

As soon as the deception by the imams was revealed in the Danish press in mid-January, moderate Muslims began to speak out against them. The first was Hadi Kahn, a Copenhagen IT consultant, who told *Jyllands-Posten* on Jan. 5, "We have no need for imams in Denmark. They do not do anything for us." On Feb. 3, Naser Khader, a Muslim member of the Danish Parliament for the Radical Party, announced the establishment of a network of moderate Muslims, the Demokratiske Muslimer. "If these imams think it is so terrible to live in Denmark, then why do they remain here?" Khader said. "They can always move to one of the countries in the Middle East which are based on the Muslim values they insist on living by. It seems that their loyalty is mainly to countries such as Saudi Arabia, so I think they should move there. I am tired of hearing them complain about the situation in this country which has given them shelter, freedom of expression, freedom of religion and tons of opportunities for their children. If they cannot be loyal to the values of this country they should leave and by that do the majority of Danish Muslims a big favor. The imams should stop criticising the cartoons and instead criticise the terrorists that cut the throats of innocent hostages in the name of Allah."

When Rasmussen met a delegation of the Demokratiske Muslimer for the first time on Feb. 13, about 700 Danish Muslims had already joined the group. It prompted a member of Parliament from Pia Kjaersgaard's Dansk Folkeparti to say that he did not know there were so many moderate Muslims in the country.

While the moderate Muslims began to speak out, the Danes rallied behind the government. Opinion polls indicated that the majority supported the government throughout the cartoon crisis. Rasmussen's party retained its position, while Kjaersgaard's party advanced considerably at the expense of the Labour Party.

The events in Denmark have been closely monitored in the rest of Europe, and will probably strengthen the electoral appeal of immigration-reform parties, who have been observing Danish policies for a couple of years now. In France and Germany, leading right-wing politicians and advocates of law and order, such as Nicolas Sarkozy, the French interior minister, and Wolfgang Schäuble, his German colleague, spoke out in support of the Danish government.

The cartoon affair comes as the second clash in barely three months between the traditional territorial nation-states of Europe and the forces of Eurabia. The

first clash was November's French *intifadah* when Sarkozy opposed gangs of Muslim thugs who wanted to assert power over parts of French territory. In Denmark, radical imams tried to assert power over the media. In both cases, Europe fought back, albeit hesitantly. The Danish resistance even compelled the generals of Eurabia to enlist the help of the entire Muslim world to intimidate one of Europe's smallest countries. And still the Vikings held their ground. Perhaps all is not yet lost. ■

Paul Belien is the editor of www.brusselsjournal.com

Cultural Warmongers

Picking a fight with a faith 1.3 billion strong

By Patrick J. Buchanan

IF YOU WISH to get along with a man, you do not insult his faith. And if you seek to persuade devout Muslims that al-Qaeda is our enemy, not Islam, you do not condone with silence insults to the faith of a billion people.

Understanding this, President Bush ceased to call the war on terror a "crusade." Visiting a mosque, he removed his shoes. He has hosted White House gatherings for the breaking of the fast at the end of Ramadan. He sent Karen Hughes to the State Department to improve our dismal image in the Islamic world. He has declared more times than many of us care to recall, "Islam is a religion of peace."

President Bush knows we are in a struggle for the hearts and minds of Islamic peoples, and if we are to win this struggle we must separate the Muslim monsters from the masses. For as that great American military mind Col. John Boyd defined it, strategy is the appending

to oneself of as many centers of power as possible and isolating your enemy from as many centers of power as possible.

This is what makes the Mohammed cartoons so stupid and self-destructive. They have given Islamic extremists visible proof to show pious Muslims that the West relishes mocking what they hold most sacred: the prophet. They have united Muslim moderates with militants in common rage against us. They have added to the hatred of the West in the Islamic world as friends like King Abdullah of Jordan, Presidents Mubarak of Egypt and Karzai of Afghanistan, and Prime Minister Erdogan of Turkey warned us they would.

One wonders. Did the cynical Europeans learn nothing from the Salman Rushdie episode? Did they learn nothing from the firestorm that erupted in the Islamic world when Christian ministers in the United States, post-9/11, called

Mohammed a “terrorist”?

Why then did they do this? Why did the Danish paper *Jyllands-Posten* publish cartoons it knew to be so blasphemous to Muslims? Why did *Le Monde*, *France Soir*, *Die Welt*, *El Pais*, *Il Stampa* republish them—on their front pages? If a European newsman was oblivious to the probable effect among Muslims of plastering a cartoon of Mohammed with a bomb in his turban on page one, he is too stupid to be an editor. But if he did know the near-certain effect of such an in-your-face provocation, why would he do it? Is this the reflexive secularist hostility of the Euro-press to all religious faiths on display here or something else?

And so we come to the heart of the matter. Why? What was the motive here? What is the game that is afoot? The rationale of the imams who ensured that all Muslims knew of the cartoons and their contents and called for demonstrations and assaults on Western consulates and embassies is evident. They hate us, and they wish to drive us out of the Middle East. But what propelled our own ideologues to prod U.S. editors to republish the cartoons in “solidarity” with the Europeans? Who pushed George W. Bush and Condi Rice not to condemn the cartoons but to “stand up” for the freedom to publish and defy any “intimidation” by the Islamic world?

Answer: our cultural warmongers, who seek the same goal as their cultural warmongers—to ignite a war of civilizations. Both want the “long war” of which the Pentagon speaks, the “World War IV” against “Islamofascism” that is the dream of neoconservatives and the nightmare of their countrymen.

As has been evident for some time, bin Laden and the neocons both seek the same thing: a fight to the finish, no matter how long, no matter how many invasions it takes, no matter how many lives are lost. For if peace were reached

between the Islamic world and the West, even a cold peace with Iran and Syria, what would they do then?

As the provocations of Ahmadinejad are music to the ears of neocons, for they rule out dialogue and diplomacy, the escalation of the cartoon wars into an all-out culture war between Islam and the West has made their day. But it has also wiped out much of the goodwill that George W. Bush has sought to rebuild in the region.

As one explores the arguments of the provocateurs in the West for what they are doing, on inspection all appear hollow. “We believe in the First Amendment!” comes the blustery reply of journalists when asked why they published the cartoons. The First Amendment protected the right of Trent Lott to toast Strom Thurmond. But that did not save Lott from the savagery of the neocons who demanded and got his ouster as Senate majority leader. Yet which is the more egregious offense? To pay a birthday tribute to a century-old man who was once a segregationist or to insult deliberately the most revered figure in the faith of a billion people?

Daily, U.S. editors decline to publish ethnic slurs and obscene remarks and cartoons that might offend a race or religion. This is not censorship. It is editorial judgment. The motto of the *New York Times*, which declined to publish the offending cartoons, is “All the News That’s Fit to Print.”

Conservatives contend that Islamic nations tolerate cartoons and TV shows far more viciously anti-Semitic than these cartoons were anti-Islamic. They are right. But Western newspapers never publish such cartoons, first, because they are outrageous, second, because publication would cost them advertisers, readers, and maybe their jobs. Insulting Muslims and Mohammed is a less risky and less expensive hobby than insulting Judaism or Jews. Indeed,

if you insult Islam, you can make out credentials as a moral hero.

Though State initially condemned the cartoons—“Inciting religious or ethnic hatreds in this manner is unacceptable”—the neocons rapidly re-seized control of the message. In hours, State was in retreat: “While we share the offense that Muslims have taken at these images, we at the same time vigorously defend the right of individuals to express points of view.” Of course we do. But do we believe freedom of the press was responsibly exercised when these idiot editors used it to incite a religious war?

And when it comes to press freedom, Europeans are world-class hypocrites. British historian David Irving has spent months in a prison in Vienna awaiting trial for two speeches he made 15 years ago. In Europe, skeptics and deniers of the Holocaust are fined and imprisoned with the enthusiastic endorsement of the press.

Unfortunately, Bush let slip an opportunity to show respect for the Islamic world and faith and, instead, let himself be intimidated into silently condoning an insult to both. Standing beside the King of Jordan, Bush denounced the violence the cartoons had ignited but declined to condemn the cartoons. Condi Rice denounced Iran and Syria for exploiting the rage over the cartoons but did not condemn the cause of that rage. If there is a double standard here, Bush is the guilty party. He rightly denounced Iran’s president for mocking the Holocaust but would not denounce the European press for mocking the prophet.

If Bush and Rice cannot muster the moral courage to condemn the insulting content of the cartoons, as well as the violence being promoted by anti-Western agitators and demagogues, our wars for democracy in the Middle East are in vain. For we can never win the friendship of these people if they believe our words of respect for their religion cover up a sneering contempt. ■

Election Fraud

Democracy is an effect, not a cause, of nonviolence.

By James L. Payne

NATION BUILDERS put great faith in elections. “Three days ago,” said President George W. Bush in his address of Dec. 18, 2005, “in large numbers, Iraqis went to the polls to choose their own leaders—a landmark day in the history of liberty.” This election in Iraq, Bush went on to say, “is the beginning of something new: constitutional democracy at the heart of the Middle East.” Two previous elections in Iraq were greeted with similar enthusiasm. On each occasion, politicians and editorialists heralded them as “historic” “turning points” in the development of a “strong and lasting” democracy.

If nation building were a rational enterprise, conclusions about the connection between elections and establishing democracy would be based on experience. The nation builders would have made a tabulation of all the elections held in nation-building situations in the past and observed the outcomes. If the holding of an election was followed in all or most cases by a lasting democracy, then they could have a basis for believing that elections, such as those in Iraq, have long-term significance.

Alas, nation builders shun studying past nation-building attempts for the same reason that teen lovers reject statistics on early sex. They are eager to have their way and don't want to hear cautionary advice. From the beginning, the promoters of the Iraq invasion have ignored history, so it is not surprising to see President Bush doing it again when making claims about the significance of

elections. A look at the facts reveals that his faith in elections is seriously misplaced. In turbulent Third World political situations where nation building is attempted, elections neither portend nor establish a durable democracy.

A fruitful case to study on this point is Cuba, the scene of extensive U.S. nation-building efforts a century ago, beginning in 1898 after the Spanish-American War. The involvements included landing troops five times, two U.S. military administrations (1899-1902 and 1906-1909), and a closely guided native government from 1917-1923. These interventions constitute a laboratory of nation-building experience, for in their efforts to establish democracy, U.S. administrators tried everything from drafting constitutions, election codes, and civil-service reforms to building public schools and banning cockfighting. What does this experience tell us about the long-run effect of elections?

During the first American occupation, three elections were held: a municipal election, an election for a constitutional convention, and a presidential election in 1901 that put Tomás Estrada Palma in power. Five years after that election, rebel forces of some 24,000 troops began a revolution that threatened to overwhelm the government of Estrada Palma, prompting a second U.S. occupation and administration. In 1908, the Americans held municipal and presidential elections and handed power over to another president. Subsequent Cuban

political history includes four dictatorships, two military coups, and dozens of revolts, including the bloody revolution of 1956-1959 that brought Fidel Castro to power.

Cuba thus teaches a clear lesson about the lack of connection between elections and a durable democracy in a turbulent setting. In the period from 1900-1958, Cuba saw 23 elections, yet the only thing “strong and lasting” the country has come away with is a totalitarian dictatorship.

The history of Iraq also confirms the point that elections don't guarantee anything about democracy. In the period from 1921-1958, Iraq saw a total of 13 elections, including five under the two British occupations (1917-1932 and 1941-1948). If elections make for democracy, then Iraq should have become a Switzerland. Instead, the country got the Saddam Hussein dictatorship,

What accounts for the faith in elections despite the overwhelming evidence that, in the Third World context, they seldom result in stable democratic regimes? The answer seems to be that observers are putting the cart before the horse. They see that elections are a characteristic of established democracies and conclude that if an election were held, that would bring about a democracy. This is the logic that grandmothers use when they pinch little cheeks. Ruddy cheeks are a sign of health. Therefore, they reason, if they make the cheeks red, it will make the child healthy.