

Saddam Hu?

by Jerry Dunleavy

If Saddam Hussein had been an evil dictator, he'd be an intensely corrupt and self-centered megalomaniac who would love torturing and gassing his own people and the people in countries around him, would revel in evading inspections to hide his illicit WMD's, and would delight in throwing money at every mangy gang of US-hating terrorists that he'd invite into one of his opulent uber-palace-fortresses. Oh wait, that's all true...

No matter what side of the political spectrum you find yourself on, Saddam Hussein's support for global terrorism cannot be disputed. Saddam Hussein paid \$10,000 compensation to the families of Palestinian suicide bombers for many years. But Saddam, being the generous guy that he was, decided that \$10,000 wasn't enough, and upped the payments to \$25,000.

Between the time of the bloody pay raises and the US invasion of Iraq, some 28 suicide bombers would injure 1,209 people and murder at least 223 others, including eight US citizens. All of the suicide bomber families would find themselves \$25,000 richer, thanks to Mr. Hussein.

Saddam also provided refuge, supplies, medical attention, financing and training to many other terrorist groups. The Abu Nidal Organization, the Arab Liberation Front, the Palestinian Liberation Front, the Mujahedin-e-Khalq Organization, and Hamas

would all comfortably operate bases out of Iraq, protected and aided by the Iraqi government.

These groups altogether would murder hundreds and hundreds of people, making them among the most deadly terrorist groups

tives, received instruction on bomb making, poisoning, assassinations, and mass murder. Most striking, however, was the fact that this training camp was equipped with a full sized jet—which was used to instruct ter-

which Al Qaeda members attended. Iraqi officials held many meetings with Al Qaeda operatives, and helped them out with financing and training. The fake passports used by the first World Trade Center bombers in 1993,

along with the bomb-making training, were supplied by Iraq's head g u r u .

Iraq was a safe haven for Al Qaeda throughout the 1990's and 2000's, with large numbers of these terrorists moving into and out of training camps in Iraq at will. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, commonly considered the second-ranking Al Qaeda man and Iraq's most deadly terror organizer, sought refuge in Iraq, of all places, after he fled Afghanistan during our invasion.

With the help of Saddam, he was able to set up a far-reaching network that operated out of Iraq, and still operates in Baghdad today.

Saddam Hussein supported Al Qaeda; there is no argument there. Still think Iraq had no terrorist ties? Money to suicide bombers, huge terrorist training camps, terror organizations based in Iraq, and aid to Al Qaeda aren't enough to convince? Iraq was a terror-sponsor, and was dealt with as such by the US. Al Qaeda has lost a financier. Iraq



in the world. Abu Nidal's organization alone murdered over 300 people, and Mr. Nidal would call Iraq his home from 1999 on.

Did you know that Saddam wasn't allowed to protect terrorists and aid in mass terrorism? I'm quite sure you did. Outlawed in UN Security Council Resolution 687, helping kill innocent civilians was a definite no-no for H u s s e i n .

Salman Pak was a terrorist training camp inside Iraq, funded by Iraq's own terrorist, Saddam Hussein. Many terrorists, including numerous Al Qaeda opera-

rorists on how to hijack planes with knives. Sound familiar?

If somehow Hussein had no idea about and wasn't involved with the 9/11 attacks (above evidence to the contrary), then at the very least he probably felt embarrassed when he found out about the attacks and asked himself: "Hey, did those guys just steal my idea?"

Finally, though ties to Al Qaeda have recently been dismissed by the elite intelligencia, perhaps a quick overview is appropriate. Throughout the 1990's, Iraq held various terrorist meetings, at

Left To Right

by Pat Moroney

In what has been called the most important presidential election in the history of the United States, I can not mask my disappointment in the Democrats for not being able to offer up a worthy challenger to Bush. I, however, must give credit where it is due; the Republicans have done an excellent job of playing the complicated game of politics. Even though no weapons of mass destruction have been found, there still isn't a clear link between Usama and Saddam, and the US death toll in Iraq reaches one thousand, Bush continues to have the support of

many Americans for the Iraqi war. I am not saying the war in and of itself is a good or a bad move. Rather, I am extremely disappointed in our reasons for going to war. Current justification for war does not match what we Americans were told. Yet, give credit to Bush; while being able to keep up support for a controversial war, he has, at the same time, distracted a great deal of public attention from pressing domestic issues.

Unfortunately, Kerry has not capitalized on these issues. Instead of basing his campaign on health care (1 in 6 Americans does not have health insurance) and social security, Kerry has

painted himself as a patriotic war hero, and the Republicans have attacked it beautifully. I am not very concerned about how my president served; George Washington was a sub-par general but not a bad president; Abe Lincoln didn't base his presidency on a war record; FDR never served. Not only does the war-hero image not address crucial issues, Republicans have even forced the public to question the validity of Kerry's service record – the root of his campaign.

Although Kerry does promise to create 10 million jobs by 2009 and provide health insurance for all children, such utopian goals make me (and perhaps the aver-

age voter) skeptical. Whereas Kerry could have formed his campaign around promises to halt job outsourcing and cite Barbara Ehrenreich's book on how minimum wage isn't enough to survive in today's society, he focused on a questionable war record, making a sidenote of his promise to increase minimum wage by about one dollar per hour.

There are still a score of debates and one month's time for Kerry to become more convincing and present a more appealing platform. However, after the RNC, it doesn't look too good. I do see Kerry as the lesser evil. But I can only hope that so does the rest of America.

Campbell Fired Up About Rallies

by Pat Campbell

It was just over one year ago when I was sitting in Sullivan Gym trying to be taught a chant that went something like "We are...Wildcats...Number...One!" that it came to me—rallies are terrible. Let's face it, rallies were no fun last year, and it seemed at the time that it would be that way

forever. They were as consistent a disappointment as every episode of "Saved by the Bell: College Years."

Despite my poor expectations for this year's rallies, I must say I've been very impressed with this year's rallies so far. They have succeeded in getting the students into the rally, and perhaps more importantly, have kept

them as short as possible. Because, really, despite how much fun a rally can be, at 2:50 we're ready to leave.

Seniors Jeff Wolanin and Matt Lobe were able to keep the Fall Sports Rally seem short, even though rallies of that type can drag on. And the simple fact that the Homecoming Rally, M.C.-ed by Jack Froliklong and Jim

Walter, actually had Homecoming floats, thus making it better than last years. I mean how can you beat Bill Gorie walking into the gym as AWK?

I'm hoping that the rest of the year's rallies can match what has been done so far this year. And hopefully, many of the rallies will result in a free day.

has lost a dictator. And we have won a key battle connected to the global struggle against terrorism.

This war must be brought to every terrorist and to all those who sponsor them. As one politician brilliantly stated in 2001, leading up to the Iraq war: "I think we clearly have to keep the pressure on terrorism globally. This doesn't end with Afghanistan... And it is absolutely vital that we continue, for instance, with Saddam Hussein." Kerry, I couldn't agree more.

Western Imperialism

by Tom Paulett

With fighting in the Iraq escalating, many in the international community have taken to criticizing President Bush for his actions (or lack of action if you have a different perspective). Ranging from Russians to Europeans, everyone has had a stake in the happenings of Middle Eastern nations. But any way that you look at the situation, Bush is the first to overextend his reach into the Middle East.

Starting with the fall of the Ottoman Empire, Western nations have been constantly involved in Middle Eastern affairs. In the past, entire peoples were jostled around as European nations wrestled control from local leaders. Then, when the European nations faced domestic hardships, they quickly pulled their release chords and left their colonies in devastating disarray.

From the ashes of these ravaged territories, military and religious leaders emerged and fought to dominate their respective regions. With this in mind, many Americans should realize that Bush is not the sole maligner of Middle Eastern nations: he is merely following century old traditions.

These traditions were initiated by European colonists, colonists who forced their will upon the Arab world. Bush has tripped on all the same pitfalls as his European predecessors. While Bush has clearly not done an even close to a perfect job in handling the situation in Iraq, he is by no means the sole cause of the problems in the Middle East.

The people who criticize Bush should take another look at the situation. Then, maybe they will realize that they are not angry about Bush's handling of Iraq, but instead angry at the entire Western philosophy on the Middle East.