

DHAKA SATURDAY MARCH 22, 2003

Raging war

The biggest concern is the safety of Iraqi people

ITH the US-led war on Iraq sending mind-boggling images of deaths and destruction, the demonstrations against it continue across the world.

The collective conscience of people took a terrible ham-mering when President Bush ordered the coalition forces to begin military operations against Iraq. The worldwide opposition to his campaign is now manifest everywhere-- the Arab countries, Europe and even the United States. Demonstrators protested violently against the war as the European Union summit was in progress in Brussels. Reports from the Middle Eastern capitals indicate that Bush's war plan has been totally rejected by Arabs.

However, it is not enough to disagree with the warmongers. The EU divided on the use of war option is wholly committed to giving humanitarian aid to Iraq. However, the prime concern at the moment is to minimise civilian casualties in the beleaguered country. The western media is covering almost all developments in the battlefields, but the extent of civilian casualties is yet to be reported in detail. A huge number of Iraqis might have been trapped as Baghdad is coming under heavy missile fire and the American and British troops are forcing their way towards the southern city of Basra and some other strategic points. Even if they want to take shelter in the neighbouring countries, they will need some sort of cover to leave Iraq.

Countries like France, Germany, Russia and China which did not bow to the US pressure for endorsing its military strike on Baghdad, should now work togetherof course with the support of the vast majority of other countriesto end the hostilities. The UN Secretary General Kofi Annan may initiate a process to convene an emergency meeting of the UNSC to review the situation and create conditions for a cease-fire, even though the United States and Britain have acted in utter disregard of the world body so far. Similarly, the Arab League and the NAM should treat the war as a direct threat to world peace and get their act together with a view to further mobilising world opinion against the war. Time, they must not forget, is an important factor because one extra day of hostilities could mean more death and destruction.

President Bush should once again ask himself why the dissenting countries in the EU think that the war is absolutely uncalled for and 'illegal'. It is, of course, for the people of Iraq to decide what type of government they would have and how they would run their country. His theory of 'liberating Iraq' has found, for understandable reasons, very few takers even in his own country or in the countries that he claims to be on his side in this unequal, unjust and outra-geous war against an already subdued power.

Welcome move to diversify relations

Concrete steps awaited

E welcome the impetus provided to bilateral rela-tions between Bangladesh and Myanmar during Prime Minister Khaleda Zia's visit to Yangon. Both sides have agreed to follow up on the understanding reached on construction of Bangladesh-Myanmar road network during Myanmar PM's visit to Dhaka some time ago. Undoubtedly, the road-link would play an immensely positive role in building up a more co-operative trade envi-ronment between Dhaka and Yangon. Apart from the bright prospect of linking the proposed road network with the planned Asian Highway, the road-link could effectively put a stop to cross-border smuggling. It is worthwhile to note that trade balance is tilted towards Yangon.

It is not for the first time, that the government of fourparty alliance led by Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) has shown keen interest in developing close ties with a neighbour in the eastern region. Not so long ago, Prime Minister Khaleda Zia visited China and Thailand, with a view to boosting business and investment cooperation with the two countries. Thailand has already shown interest in developing road networks while China has agreed to help in developing other infrastructures. Such a policy taken by the government would no doubt be welcomed if it brings dividends. Instead of restricting trade cooperation with a few countries, the government seems to have decided to expand the horizon. But here steps should be taken in a way that those with whom we have had close trade ties, do not feel neglected. But sadly even in the latest meeting between the heads of government of Bangladesh and Myanmar no headway could be made in resolving the question of repatriation of the last batch of 20,000 Rohingya refugees camped in Cox's Bazar. They have been waiting for years with the hope that their government would agree to take them back but to no avail. We earnestly hope the repatriation process would be expedited so that the refugees could be relieved from years of miseries in camps.

The war against Saddam is not about Iraqi people

DR FAKHRUDDIN AHMED writes from Princeton

mid-term elections. It is Karl Rove

who has decided that the best way

for Bush to win reelection next year

is to grab Iraq's 200 billion barrels

of oil on the pretext of removing Saddam, disarm Iraq so that the Israelis are happy, thus securing

the votes of the Evangelical Chris-

tians and Jews, both whom are

passionate supporters of Israel. As

in Afghanistan, the evangelical

Christians would also like to see

some proselytizing (conversion of

Muslims to Christianity) in Iraq

They would also like the Muslims

to renounce a part of the Qur'an so

deception!

erated. Friedman said that he had travelled around the country and found that 99 per cent of Ameri-HAT is the opinion of Wayne Slater and James Moore, the authors of the best seller, "Bush's Brain." The "Brain" refers to Mr. Bush's cans are against the war. Fifty percent, however, feel obliged to support the President, regardless of how they feel. "This is an elitist driven war," Friedman said. The war had its genesis in July of last political strategist, Karl Rove, who has masterminded Bush's rise year when Bush gathered his rightwing confidants, Vice Presi-dent Dick Cheney, Defence Secrefrom an obscure owner of a professional baseball team, The Texas Rangers (early 1990s), to the Govertary Donald Rumsfeld, Deputy norship of Texas (1994), and the Defence Secretary Paul Wofowitz Presidency of the US (2000). It was and National Security Chief Condy Karl Rove who formulated the winning Republican strategy of Rice at his Crawford, Texas ranch and decided to send troops to focusing entirely on war and ter-Kuwait to attack Iraq. Secretary of rorism (and never mentioning the sinking economy) in last year's State Colin Powell was not invited.

accompli to the world. Here Mr Bush miscalculated. The world is not America and cannot be bullied into backing an unnecessary war. That is why Mr Bush ran into all sorts of troubles at the UN and the world at large. Outrageously, the US and Britain also became critical of Hans Blix for his neutral assess-ment of Iraqi compliance, and for standing in the way of their war!

So why was the link between Saddam and Al Qaeda concocted? According to Friedman, polls showed America's lack of enthusiasm for war against Iraq. However, the same polls showed that if Saddam is linked to Al Qaeda, America's support skyrockets!

Iraq today is not vital to America's security. Saddam Hussein has neither the intention nor the capability to threaten America. This is not a war of necessity. That was Afghanistan. Iraq is a war of choice. The problem that Mr. Bush is having with legitimate critics of this war stems from his consistent exaggeration of this point. When Mr. Bush takes a war of choice and turns it into a war of necessity, people naturally ask, 'Hey, what's going on here? We are being hustled. For a war of no choice against 9/11 terrorists in Kabul, we didn't need anyone's permission. But for a war of choice in Iraq, we need the world's permission." And the

make the wicked and the wayward think twice about crossing us. It still confuses many Americans that, in a world full of vicious slimeballs, we are about to bomb one that didn't attack us on 9/11 (like Osama); that isn't intercepting our planes (like North Korea.) The President genuinely believes that smoking Saddam will reduce Islamic terror. That is why no cost -- shattering the UN, NATO, the European alliance, Tony Blair's career and the US budget -- is too high...By citing 9/11 eight times, Mr. Bush tried to alchemize American anger at Al Qaeda into support for smashing Saddam. The same day in an NYT op-ed

article former President and 2002

Nobel Peace Prize winner, Jimmy

Carter, who described himself as a

"Christian and a president," said

that for two hundred years America was committed to "basic religious

principles, respect for interna-tional law and alliances...It is clear that a substantially unilateral

most unprecedented in the history of civilized nations." Mr. Carter goes on to elaborate why this does not meet the criteria of a just war. A "just war," according to St. Augus-tine and St. Aquinas, requires proper authority and cannot be It was President pre-emptive. Carter who put human rights front and centre, and who told apartheid South Africa in 1977 that American policy would be one-man one vote in that country, paving the way for majority black rule. Even when the Iranians took American diplomats hostage in 1979, Carter did not go for the military option, but won their release diplomatically, though it cost him the presidency. Wouldn't the Bushies have obliterated Iran?

The parade of prominent mem-bers of Israeli lobby appearing on talk shows continues. Each one of them, from Dr. Henry Kissinger, Dr. Paul Wolfowitz, Senator Lieberman, Dennis Ross on down, without exception, exhorts Amer-ica to go to war. This proved too much for a Democratic Congressman from Virginia, who accused the American Jews of warmongering. America is split down the middle about the war; many talk show hosts are opposed to the war. Yet, none of them questions the motives of those appearing on their shows, who suddenly are all of the same opinion! Of course we know why. It is not pc to tell the truth that the American Jews are more interested in the good the war will do for Israel, and less interested in the bad that it might do to America! They are Jews first, and Americans last.

attack on Iraq does not meet these Why the rush to war? Because it standards. This is an almost uniwas getting hotter and the sand-storms were getting fiercer in Iraq. versal conviction of religious leaders, with the most notable excep-tion of a few spokesman of the Southern Baptist Convention who Because it would take exactly two days for Bush to destroy the pos-sessor of the "weapons of mass destruction!" After the victory will are greatly influenced by their commitment to Israel...with our national security not directly come the accolades; after all, ev-eryone likes a winner. The cost? threatened and despite the over-With Kuwait and Saudi Arabia not whelming opposition of most people and governments in the bankrolling Gulf War II, Iraq's oil is going to foot the bill this time. world, the United States seems Doubly lucky Iraqis! They get to determined to carry out military and diplomatic action that is alpay for the destruction of their country, and for its reconstruction!

LETTER FROM AMERICA

Why the rush to war? Because it was getting hotter and the sandstorms were getting fiercer in Iraq. Because it would take exactly two days for Bush to destroy the possessor of the "weapons of mass destruction!" After the victory will come the accolades; after all, everyone likes a winner. The cost? With Kuwait and Saudi Arabia not bankrolling Gulf War II, Iraq's oil is going to foot the bill this time. Doubly lucky Iraqis! They get to pay for the destruction of their country, and for its reconstruction!

that it is more palatable to the Jews and the Christians. According to Suddenly the nation was told the authors, even if Saddam that Saddam was a mortal danger Hussein were to somehow met the to America, and that several thou-US's impossible demands, the sand troops were already in Kuwait President's response would be: to depose him. After presenting 'This is another example of Iraq's the war as a fait accompli, Congressional approval for the use of force Tom Friedman, *The New York Times'* three-time Pulitzer Prize was sought. Petrified of being labeled unpatriotic, US Congresswinning columnist, who supports men and Congresswomen, as well as US Senators essentially gave the President a blank cheque to dethe war, made some interesting observations on Tim Russert's television programme on March 8. clare war, thus forfeiting to the "America is going to war on the wings of a lie," Friedman said. The President the Congress's own mandate to declare war. Without ie, according to Friedman, is that waiting for the UN to authorise war, the administration relent-lessly built up troops, which ap-proached quarter of a million. Saddam and Al Qaeda are linked. He went on to say that Al Qaeda is an Islamic fundamentalist terrorist group, and Saddam Hussein is a secular thug. As the last Bin Laden Once again, the war was presented as a fait accompli to the American public, who risked being called tape clearly demonstrated unpatriotic if they oppose it. The war was also presented as *fait* Saddam and Osama hate each other's guts, and have never coop-

Therefore, Karl Rove, the master tactician, suddenly "discovered" close ties between Saddam and Osama! Of course, he convinced only the converted. Lately, Mr. Bush has taken to accusing Saddam of ties to "Al Qaeda-type" organisations. The Bush adminis-tration is full of unilateralist, narrowly focused rightwing ideologues who want to use Amer-ica's unchallenged power to crush potential enemies (such as Iraq), reward friends (such as Israel) while remaking the world in their image. September 11 offered them the perfect excuse.

In his March 9 column, Friedman criticizes Bush for a comment he made in his March 6 Press con-ference: "When it comes to our security, we really don't need anybody's permission." Adds Friedman: "Fact: The invasion of

world's answer is an emphatic No!" Friedman believes that the Bushies are making a huge mistake with their unilateralist approach. If things go wrong, they will be solely responsible for the consequences.

Friedman's fellow columnist Maureen Dowd is harsher: "As he rolls up to America's first preemptive invasion, bouncing from motive to motive, Mr. Bush is trying to sound rational, not rash. But the Xanax cowboy made it clear that Saddam Hussein was going to pay for 9/11. Even if the fiendish Iraqi dictator was not involved with Al Qaeda, he has supported Al Qaeda-type organisations. Bush officials believe that making the world more scared of us is the best way to make us safer and less scared. So they want a spectacular show of American invincibility to

In any conflict, greater State control is the true victor

SIMON JENKINS

HE world has been cancelled. There is a war on. I normally consume news by the

hour, almost the minute. Yesterday I had to turn it off. For much of the day, there was no news, merely the fallout of a bungled assassination attempt on President Saddam Hussein. There was just hours of waiting for news. Yet nothing else had a look-in. Only the ultimate anaesthetic, football, was permitted to supplant bombs as fit subject for public interest.

The American senator, Hiram Johnson, declared that the first casualty of war is truth. He was wrong. The first casualty is news. Sooner or later truth find its voice. If news is the first casualty of war, the first victor is government. It is ironic that every war fought by Britain in the News is always relative. Yesterday Britain suddenly had no worries past century, justly in the cause of freedom, has led directly to a curtailment of freedom in favour of state control. over Europe's constitution, the Olympics or the Budget. Instead the nation waited breathless for tales of bombing and heroism. When "all the youth of England are on fire", cried Shakespeare, and the 'blast of war is in our ears", then silken dalliance in the wardrobe lies". Tolerance and humility must give way to "hard-favour'd rage". During the Falklands conflict the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Geoffrey Howe, commented that he might as well shut up shop for the duration. All he could do was sign blank cheques. British government was on autopilot. Two weeks ago Gordon Brown made a similar remark, inconceivable from him at any other time. Repeating Lord Howe of Aberavon, he said that the Ministry of Defence could have unlimited access to Treasury funds. He gave the most notori-ously wasteful department in

Whitehall a golden key to the Exchequer. Drugs clinics, the elderly, Aids in Africa, the war on poverty could all eat their budgetary hearts out. War excused everything. Politics was in abeyance.

I have tried over the past month to argue my way through this wretched war. Debate is now overtaken by action. Democrats must accept collective responsibility for decisions taken by govern-ment when validated by Parliament. This decision has been so validated, despite Downing Street's disinclination at first to risk it. Iraq may not be a legal war, but for Britain it is a constitutional one.

If news is the first casualty of war, the first victor is government. It is ironic that every war fought by Britain in the past century, justly in the cause of freedom, has led directly to a curtailment of freedom in favour of state control. The history of war runs in tandem with that of higher taxes, greater regulation and more government.

for hostilities against Napoleon. It rose above a shilling in the pound to pay for Crimea. It went up higher, to 30 per cent and "super tax", to pay for the Great War. It hit a top rate of 90 per cent to pay for the Second World War. These rises

ran their own hospitals, social services, poor homes and prisons. After it they ran none. The welfare state was introduced not through socialism but on the back of a wartime economy. The trains were nationalised not out of conviction but out of military need. State control of universities goes back to 1919 and the Army's demand for more scientific research. The statist Utopia that passes for some

British cities was made possible only by the bombs of war. War offers an opportunity for

repressive legislation that would never be tolerated in peace. The Great World War saw the xenopho-

The present Labour Govern-ment promised to repeal the Prevention of Terrorism Act. It did, cynically introducing one ten times as long and far more draconian. Under the cover of "9/11" the Home Secretary, David Blunkett, brought in his Anti-Terrorism Act, the most extensive restriction of civil liberties in Britain in peacetime. It included indefinite internment of "suspects", expulsion of foreigners and the right of the Home Secretary to take any further measures "by decree" without oversight. Only the House of Lords, to its credit, demanded the dilution of his more extreme police-state proposals

ments of civil liberty than she can have imagined possible when she wrote her book. That is ambition for you. Ms Hewitt is another Clare Short.

Such offences against personal freedom are bitterly fought in the United States, where courts and politicians regard the championing of liberty as a sacred duty, not an Opposition hobby. In Britain infringement seems immune to party and to argument. Labour and Conservative ministers alike fall in love with emergency powers. From Roy Jenkins to David Blunkett, ministers once dusted with the glitter of office grab eagerly at any chance to exploit war' "hardfavour'd rage"

Nor are they its only beneficiaries. Hard-favour'd rage is now gathering a multitude of demons into its embrace. Pro and anti-war advocates pollute politics with mindless name-calling in the press. On Monday Labour whips

blighted the careers of MPs for

Income tax was invented to pay

The history of war runs in tandem with that of higher taxes, greater regulation and more government.

More than that, it is an act of collective violence which, once put in train, is best done fast. This is more likely if soldiers charged with its execution are supported, not shown red cards at every turn.

That does not mean politics ceases. This is no war of national security. It does not require domestic mobilisation. A national coalition has not been formed. Despite Tony Blair's crude efforts to scare the public into becoming pro-war, there is no threat to Brit ish territory. We have sent profes-sional soldiers to aid an American 'disarmament" expedition in the Gulf. This should not require emer-gency powers. The war should by rights fall within the defence budget, give or take an extra £1 billion.

may have been necessary at the time, but they were not immediately abolished on the return of peace. There is no case in the past century of tax rates used to pay for a war returning to the status quo ante. War is the most efficient of all tax-gatherers, because it inflicts its pain under general anaesthetic. Against the blast of war no scream is heard. Mr Brown is so acquiescent today because at last he has an

excuse for higher taxes. The same goes for the size and scope of government. The first surge in officialdom occurred in the Great War. By the time of the Second World War there were roughly 200,000 civil servants. Fifteen years after it had ended there were 375,000 and rising. Before that war, local communities

bic Defence of the Realm Act. The Second World War saw the War Powers (Defence) Act, which banned as a threat to national security the sentence, "Even Hitler had a mother". Official secrets, censorship and espionage were given a scope that nobody saw fit to repeal with the coming of peace. Freedom had no lobby.

After an IRA attack in 1974, the supposedly liberal Roy Jenkins introduced the Prevention of Terrorism Act, pledging in public that it was a "strictly temporary measure". It gave the police extensive discretion to spy on, intern and deport citizens without trial. It has never been repealed. It was just too useful. There is in Britain no supreme court to demand its demise.

treating war as a matter of con-Who knows what Mr Blunkett may be scheming to slip through under cover of bombing this week. He is already seeking powers to tap mobile phones and e-mail mes-sages and pass on such information to an array of state agencies. He is a shameless enemy of liberty. Protest such intrusion and you will be given the excuse of Tosca's Scarpia and the East German Stasi: "The innocent have nothing to fear.

The most trenchant critic of such control-freakery used to be a certain Patricia Hewitt, the author of The Abuse of Power and a civil liberties lobbyist. "Patricia Hewitt prosecutes the State," cries a handout in my file. Ms Hewitt now sits happily in the Cabinet. There she enforces more severe infringe-

THE EDITOR TO THE EDITOR

science, a contempt of Parliament which would be illegal if committed by outsiders. Other MPs who support the war are threatened with deselection. Universities have become cockpits of intolerance. Football matches have become cauldrons of xenophobia. Germans and French are excoriated for taking a view of the war no different from that which Britain took a year ago. Leviathan has all the best tunes,

with full orchestral backing when nations go to war. That is why war is the hardest time to plead the case for free speech, fair trial, due process and personal liberty. And that in turn is precisely the point. Wars fought for freedom bring in their train freedom's greatest foes. They need hawk-eyed scrutiny.

TO THE EDITOR TO THE EDITOR TO THE

Letters will only be considered if they carry the writer's full name, address and telephone number (if any). The identity of the writers will be protected. Letters must be limited to 300 words. All letters will be subject to editing.

Why this hartal?

It is surprising that a political party who claim themselves to be pro "mehonoti manush" (laboriouspeople) called yet another hartal. The Left parties called this hartal protesting the US led attack on Iraq and also due to Bangladesh Govt.'s "suspicious attitude" towards the war

When many anti-war movements and processions are being held in Bangladesh protesting the seizure of Iraq by the US, it is very much unjustified to seize our people by calling hartal. Moreover, the hartal is called on a day when a foot march and grand rally is scheduled to be held at the Dhaka University (DU) campus and DU Vicechancellor, teachers and officers are expected to participate in it. Doesn't the Left partie's attitude seem to be 'suspicious' as well? ATeacher

Dhaka University

"How I will fight Bush"

This letter is in support to Masood Rahman and Arild Klokkerhaug ("How I will fight Bush", (March 20 and 21). In order for this "fight" to be effective, we need to do more than just boycotting the US products. We need to stop trade with the US and start sending every-

thing to Germany and France. We also should not forget that countries like UK, Japan, Spain, Portugal, Australia, Canada, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait are also morally supporting the US by either sending solders or saying that the US is right in attacking Iraq. So, we should immediately stop all import and export with all these countries because after all people who support evil are also

Shuja evil. By the way we should immedi-

ately bring back all Bangladeshi workers from countries like Kuwait and Qatar remember Qatar just spend more than \$1 billion to build the largest airstrip for the US airforce and giving unconditional

support to the US army. We should not take any aid or help from these countries either, because then we would lose our moral right to protest

Along with boycotting the US products, we should also boycott companies like Singer, American Express, the oil companies etc? We should make lists of everything and anything that is remotely related to the US and abandon them until they learn their lesson. Mahmud Zaman Uttara, Dhaka

* * *

While you all are at it (boycotting American stuff) make sure you also

pray hard so that the Americans do not start playing the same game. Because that would definitely put in danger the economy of a large number of developing countries and hundreds of millions of people who need American business not to watch American movies or drink American drinks but to buy food and clothing

Canada

Catastrophe@todie for. com

The moment of truth and no more truce have indeed arrived and President BushÊhas made it clear to the world and his fellow Americans that all out warÊis possible defying all rules of deterrence. ÊYet again the world is betting peace with anarchy, crude politics at its best. And who is to suffer?ÊIt's you and me and the entire humanÊrace.

President Bush's statement, "the opening scene of aÊlong concerted attack" means all the more excruciating pain for us.ÊThis has opened the gates for Saddam Hussein toÊresort toÊWMD weapons,Êthus creating anarchy andÊwe again re-enterÊtheÊdays of the barbarians.ÊThisÊholy war (as Saddam describes it) is going

toÊimpinge on mankind and instead of boldly venturing the future we go reverse.EE

We today are facing an identity crisis as to who to trust and beingÊstuck around the vicious circle ofÊthis instability paradox weÊwill be mere spectators of theÊevent-taking place. When eventually peace is resumed spectators will chant Êcritiques that this was a crime and politics again, will be as crude as Êusual

Aziz Uttara, Dhaka

Beware of the media!

It will be wise for everyone following the Iraq crisis to be circum-spect about the Western media. The BBC and the CNN are the major networks covering the war and telecasting the war to our part of the world. The news is heavily tainted and is largely influenced by the coalition forces. If, for instance, 10 coalition forces' soldier die during the invasion, the CNN will invariably deny the report in the first place and then later confirm that 2 soldiers are killed rather than the original ten. The BBC will predictably support that same report. Here, we must be careful not to follow everything that is being covered by these two net-

works. It is sad when the BBC carries out

video montages every hour, containing injured children with some dramatic background music. The BBC has churned out old archive videos of atrocities of Saddam



Hussein. This whole coverage is merely propaganda targeted to influence the Muslim sentiments to support George W. Bush and his allied forces. I do not support this attack on Iraq

simply because innocent civilians

are going to be killed. And all this just for having material gains is sick and the one's supporting the US are surely bought by the President of the United States.

Haji Mohammad Isam Dhanmondi, Dhaka

War in Iraq

amusing. The editorial says that

this paper has been totally

opposed to the war from and has

found none of the arguments

EDITOR TO T

persuasive. Of course it didn't find the arguments persuasive, it never looked at them.

With the exception of a few letters absolutely no space was given to any editorials supporting the war. This paper deliberately gave the impression of there being a united international front against the war while in reality quite a lot of people and many governments support this war. Already Britain, Spain, Italy, Denmark and Australia have started giving active support.

The Letter's Page has been a bit fairer than the Editorial one but not by much. While open letters from fringe American activists were printed prominently ones from mainstream commentators weren't.

The war has started and despite the doomsayers will hopefully result in a free and prosperous Iraq. In the future I would hope The Daily Star presents both sides of the story and not just one, often extremist, view. Azad Dhaka

Two for the price of I found the editorial in March 20 one issue about the war in Iraq quite

This is a great opportunity for the war criminal Sharon. With all our attention diverted to Iraq, Sharon

will have a golden-chance to achieve his final goal; the destruction of Palestine. In fact, the Israeli IDF terrorists are already in position to storm into action as soon as the mass murder starts in Iraq. There is a good chance that, at the end of the Iraqi war, we will also have the end of Palestine. However, you are unlikely to see a single shot of the killing in Palestine as your screen will be bombarded with all sorts of statistics, inter-

leaders hitting each other with sledge. However, the good thing is, with the miserable Palestinian losers gone, our leaders can finally concentrate on more important matters e.g. buying luxury cars or building homes for their families with the latest innovations from our Western "friends"!

Azad Miah Oldham, UK

views and clever analysis about Iraq. After all, who wants to see some low-budget actions in Palestine, when you can have real-time actions in full-colour, with stereosound and added special effects, brought to you by the newly created "embedded" reporters from Iragi deserts? As always, we will have our Muslim