility for this content.