

War Blog

By FrontPage Magazine
FrontPageMagazine.com | July 14, 2004

KERRY'S WAR CONTRADICTIONS

[John Podhoretz](#) took Kerry to task for his contradictions on the Iraq war in today's NY Post.

John Kerry has finally spoken the words that make the November election an unambiguous choice. On "60 Minutes" on Sunday night, according to the official transcript released by CBS News, Kerry said: "I am against the — the war."

He tried to qualify them, to fudge them a bit, but no matter. The words are now out there and can't be taken back.

The possible future president of the United States opposes the war in Iraq now being fought by 130,000 American troops.

This is not a tenable position for Kerry. He first came to prominence as a Vietnam war veteran against the war who famously asked (in what is perhaps the only genuinely memorable sentence he has ever spoken): "How do you ask a man to be the last man to die for a mistake?"

What I want to know is this: How, after Sunday night, could a President Kerry ask a single man or woman in the U.S. armed forces to risk his or her life in Iraq when he is "against the — the war"? Don't simple honesty and decency demand that Kerry immediately announce his plans for a complete withdrawal from Iraq?

Kerry has made no such announcement. In fact, he continues to proclaim his support for a huge American presence in Iraq on the grounds that "the world has a stake in . . . a stable Iraq."

He never speaks about the Iraq war in terms of protecting America from terrorism, or advancing democracy in the Muslim Middle East, or liberating a suffering people from more than 30 years of tyranny and chaos.

He offers no cause higher or nobler than "stability."

That cannot stand. Kerry cannot lead this country to a successful resolution of the hostilities in Iraq if the only positive value he sees in victory is "stability." The country won't stand for it.

Kerry may share JFK's initials, but right now, the president he most resembles is Richard Milhous Nixon — the very man he condemned in 1971 for not wanting to be "the first president to lose a war."

Nixon did become the first president to lose a war.

If John Kerry becomes president, he'll be the second. *Tuesday, July 13, 2004*

www.nerepublican.blogspot.com

*

BLOWING SMOKE



Tuesday, July 13, 2004

www.coxandforkum.com

*

IRAN'S "SUPREME LEADER" RAVES

Proving once again that nobody conspiracy-theorizes like an Iranian mullah, the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei announced today that US and Israeli agents are behind the beheadings, kidnappings, and terror bombings in Iraq: [Ayatollah: U.S. Supports Iraq Insurgency](#). (Hat tip: [Jihad Watch](#).)

TEHRAN, Iran - Iran's supreme leader on Tuesday accused U.S. and Israeli agents, not Muslims, of responsibility for the wave of beheadings and kidnappings in Iraq, the official Islamic Republic News Agency reported.

Ayatollah Ali Khamenei also described terrorism as a "loathsome, horrible" and said

fighting it was “of great importance.”

In comments made during a meeting with visiting Singaporean Prime Minister of Singapore Goh Chok Tong, Khamenei said: “We seriously suspect the agents of the Americans and Israelis in conducting such horrendous terrorist acts and cannot believe the people who kidnap Philippines nationals, for instance, or behead U.S. nationals are Muslims.”

PALESTINIAN CHILD ABUSE

Gaza’s Killing School. (Hat tip: Ben F.)

Children as young as 10 are being recruited to fight for the Palestinian cause.

Sky News has gained access to a young people’s camp in Gaza, where the only lesson taught is how to kill Israelis.

Sky’s Middle East Correspondent Emma Hurd said the camp, at an undisclosed location, had been set up to drill children in the ways of war.

The recruits, some of whom are dwarfed by their AK-47 assault rifles, are taught how to carry out ambushes.

They are also made to do an obstacle course, crawling under barbed wire and leaping through hoops of fire while their instructors fire live bullets overhead.

Hurd witnessed one training session in which a militant, dressed as a Jewish settler complete with yarmulke skull cap, was ambushed in his car. Gunmen pulled the “settler” from his vehicle and Hurd was told if this had been real he would have been killed.

Tuesday, July 13, 2004

AUSTRALIA TO BOOST TROOP NUMBERS IN IRAQ

Again I raise a glass of wine to our Australian allies, as they do the right thing in the face of thuggish intimidation: **Australia to Boost Troop Numbers in Iraq.**

CANBERRA (Reuters) - Australia, a staunch U.S. ally, is boosting the number of its troops in Iraq to better protect Australian diplomats and personnel training the Iraqi military, a minister said on Tuesday.

The move was also a show of support for the U.S.-led coalition in Iraq as some countries start to withdraw troops because of continuing violence and a series of kidnappings and executions of hostages.

Defense Minister Robert Hill said Australia was doubling its light armored vehicles in Iraq to 12 and sending 30 extra army personnel, bringing the Australian security detachment to 120 and total number of Australians on duty in and around Iraq to 880.

“The threat from (explosive devices) is greater than it was some months ago,” Hill told reporters on Tuesday.

“Our commitment is to remain there until the job is done but it is a dangerous environment for both military forces and for officials. We believe we have a responsibility to do everything possible to protect Australians in that environment.”

Monday, July 12, 2004

www.littlegreenfootballs.com

*

MICHAEL MOORE'S FOREIGN CRITICS

The Washington Post has selected comments from the foreign press on "Fahrenheit 9/11": "**Michael Moore, ugly American.**" First, the good news at the top:

Michael Moore can handle verbal abuse from the conservative pundits in America, but harsh words from Pete Townshend, lead guitarist for The Who, may hit closer to his liberal heart.

"I greatly resent being bullied and slurred by him just because he didn't get what we wanted from me," Townshend told [Ireland Online](#).

Moore wanted Townshend's rock anthem "Won't Get Fooled Again" for use on the soundtrack of his anti-Bush documentary film, "Fahrenheit 9/11." Townshend refused, saying he thought Moore's previous movies amounted to "bullying." In response, Townshend said that Moore accused him of being a war supporter. Townshend says Moore's attitude was evocative of President Bush's war on terrorism credo: if you're not with me, you're against me.

"It seems to me that this aspect of his nature is not unlike that of the powerful and willful man at the centre of his documentary," Townshend observed.

Then the rubbish at the bottom of the downhill slide, with an accidental bump into the truth at the end:

Hussein Ibish, a Washington-based commentator writing for the [Daily Star](#) in Beirut, Lebanon, said Moore ignored "the massive paper trail demonstrating a pre-existing agenda, which placed the overthrow of the Iraqi regime at the center of both US and Israeli policies."

Instead, Moore depicts "the malevolent influence of 'the Saudis,' a phrase that in the US is increasingly spat out with utter contempt, reminiscent of the tone reserved for 'the Jews' in anti-Semitic discourse, ascribing to millions of otherwise heterogeneous people the same menacing and hostile essence."

"Moore may or may not affect the election," Ibish concluded. "But he has certainly succeeding [sic] in bringing to a great many Americans the most powerful critique of US foreign policy they have ever heard, albeit one that rests on a bizarre and incoherent conspiracy theory and which confuses at least as much as it enlightens."

I'm not sure Ibish really belongs in this roundup of foreign comment on 9/11. When last heard from, he was the director of communications for the Washington-based American-Arab Anti-Discrimination

Committee. (For more on Ibish, see "[The insane rubbish of Hussein Ibish](#)" by Erick Stakelbeck and "[U.S. Arabs' firebrand](#)" by Daniel Pipes.)

CHURCHILLIAN OBSERVATIONS

Prominently featured in Mark Steyn's column condemning British Home Secretary David Blunkett's proposal for "religious hate" laws to shield Islam from criticism is a devastating quotation of Winston Churchill, and Steyn's pointed comment:

In *The River War* (1899), Winston Churchill's account of the Sudanese campaign, there's a memorable passage which I reproduce here while I'm still able to:

"How dreadful are the curses which Mohammedanism lays on its votaries! Besides the fanatical frenzy, which is as dangerous in a man as hydrophobia in a dog, there is this fearful fatalistic apathy. Improvident habits, slovenly systems of agriculture, sluggish methods of commerce, and insecurity of property exist wherever the followers of the Prophet rule or live. A degraded sensualism deprives this life of its grace and refinement; the next of its dignity and sanctity. The fact that in Mohammedan law every woman must belong to some man as his absolute property - either as a child, a wife, or a concubine - must delay the final extinction of slavery until the faith of Islam has ceased to be a great power among men.

"Individual Moslems may show splendid qualities. Thousands become the brave and loyal soldiers of the Queen: all know how to die. But the influence of the religion paralyses the social development of those who follow it. No stronger retrograde force exists in the world. Far from being moribund, Mohammedanism is a militant and proselytising faith. It has already spread throughout Central Africa, raising fearless warriors at every step; and were it not that Christianity is sheltered in the strong arms of science - the science against which it had vainly struggled - the civilisation of modern Europe might fall, as fell the civilisation of ancient Rome."

Is that grossly offensive to Muslims? Almost certainly. Is it also a rather shrewd and pertinent analysis by one of Britain's most eminent leaders? I think so. If Blunkett bans the sentiments in that first sentence, the sentiments of the last will prove even more pertinent.

Steyn's column is "[Blunkett's ban will fan the flames.](#)" (Courtesy of [Little Green Footballs.](#))

FENCING FOR ARAFAT'S GANG

Jeremy Rabkin is professor of government at Cornell University. He is also the only such scholar I know of who has thought through the peril to American sovereignty and freedom posed by international institutions such as the United Nations and the International Criminal Court.

On the editorial page of today's *Wall Street Journal*, Professor Rabkin writes about last week's decision of the International Court of Justice at the Hague on Israel's West Bank security fence. Rabkin's column is titled "Lawfare," in tribute to its thesis that international institutions have become the tool of parties warring against free countries. (Unfortunately, the electronic version of the column is restricted to subscribers to the *Journal's* online service.)

In a 14-1 advisory opinion, the ICJ ruled that Israel's security fence violated international law. Professor Rabkin devotes most of his column to a lucid explanation of the procedural shenanigans that produced the court's ruling. Regarding the procedural shenanigans, Rabkin writes:

The statute of the ICJ provides that the Court may only decide disputes submitted by states and then only with the consent of the states that are parties to the dispute. This provision follows the practice of the international court established under the League of Nations, of the international arbitration court established by the Hague Peace Conference in 1899, and of all previous international arbitrations. Serious diplomats have always doubted that international questions, involving the highest national interests, could be settled by mere legal reasoning.

The traditional approach to international arbitration would have barred the Court from entering into this most intractable international conflict. Palestine, since it is not a recognized state, cannot sue before the ICJ in its own name. And since Israel assuredly did not *consent* to let the legality of the fence be decided by the ICJ.

The U.N. General Assembly, however, at the prompting of Arab states asked the Court last December to provide an "advisory opinion" on the dispute over the fence. The U.N. Charter allows for this procedure, but only in regard to "legal issues" and only in conformity with the overall scheme of the Charter. Here, the General Assembly was effectively asking the ICJ to endorse its own political conclusions, with its resolution describing the fence as a "wall" (most of it is, in fact, chain-link construction) on "occupied territory including East Jerusalem." The General Assembly was also seeking to have the ICJ do an end-run around the Security Council, which is supposed to have primary responsibility for resolving threats to peace (while at the same time circumventing the legal requirement that Israel consent to be judged in a case to which it was a party).

The Council had exercised this responsibility only a few weeks earlier, by endorsing a "road map to peace" which stipulated that ultimate borders -- and such questions as the ultimate status of Jerusalem -- should be settled between the Palestinians and the Israelis in direct negotiations. The ICJ's ruling is likely to prove a genuine obstacle to the step-by-step bargaining process envisioned in the road map.

How can a Palestinian representative, for example, now embrace a peace plan that cedes less than full sovereign control of the Old City of Jerusalem, when the highest international court has declared that Palestinians should have the right to oust all Israeli claims to that place? How can Israel put any trust in international guarantees when even the ICJ seems so indifferent to its life-and-death concerns?

The Court had many legal grounds for refusing to decide this case. And such arguments were pressed on the Court not only by the Israeli government but by the U.S., by Russia, by the European Union and a majority of EU member states. All the sponsors of the "road map," in other words, urged the Court to stay out of this heated political conflict. Many other governments around the world took the same view.

Given the membership of the Court, where states hostile to Israel are plentifully

represented, condemnation of the fence was to be expected. Most dismaying, however, was that all five judges from EU states (UK, France, Germany, Netherlands, Slovakia) went along with the majority. Only the dissent of the American judge, Thomas Buergenthal, argued against taking this leap into the heart of the Mideast conflict.

On the substance of the ICJ opinion, Rabkin writes:

The terror war against Israel, launched in the summer of 2000, has by now resulted in the deaths of nearly a thousand Israeli civilians. The security fence, by greatly impeding the movement of would-be terrorists into Israel, has helped to achieve a sharp decline in terror attacks over the past year. Nonetheless, the ICJ admonished that the nations of the world are obligated, not to pressure Palestinians to abandon terrorism, but to pressure Israel to dismantle its security fence.

Most of the Court's reasoning, based on arguments advanced by British barristers, is superficially plausible -- so long as one ignores the actual political context of the dispute. Perhaps the Children's Rights Convention or the Fourth Geneva Convention do provide arguments against disrupting the free movement of innocent Palestinians. But the arguments are more plausible if one ignores the terror threat to Israeli lives, as the Court essentially does. In concluding that the fence sits on "occupied territory," the Court assumes that the armistice lines of 1949 are Israel's final borders, though never accepted as such by Israel's neighbors. In concluding that Israel cannot undertake intrusive measures to protect "illegal settlements," the Court assumes that Jews had no claim to return to places, like the Old City of Jerusalem, from which they were forcibly expelled by Arab armies in 1949...

For Yasser Arafat, the decision now looks like an unalloyed boon, tossed to him without extracting any serious effort to help suppress ongoing terrorist activities.

In effect, the ICJ now claims that countries beset by terrorism must ignore terror threats and focus on the Court's priorities. It is a dangerous precedent for the U.S., which has often contended for interpretations of its rights, under international law, that a majority of U.N. members might dispute. To those who argue that the U.S. should join the new International Criminal Court, because that new court will be moderated in its rulings by the influence of European members, this ruling of an older U.N. court should be sobering.

The ruling raises still broader questions about the U.N.'s capacity to contribute to any serious international effort against terrorism. Even U.N. judges, we now see, have other priorities.

When do you suppose some enterprising journalist will ask John Kerry or John Edwards for his position on this ruling and Israel's noncompliance with it? Or how he would respond on behalf of the United States in the event of such a ruling against it? *Tuesday, July 13, 2004*

www.powerlineblog.com

*

YOU CAN'T TELL THE PLAYERS WITHOUT A SCORECARD

Everybody has his own narrative of events in Iraq and, predictably, at this moment CNN is emphasizing the bad news -- [Source: Philippines bringing troops home early - Jul 13, 2004](#). Of course this ongoing soap opera is about a measly 50 troops on a humanitarian mission.

Meanwhile, on what I would wager is a far more significant front (and yet to make its appearance on CNN) the [Associated Press](#) is reporting: *Iraqi police seized more than 500 criminal suspects in raids in Baghdad Tuesday, an Interior Ministry source said*. Some of these people are evidently weapons traders. In others words, the Iraqi government is getting its act together. Let's keep our fingers crossed it continues. So far, this Allawi guy seems to have his head screwed on straight. (via [LGF](#)) *Tuesday, July 13, 2004*

THE EVIDENCE OF ABSENCE AT THE NYT...

Nothing in the NYT today (that I could find, anyway) about the humiliation of Joseph C. Wilson, whose story they covered so assiduously last year, usually on the front page. They do, however, inform us that the ["Final 9/11 Report Is Said to Dismiss Iraq-Qaeda Alliance"](#).

That's the headline. The article, not surprisingly, begins a little differently: The commission investigating the Sept. 11 attacks is nearing completion of a final, probably unanimous report that will stand by the conclusions of the panel's staff and largely dismiss White House theories both about a close working relationship between Iraq and Al Qaeda and about possible Iraqi involvement in Sept. 11, commission officials said.

Note the words "close working relationship." Whoever said that? Mafia families rarely have close working relationships. Frequently they kill each other. On the other hand, they know who their enemy really is -- in the case of the Mafia, the government; in the case of Saddam and Al Qaeda, the USA. When it is to their mutual advantage, they will ally against their common enemy. What is so difficult to understand about that?

Never mind. Philip Shenon is doing his job, expressing the party line. The NYT does, however, have [fascinating piece of reporting](#) on one of the lead terrorists in the Madrid bombing known as "Mohammed the Egyptian." Apparently this fanatic was addicted to cellphones (not just to blow people up, but to talk) and was recorded at length by Italian police. On one of the calls, he was persuading some poor fellow to be a suicide bomber:

Mr. Ahmed told his young charge that he listened to soothing cassette tapes of martyrdom continuously, and told him to do the same.

"They will make everything easier when you feel them enter your body," he said, explaining that a suicide mission "takes five minutes, and then everything blows up." *Monday, July 12, 2004*

www.rogerlsimon.com

*

THE MULLAHS' PATHOLOGY

Here's Iran's Ayatollah [Ali Khamenei](#) blaming the terrorist violence against civilians in Iraq on ... Americans and Israelis. "We seriously suspect the agents of the Americans and Israelis in conducting

such horrendous terrorist acts and cannot believe the people who kidnap Philippines nationals, for instance, or behead U.S. nationals are Muslims." Try not to burst out laughing. *Wednesday, July 14, 2004*

www.andrewsullivan.com

*

IT'S ALL A QUESTION OF INTERPRETATION

The *charitable view*:

"[UN] Sanctions fuse burns as Sudan fiddles."

The uncharitable view:

"Sudan burns as UN fiddles."

Read also this piece by Makau Mutua, professor of law and director of the Human Rights Center at the State University of New York at Buffalo:

"Darfur is not an accidental apocalypse of mass slaughters, enslavement, pillage, and ethnic cleansing. The Darfur pogrom is part of a historic continuum in which successive Arab governments have sought to entirely destroy black Africans in this biracial nation...

"What is required for peace in Sudan is either regime change, in which a democratic, inclusive state is born, or a partition, in which the black African south and west become an independent sovereign state free of Khartoum and the Arab north."

I wouldn't hold my breath, though; after all, it's black people killing black people. The real outrage seems to be a very precious and easily exhausted commodity; hence it's reserved for special cases only; such as when the Americans or the Israelis are the perpetrators. Mutua writes that "[t]he tragedy of Darfur wouldn't be permitted if it were taking place in Europe." I'm not so sure; Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo came pretty close while the EU and the rest of the "international community" kept dragging their feet. The signs for Darfur aren't too good. *Wednesday, July 14, 2004*

CLINTON TURNS INTO A PRETZEL ON BRITISH TV

Bill Clinton, on his book signing invasion of Great Britain, nuances himself into oblivion, trying to defend Tony Blair without giving aid and comfort to George Bush:

"What [Blair] was trying to do was to preserve the integrity of the UN resolution, the unity of Europe and the transatlantic alliance and in the end it became impossible to do all three. So he had to decide – it was a terrible, terrible dilemma and any British prime minister would have been in, I think, a terrible position here,"

Clinton told Britain's Channel 4.

"Mr Clinton said Mr Blair had three options to consider when most thought he only had two – to go to war or not.

"He said there was also the possible position of the role of the weapons inspection team.

" 'If Hans Blix had finished his job, or said 'I can't do any more because this man won't cooperate, so I think he has chemical or biological weapons, which were unaccounted for' – that's the proper language, unaccounted for – then I would have supported actions,' he said.

" 'That was Tony's position, so they tried one more time to go to the UN to get enough votes for that position, but they couldn't do it'."

In other words, Tony meant well and tried his best, but it was not to be, or as Clinton said in defence of his Third Way pal, "I agree with Tony on this. He believed at the time, and I think British people need to at least take into account of this in judging whether he did right or wrong."

This is all very reminiscent of Clinton's **recent comments** that he agreed with Bush's decision to go to war against Iraq, but not with the timing of the war. On the other side of the Atlantic, Clinton now seems to be saying that in the end, even bad timing can be forgiven, particularly if your name is Tony.

If it all sounds like too much hair-splitting to you, it probably is. Purely cosmetic glosses aside, the US and the UK position on Iraq was pretty much the same all along, and so, what's good for Tony should also be good to George. But if not as charitable to his successor as he is to his British pal, Clinton at least avoids recriminations and conspiracy theories about Bush's rationale for the war:

"They thought they could make a new democracy there, shake up the authoritarian machines in the Middle East, increase their leverage to make peace between Israel and Palestinians and they thought the peace-making process after the conflict would be much easier than it has been."

Which doesn't sound all that bad, does it?

"LIBERAL MEDIA ARE FANATICS"

Check out [Orson Scott Card](#), my favourite Mormon science-fiction writer in the "Opinion Journal" talking about media bias. Card, by the way, is not a conservative, but he doesn't apologise for being a patriot.

"What makes the liberal bias in the mainstream media so pernicious is that they deny that they're biased and insist that their twisted version of events is 'reality,' and anyone who disagrees with them is either mentally or morally suspect. In other words, they're fanatics. And, like all good fanatics, they're utterly convinced that they're in sole possession of virtue and truth."

You can also check his regular contributions on [The Ornerly American](#). *Tuesday, July 13, 2004*

www.chrenkoff.blogspot.com

*

CHEVY CHASE ON BUSH

Well-known global thinker Chevy Chase, on George W. Bush, after last week's concert of hate:

"I'm frightened by Bush, if you want to know the truth. He's a narcissist, as are we all. But, eh, he's managed to, ah, you know, form a few hate groups into a, ah, an entire Islamic jihad, and I, ah, I don't trust him. I don't like him. And I think he's venal, and I just don't like him, for the record. I want him out. I want Kerry in."

OK, we all know that no one give's a hoot what Chevy Chase thinks. I concede he's harmless. But he does serve as a window into the "thinking" of the Michael Moore Democrats, who seem to believe that the jihadists wouldn't exist but for Bush. Would that even one reporter would have asked Chase about the first attack on the World Trade Centers, the embassy attacks in Africa or the U.S.S. Cole. But that would have been unfair. That would have required Chase to think on camera, not read lines in a prompter. *Tuesday, July 12, 2004*

www.hughhewitt.com

*

CZECH LEADER LABELS 'FAHRENHEIT' WEAK PROPAGANDA

By Nick Holdsworth

KARLOVY VARY, Czech Republic (Hollywood Reporter) - Czech president Vaclav Klaus has dubbed Michael Moore's controversial documentary "Fahrenheit 9/11" as weak Communist-era style propaganda after a festival screening of the film.



Klaus, known for his politically conservative views, was in the audience for Friday's screening at the Czech spa town, accompanied by his wife Livia.



AP Photo

 **Slideshow:** Michael Moore

"The message of this film is very weak and propagandistic," Klaus said. "We were used to such messages in the communist days. Everybody has open eyes and can understand that this is propaganda. It was a weak film that tells us nothing new."

Klaus refused to answer questions on whether he supported President Bush ([news - web sites](#)) in the war in Iraq ([news - web sites](#)), despite the fact that the Czech Republic has supported the war.

Moore's film played twice to sell-out crowds at the festival.

Reuters/Hollywood Reporter *Sunday, July 11, 2004*

*

THE NAVY IS SURGING

Vanderleun [reports](#) that

... 92% of our surface ships are currently underway or deployed, and that 91% of our submarine fleet is either underway or deployed.

This is a lot of activity.

This includes more than half our aircraft carriers.

Truman, Enterprise, Stennis, Washington, Kennedy, Reagan, Kitty Hawk. It could all be, of course, just prudent planning and practice. On the other hand, given the various signals being sent by Homeland Security, the nearness of the Olympics, and the advent of the elections, it may be a case of "Fortune favors the forward deployed."

Since six carriers will exercise near Taiwan, it's also a unobvious signal to China that it needs to behave. Military analysts have long said that mainland forces could capture Taiwan in less than a month if the US does not oppose, but can't capture it at all if the US does oppose. China is thought to be able to defeat only one American aircraft carrier battle group. It can maybe *defend*, not attack, against two groups. More than two spells real gloom for them. Six at one time means utter military catastrophe.

For the nonce. Almost all China's offensive military focus is oriented on Taiwan. China is militarizing and modernizing as fast as it can. Some analysts think China will have the capability to handle six carrier groups in about 10 years. *Tuesday, July 13, 2004*

www.donaldsensing.com

*

RESPONDING TO SONESHEIN

This is a letter from this week's Jewish Journal responding to last week's op-ed by Soneshein:

From the Poll

Raphael Sonenshein is, unfortunately, no doubt correct in his assessment (which I paraphrase) that most Jews will continue their near-slavish, lock-step devotion to the liberal-left Democrats in the coming election, and that there will be a "world celebration" if Bush is defeated ("For Whom the Poll Tolls," July 2). He dismissively notes the Bush administration's absolute support of Israel and its government, by stating that the Democrats will select strongly pro-Israel candidates with better social policies.

A clue to just who will be celebrating if Bush loses is a recent press release from the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), citing a poll showing Muslims will heavily support Kerry by 54 percent to only 2 percent for Bush; Nader, who calls for American disengagement with Israel, gets 26 percent. CAIR cites disagreement with administration policy in the Middle East. In accord, a recent issue of Cairo's English edition Al Ahram contained an article urging Muslim Americans to support Kerry "even though the Zionists are the principal supporters of the Democratic Party." They must know something that Sonenshein doesn't.

I am sure that the leaders of France and Germany, Saddam Hussein, Osama bin Laden, Hamas, Hezbollah, the ayatollahs of Iran and all their adherents and admirers will be among those celebrants and would endorse Kerry if asked. One can sometimes define a person (Bush) as much by his enemies, as one can define another (Kerry) by his newfound friends.

Carl Pearlston, Torrance