

news is that not enough people of goodwill have been willing to stand up to reject anti-Semitism. It is especially disturbing that only 60 years after the Holocaust, Europe's leaders and citizenry are being diffident when confronted with anti-Semitism."

Steven Menashi :: [3/24/2003](#) ::

Japanese Aid: [Japan is giving \\$100 million](#) to Jordan to compensate for the kingdom's loss of cheap oil from Iraq and its loss of revenue from trade with that country. Also, according to the [Jordan Times](#), "An additional \$4.2 million will be designated for Palestinian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, as well as Syria to fund an UNRWA project providing flour to refugees." Yoriko Kawaguchi, the Japanese foreign minister, spoke with Marwan Al Muasher of Jordan and Nabil Sha'ath of the PA by [telephone yesterday](#).

Additionally, the United States is [rescheduling \\$117 million](#) of Jordanian debt. Still, Jordan is launching a "[fresh diplomatic offensive](#)" to stop the war in Iraq.

Steven Menashi :: [3/24/2003](#) ::

True Believers: All over the place, [riffraff are rising up](#) to halt the war against Saddam Hussein through a concerted campaign of annoying stunts. I just saw a bunch of uppity teenagers lying in the middle of K Street, wearing Army fatigues splattered with red paint, in order to disrupt traffic. They chanted "Bring the soldiers home" and "No blood for oil." A policeman parked his patrol car nearby and stood in the street to protect the kids from oncoming cars and buses. He held up traffic until additional police arrived (presumably to round up the children and call their parents), at which point the protesters fled. When a frustrated motorist honked at her, one young malcontent snipped, "This is what war is like."

This is not what war is like. As [Norah Vincent](#) writes, the demonstrators lie in the street precisely because they know no one will run them over. The protesters [don't care a whit](#) about actual Iraqis, who would like to live, as the protesters do, free of [tyranny](#). The "peace activists" are fighting for nothing other than to preserve Saddam Hussein's regime in Baghdad. (Fortunately, it's too late for that.) Hussein's regime is responsible for hundreds of thousands of deaths. Even putting aside the threat from its weapons of mass destruction, and counting only Saddam's murders of his own subjects, the war against him will save lives. Yet the protesters are so pathologically self-absorbed that they don't concern themselves much with saving Iraqis.

Listening to the speeches at the [rally](#) in Washington last weekend, I was struck by all the isolationist, America-first arguments coming from the left. The war will cost a lot of money, speaker after speaker noted -- money that could be spent on prescription drugs or farm subsidies or welfare or schools. Who cares about Iraqi lives? We need cheap Xanax and a new playground for the nursery school. It's strange to see the left adopt the cause of isolationism and champion *realpolitik* such as deterrence and MAD and accommodations with dictators. They're totally unprincipled -- and thoroughly contemptible. They've resolved to stop a war, and remain blind to [the costs should they prevail](#).

Activists have said they're willing to [risk their lives](#) to stop the war. Why do they refuse to believe that Iraqis would be willing to risk their lives to win their freedom? They've done it before, and we abandoned them. Not this time.

Iraqis are [surrendering in droves](#), even to less-than-fearsome journalists. It seems the only people willing to fight for Saddam Hussein are in San Francisco.

Steven Menashi :: [3/21/2003](#) ::

New Rules: "Since the beginnings of the state system in the 16th century, international politics has seen one clear pattern -- the formation of balances of power against the strong," writes [Fareed Zakaria](#). "Countries with immense military and economic might arouse fear and suspicion, and soon others coalesce against them." We're now in a world marked not by a cold war between two superpowers but by American unipolarity. In such an environment, it's not remarkable that the United States faces widespread resentment, but it is quite an achievement that some 30 countries would [go on record](#) supporting the American position. On the Fox News Channel, Fred Barnes described the "coalition of the willing" Bush has assembled as the third-largest such coalition in history. Whatever the specific rank, it's a significant diplomatic accomplishment. And Bush and Blair have the [American](#) and [British](#) publics behind them.

What looks like bumbling is the failure to win over the United Nations Security Council, yet as one letter-writer [writes](#) to the *Washington Post* today, "President Bush called upon the United Nations to show some backbone in the Iraqi situation. What he fails to recognize is that it has shown backbone -- by standing up to the United States." Global security has become a specifically American responsibility, a reality recently acknowledged by the global community in the demand that the United States should (unilaterally) resolve the North Korea crisis. When countries know they can rely on the United States to address serious threats to their security, their own foreign policies quite naturally focus on interests apart from security and stability, such as economic interests in Iraq and elsewhere. (Those Security Council members who now champion inspections in lieu of action against Iraq -- France, Russia, China -- are precisely those countries who worked assiduously to undermine the original inspections regime; this isn't principled opposition, it's obstructionism.) And the United Nations, as it is designed to do, follows the policy favored by a majority of its members. It's not that the United Nations failed to live up to its mission; it's mission just doesn't include facing threats like Iraq. That, it is becoming increasingly clear, is America's mission.

Dick Cheney has recently said that institutions "built to deal with the conflicts of the twentieth century...may not be the right strategies and policies and institutions to deal with the kind of threat we face now." When he was the French foreign minister, Hubert Vedrine explained that his country's foreign policy aims to offset American "hyperpower" by constraining it through multilateral institutions such as the UN. The United Nations now serves a purpose very different than that envisioned at its founding, and it is one at odds with current global realities.

What looks like diplomatic bumbling is the messiness that occurs at every turning point in international relations. As David Gelernter noted last week, "Both times in 1918 and 1945, France was quite prepared for Germany to hate her forever and menace her forever... And out of that attitude grew eventually the Franco-German friendship we all know and admire today." Cold war diplomacy and institutions are proving inefficient, and it looks to some like a diplomatic disaster. But the truth is we're leaving the cold war behind and entering a new, unipolar era. An initial period of bitterness and brow-beating is to be expected. But the "coalition of the willing" is a significant indicator that the Bush White House is successfully helping the world adjust to the [new rules and realities](#).