

NON-STANDARD ISSUE

VOLUME 2, ISSUE 3 | AN ALTERNATIVE NEWS AND INFORMATION SOURCE FOR CALGARIANS | MARCH 2004

Where Do We Go From Here?

By Collette Lemieux

A View from CANDIL

It has been one year since the US, UK and their allies invaded Iraq. Many reasons were given why the war was necessary: Iraq had weapons of mass destruction

(WMD); Iraq was trying to buy weapons grade uranium from Africa; Iraq aided Al-Qaeda to plan and execute the attacks on the World Trade Centre on September 11, 2001; Iraq's invasion would deal a lethal blow to terrorism and make the world a safer place.

What is the status of the evidence against Iraq now?

- A team of 1200 US weapons inspectors have not found any significant evidence of WMD. David Kay, the former head of the inspections team, has said that the intelligence regarding Iraq's WMD was wrong.
- The documents that linked Iraq to the purchase of uranium in Niger were forged and badly at that. One document was addressed to the President of Niger and also signed by him.
- Iraq's link to Al-Qaeda and September 11, 2001 has not been shown. In fact, President Bush has admitted that there is no relationship between the terrorist attacks and Iraq.
- The world is not a safer place. Bush and Blair's blatant disregard for human rights, international law and world opinion will only lead to more terrorists and terrorist attacks.

Regardless of whether the reasons were justified or not, the war happened and it is the people, not the leaders, who have suffered. Since the war officially ended, over 400 allied soldiers have died. We don't know how many Iraqis have died because the occupiers have not kept track but it is estimated that 10 000 died during the war. We do know the country is in ruins: that all of Iraq's ministries were bombed (except the oil ministry), Baghdad and other cities have been looted, and that there is a general lawlessness on the streets.

The situation is so bad that many Iraqis have stated that they would rather have Hussein back in power instead of the US occupational forces. After all of the suffering, we hoped that at least Iraq would be free. But Iraq is still not a democracy and Bush has said that the next government will be appointed by the provisional authority, which is a far cry from real democracy.

We were told lies to get us to go to war. We were told lies when they said that freedom and security would be brought to Iraq. We were told lies when they said that the world would be a safer place. And the lies haven't stopped.

This leaves us at a junction in world affairs. If we follow the path that Bush and Blair have set, then we will enter an era where the world superpowers can invade countries at their own discretion. But there is an alternative. We need to make it clear that no matter what, no country has the right to unilaterally invade another country. All countries must abide by international and human rights laws. Canada and other countries must give the International Court of Justice full authority to prosecute any nation that breaks international law and to enforce the sentences the court hands down.

One year after the invasion, it is imperative each of us decide which path we want for our world and how each of us will make this idea a reality. We at CANDIL believe that true democracy for all people of the world and the expectation that all nations abide by international law is the way to make our dream of a peaceful world come true.

Come join us and thousands of others around the world on March 20th, the one year anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, for a rally and a march (details in Upcoming Events) and begin to build the democratic world we all envision. ☺

This timeline is a summary of the one found at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Iraq/page/0,12438,793802,00.html>

Brief Timeline of the Hunt for WMD

Summary by CANDIL

We focused on the hunt for WMD but the Guardian's Outline is a very good summary of the violence that continues in Iraq everyday.

September 12 2002

President Bush addresses UN on the case for war against Iraq.

December 7 2002

Iraqi officials in Baghdad present the UN with a 12,000 page dossier disclosing Iraq's programmes for WMD, as demanded by UN resolution 1441. General Hasam Amin of Iraq's national monitoring directorate says the dossier shows 'that Iraq is empty of WMD'.

December 31 2002

A UN inspection team member in Iraq admits to finding "zilch" evidence of WMD and says that the teams have been provided with little guidance from western intelligence agencies.

IN THIS ISSUE

Where Do We Go From Here?	1
Brief Timeline of the Hunt for WMD	1
Blair's New Weapon of Mass Deception	2
War as an Excuse for Everything	4
What We Believe	2
Quotes	4

WEB LINKS

www.bushlies.net
www.bushwatch.com

UPCOMING EVENTS

CANDIL DOCUMENTARY AND SLIDE SHOW EVENT

In preparation for the one year anniversary of the invasion of Iraq, CANDIL will be showing documentaries and a slide show from Julie Hrdlicka and Noel Ainsley's recent trip to Iraq. For more information, please visit www.candil.ca

MARCH AND RALLY

Self-Determination for Iraqis. End the Occupation. This month is the one year anniversary of the invasion of Iraq. Join fellow Calgarians in protesting the events of the last year.

Saturday, March 20
Tentative information: March begins at 1 p.m. at Memorial Park. Rally to follow at Tompkins Park. Find out more information at www.candil.ca

NEXT ISSUE

A look at the current situation in Haiti .

Design by **Doug Ward**
Printed by **MinuteMan Press**
4A-1941 Uxbridge Drive N.W.

continued on page 2

[Page 1]

WHAT WE BELIEVE

CANDIL promotes global human security through a culture of peace, active democracy and respect for international law. Our vision is global; our strategy is local.

PRINCIPLES

Necessity of International Law for Global Peace and Security

International law is essential for global peace and security, including the peace and security of Canadians. As citizens of Canada, we are expected to obey the law; we expect the same standard of behavior from our government.

The government of Canada, and all Canadian political parties, must comply with the fundamental requirements, principles, and purposes of international law, and give international law decisive weight in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy.

Lessons from Iraq

Western policy toward Iraq has contributed to a humanitarian and human rights disaster in that country, and has violated international law, including the law of the UN Charter, international humanitarian law, and international human rights law. The errors and violations of our Iraq policy must be made explicit and used as lessons for constructive change in the direction of Canada's foreign policy, to avoid similarly destructive and costly errors in the future, both in Iraq and in other parts of the world.

Democracy and Responsible Citizenship

A critical, informed, active citizenry is a fundamental requirement of democracy. Citizens are ultimately responsible for the public policy of their government. Citizens of Canada are responsible for compliance of Canadian foreign policy with the law of the United Nations Charter, international humanitarian law, and international human rights law. Familiarity with the basic principles and purposes of international law is an indispensable part of education for responsible citizenship.

Brief Timeline - continued from page 1

February 5 2003

Colin Powell uses satellite photographs, tapes of intercepted conversations and newly opened CIA files to make the US case against Iraq in a determined attempt to win over international opinion.

February 24 2003

Russia, France and Germany put forward a counter-proposal to America and Britain's draft resolution: a step-by-step programme for Iraqi disarmament.

March 7 2003

Hans Blix gives another ambivalent report to the UN security council on Iraqi compliance.

March 20 2003

War begins. At around 0230 GMT, shortly after the 48-hour deadline for Saddam to leave Iraq expires, America launches its first series of air strikes on Baghdad. China, France and Russia denounce the US-led action.

May 15 2003

Foreign secretary, Jack Straw, concedes that hard evidence of WMD might never be found in Iraq. He says it is "not crucially important" to find them because the evidence of wrongdoing was overwhelming.

June 6 2003

Hans Blix hits out at the quality of intelligence given to him by the United States and Britain on Iraq's alleged chemical and biological weapons programmes. "Only in three of those cases did we find anything at all, and in none of these cases was there any WMD, and that shook me a bit, I must say," he says.

July 8 2003

Tony Blair tells a committee of MPs that his evidence for Iraq's attempts to secure uranium from Niger did not come from forged documents but "separate intelligence". White House spokesman Ari Fleischer says the report on the uranium "did not turn out to be accurate".

September 18 2003

The former UN chief weapons inspector, Hans Blix, says he believes Iraq destroyed most of its WMD 10 years ago.

October 2 2003

David Kay, the man in charge of a hunt for Saddam Hussein's WMD, admits that no weapon stocks had been found, and that all a three-month search, costing some \$300 M US, had uncovered was a single vial containing a possible strain of biological agent.

January 28 2004

Mr. Kay tells a senate committee "we were almost all wrong" in believing before the war that Saddam Hussein had chemical or biological arms.

January 30 2004

Condoleezza Rice admits that the intelligence that said Iraq had WMDs may have been wrong.

February 1 2004

The White House announces an inquiry into the use of intelligence before the war. The findings will be released in March 2005, after the US elections.

February 3 2004

Tony Blair bows to intense pressure to agree to set up an inquiry to establish why Iraq appears to be devoid of WMD. ☞

Blair's New Weapon of Mass Deception

By John Pilger

February 5, 2004 Znet

In the wake of the Hutton fiasco, one truth remains unassailed: Tony Blair ordered an unprovoked invasion of another country on a totally false

pretext, and that lies and deceptions manufactured in London and Washington caused the deaths of up to 55,000 Iraqis, including 9,600 civilians.

Consider for a moment those who have paid the price for Blair's and Bush's actions, who are rarely mentioned in the current media coverage. Deaths and injury of young children from unexploded British and American cluster bombs are put at 1,000 a month. The effect of uranium weapons used by Anglo-American forces - a weapon of mass destruction - is such that readings taken from Iraqi tanks destroyed by the British are so high that a British Army survey team wore white, full-body radiation suits, face masks and gloves. Iraqi children play on and around these tanks. British troops, says the Ministry of Defence, "will have access to biological monitoring". Iraqis have no such access and no expert medical help; and thousands are now suffering from a related catalogue of miscarriages and hair loss, horrific eye, skin and respiratory problems.

Neither Britain nor America counts its Iraqi victims, and the fact, let alone the extent of the human carnage and material devastation is not even acknowledged by a government that says it is "vindicated" by Lord Hutton, whose report most British people clearly regard as a parody worthy of the Prime Minister's resignation.

Blair has now announced an inquiry into the "failure of intelligence" that has mysteriously denied him evidence of weapons of mass destruction, which he repeatedly said were his "aim" in attacking Iraq. Just as the brawl with the BBC and the Hutton inquiry were quite deliberate distractions, so this latest inquiry is another panic measure. It is clear that George W. Bush, as one American journalist put it, "is now hanging Tony Blair out to dry". Blair has, as ever, followed Bush. In announcing at the weekend his own inquiry into an "intelligence failure", Bush hopes to cast himself as an innocent, aggrieved member of the public wanting to know why America's numerous spy agencies did not alert the nation to the fact, now confirmed by Bush's own weapons inspector, David Kay, that there were no weapons of mass destruction and probably weren't any since before the 1991 Gulf War, and that the

continued on page 3

Blair's New Weapon – continued from page 1

premise for going to war was "almost all wrong". "It was", Ray McGovern told me, "95 per cent charade". McGovern is a former high-ranking CIA analyst and one of a group of ex-senior intelligence officers, several of whom have described how the Bush administration demanded that intelligence be shaped to comply with political objectives, and the role of Britain in the charade.

"It was intelligence that was crap," a former intelligence officer told the New Yorker, "...but the brits wanted to plant stories in England and around the world". He described how "inactionable" (unreliable) intelligence reports were passed on to British intelligence, which then fed them to newspapers.

Former chief UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter says this false information was spread systematically by British intelligence. The clue to this secret operation was given by the weapons expert David Kelly the day before his suicide and which Hutton later ignored. Kelly told the Prime Minister's intelligence and security committee: "I liaise with the Rockingham cell." As Ritter reveals, this referred to the top secret "Operation Rockingham" set up within British intelligence to "cherry pick" information that might be distorted as "proof" of the existence of a weapons arsenal in Iraq. It was an entirely political operation, whose misinformation, says Ritter, led him and his inspectors "to a suspected ballistic missile site. We...found nothing. However, our act of searching allowed the US and the UK to say that the missiles existed."

Ritter says Operation Rockingham's bogus intelligence would have been fed to the Joint Intelligence Committee. The committee was behind the two "dossiers" in which Blair government claimed Saddam Hussein was a threat. Ritter says that Rockingham officers were acting on political orders "from the very highest levels".

How high? Right up to Blair himself? It was Blair, after all, who made such a personal "mission" of finding weapons of mass destruction. The question of how high needs urgently to be answered. Will Scott Ritter be called to Blair's inquiry? And will Blair explain to the inquiry why the February 2003 British "arms dossier", which Hutton chose to ignore, was so bogus that it plagiarised an American student's theses, lifting it word for word including the spelling mistakes?

The truth is that the Blair government has known, almost from the day it came to office in 1997, that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction were almost certainly destroyed following the 1991 Gulf War - just as Bush's weapons expert, David Kay, has now confirmed. What else did Blair know?

In February last year, a transcript of a leaked United Nations debriefing of Iraqi general Hussein Kamel, revealed that both the US and British governments must have known that Saddam Hussein no longer had weapons of mass destruction. General Kamel was no ordinary defector; he was Bush and Blair's star witness

in their governments' case against Saddam. A son-in-law of the dictator, he had overall authority for Iraq's weapons' programmes, and defected with crates of documents. When Secretary of State Colin Powell made the Anglo-American case for an attack on Iraq before the UN Security Council, he relied on and paid tribute to the reliability of General Kamel's evidence. What he did not reveal, as the transcript of the general's debriefing reveals, was this categorical statement by Kamel: "I ordered destruction of all chemical weapons. All weapons - biological, chemical, missile, nuclear - were destroyed."

The CIA and Britain's MI6 of course knew about this; and it beggars belief that Bush and Blair were not told. But neither of them let on - just as Colin Powell suppressed his informant's most sensational information, which would have contradicted all his spurious claims. General Kamel (who was later murdered by Saddam Hussein) corroborated Scott Ritter's statement that Iraq had been disarmed "90 to 95 per cent".

Iraq was attacked so that the United States and Britain could claim its oil and its assets. Only Mary Poppins would believe otherwise. For the latest in a catalogue of evidence, turn to the Wall Street journal, the paper of America's ruling elite, which has obtained copies of the Bush administration's secret plan to privatise the country by selling off its assets to western corporations while establishing vast military bases. The plan was drafted in February last year, just as Tony Blair was assuring the British people that the only reason was Saddam Hussein's "threat". The Bush/Blair attack on Iraq has brought death, destruction and great bitterness to Iraq. Every indication is that most Iraqis now regard their lives as immeasurably worse than during Saddam Hussein's rule. More than 13,000 people are held in concentration camps in their own country. This is many more than were incarcerated in Saddam's political prisons in recent years. None has been charged; most cannot see their families; the allegations of torture and brutality by the occupiers grow by the day. As the US-based Human Rights Watch reported last week, the worst atrocities were in the 1980s - when he was backed by America and Britain.

The uprising in Iraq has accelerated and almost certainly strengthened since the capture of Saddam. Drawn from 12 different groups, including those that were always anti-Saddam, the resistance is well organised and will not stop until the "coalition" leaves. The setting up of a puppet "democracy" will merely increase the number of targets. As Blair's knowledge of imperial history will tell him, this is precisely what happened in Britain's other colonies before they threw out their occupiers, and in Vietnam.

One piece of intelligence which was true and which we know Blair received is a report that warned him that an attack on Iraq would only increase worldwide terrorism, especially against British interests and citizens. He chose to ignore it. ☹

CANDIL

Canada,
Democracy, and
International Law

2919-8th Ave. N.W.,
Calgary, Alberta
Canada T2N 1C8

☎ (403) 270-9669
FAX: (403) 270-7373
✉ info@candil.ca
🌐 www.candil.ca

To keep this alternative news source alive, we need donations from people like you. If you are interested in giving please contact us.

STANDARD ISSUE is a military term meaning officially supplied and sanctioned material. **NON-STANDARD ISSUE** is the term used to describe the opposite, material that is contraband. We hope this newsletter will give alternative views, broaden the minds of citizens, and encourage them to voice their opinions about democracy, peace, international law and responsible citizenship.

What you can do to become a more responsible citizen.

1. **Educate yourself.** Check out alternative news websites and join CANDIL or a similar group.
2. **Contact your MP or MLA** on issues that you feel they should be addressing.
3. **Make your voice heard!** Send your letters, commentaries, etc. to editors.

"An immoral war was thus waged and the world is a great deal less safe place than before. There are many more who resent the powerful who can throw their weight about so callously and with so much impunity."

– Archbishop Desmond Tutu.

"The evidence indicates that Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program. Saddam Hussein has held numerous meetings with Iraqi nuclear scientists, a group he calls his 'nuclear mujahideen' – his nuclear holy warriors. Satellite photographs reveal that Iraq is rebuilding facilities at sites that have been part of its nuclear program in the past."

– **Bush**, October 7, 2002

"I don't believe anyone that I know in the administration ever said that Iraq had nuclear weapons."

– **Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld**, at a hearing of the Senate's appropriations subcommittee on defence, May 14, 2003

"Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction."

– **Dick Cheney**, August 26, 2002

"Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised."

– **Bush**, March 17, 2003

"We based our decisions on good, sound intelligence, and the – our people are going to find out the truth. And the truth will say that this intelligence was good intelligence. There's no doubt in my mind."

– **Bush**, July 17, 2003

"We don't do body counts"

– **General Tommy Franks**, US Central Command

War as an Excuse for Everything

By Robert Scheer

Creators Syndicate
February 10, 2004

utter ruin. Sunday on "Meet the Press," he could say nothing without also referring to military battles he is apparently fit to fight – presumably based on his stealthy stint in the National Guard.

I am a "war president... with war on my mind," he insisted to Tim Russert, dodging the newsman's every question, as if his trainers had assured him that the phrase was a talisman that would ward off all charges of ineptitude and bad-faith leadership. Yet it was hardly clear from his filibustering responses exactly what war it was that Bush thought he was fighting.

Surely he wasn't coming clean on his war against the 90% of Americans who will pay the price in starved government services and, ultimately, higher tax burdens as they pay off Bush's outrageous tax cuts for the super-rich and the corollary soaring budget deficits.

"It's important for people who watch the expenditure side of the equation to understand that we are at war," Bush responded when Russert questioned him about the deficit. That was presumably a reference to the war on terror, the president's handy explanation for every untoward event. But how can he justify spending much of the \$400 billion military budget on things like Cold War-era high-tech aircraft and other defence boondoggles to counter the \$1.89 box cutters used by the 9/11 terrorists?

And if the war is against Al Qaeda, why haven't we moved decisively against that shadowy movement's sponsors in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia? Although Osama bin Laden, 15 of the hijackers and most of the money for the religious schools that fed recruits to Al Qaeda and the Taliban came from Saudi Arabia, the president again insisted perversely on linking Iraq with the attack on this nation – despite having previously admitted that there is no evidence of such a connection.

Is it just me, or is President Bush's demeanour a bit Napoleonic these days? The enemies of the republic are everywhere, the president says over and over, and only he stands between them and our

There is, however, much evidence that Pakistan helped arm and train the Taliban. Yet Bush inexplicably rewarded Pakistan after Sept. 11, 2001, by lifting the sanctions that were in place to punish Pakistan for its nuclear program and sales. Only last week, Pakistan's dictator admitted that his nation was responsible for nurturing the nuclear threat posed by North Korea, Iran and Libya – conveniently blaming the country's leading scientist, whom he then quickly pardoned.

Furthermore, in apparent deference to Pakistan's admitted role in supplying North Korea with the wherewithal for nuclear weapons, Bush has suddenly warmed to that member of his "axis of evil." Whereas the president had referred to Saddam Hussein as a "madman" and a theoretical nuclear threat who could be dealt with only through pre-emptive invasion, Bush says North Korean dictator Kim Jong Il and his actual nuclear threat haven't earned a military response because "the diplomacy is only beginning."

So, if we are not at war with North Korea, Libya or Iran now that we know they got their WMD know-how from

our friends in Pakistan, then whom are we at war with? Certainly not Iraq, which the president pronounced as vanquished some nine months ago from the deck of the aircraft carrier Abraham Lincoln. Sadly, as the transcript of the Russert interview with our 43rd president shows, it is not entirely clear that even he knows for sure what is what anymore.

"I made a decision to go to the United Nations. By the way, quoting a lot of their data – in other words – this is unaccounted-for stockpiles that you thought he had because I don't think America can stand by and hope for the best from a madman," Bush said. Evidently the president has forgotten

that the U.N. Security Council turned down his request to go to war because U.N. inspectors were crawling all over Iraq and were finding nothing. Now that top weapons inspectors Hans Blix and Mohamed ElBaradei – who both told the world before the invasion that Saddam Hussein was a defanged viper – have been vindicated by Bush's hand-picked arms inspectors, it is embarrassing to witness the president prattling on in defence of the indefensible. Perhaps it would be less painful for all of us if the CIA could plant some WMD, of which the U.S. possesses a glorious excess, in Iraq as a kindly, face-saving afterthought for the baffled leader of the free world. ☺

"Naturally the common people don't want war; neither in Russia, nor in England, nor in America, nor in Germany. That is understood. But after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is to tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."
– **Hermann Goering, Commander-in-Chief of the Luftwaffe and Hitler's designated successor.**