

NON-STANDARD ISSUE

VOLUME 1, ISSUE 4

AN ALTERNATIVE NEWS AND INFORMATION SOURCE FOR CALGARIANS

NOVEMBER 2003

CANADA'S POSITIONS ON THE 1991 GULF WAR AND sanctions have been largely supportive of the US/UN position. The twelve years of profoundly destructive sanctions contributed to unprecedented loss of life, embittered the Iraqi people toward the west and destroyed many residual elements of Iraqi civil society. Deliberate

destruction of Iraqi infrastructure, economic collapse, and widespread malnutrition, notwithstanding the Oil for Food Program, added substantially to the population's suffering and to the 1.5 million deaths, one-half being children. For many Iraqis this was simply

Iraq – It's Not Enough to be Against War!

A view from CANDIL

by David Swann MD

another word for war. In this context, invasion by the US in 2003 could only aggravate this appalling humanitarian disaster, risk civil strife and inflame anti-western sentiment across the Arab world, which appears to be occurring.

This conflict has challenged all conscious citizens in relation to:

- 1) Canadian unwillingness to contradict US policy and interests and our unhealthy dependence on US trade
- 2) our collective dependence on non-renewable fossil fuels for energy and defense
- 3) the fragility of the global environment reflected in declining resources, pollution and climate change
- 4) the widening gap between rich and poor, related to the unfair trade practices, increasing control of corporations over national policy, maldistribution of earth's resources and the immoral investment in weapons worldwide, which helps maintain this systemic violence against people and the planet.

It is troubling that the loss of life since the invasion is not known precisely. Credible sources are quoted in a recent Medact UK (Oct./03) report to indicate the following range of casualties: 372 Coalition combatants (official), 13,500 - 45,000 Iraqi combatants (unofficial) and 7300 - 9100 Iraqi civilians (unofficial) died between March 20 and October 8, 2003 - a total of between 21,172 and 54,472 deaths.

What can/should we do in Calgary? We are at a critical 'tipping point' on the planet, when citizens and democratic

governments might, with the new awareness, commitment, vision and modern communications, move decisively in the direction of peace and human security. This means active policies for global equity, meeting basic human needs, and addressing issues of fair trade, arms control, and respect for international law. Canada can be a constructive leader in this.

There are a number of key actions we can/should take, including communicate to our MP's the following

- 1) support the UN mandate to assist Iraq in establishing security, in reconstruction and to oversee the election of a representative governing authority fully accountable to the people of Iraq, within the shortest possible time-frame.
- 2) call upon the U.S. government to meet its obligations under the Geneva Convention in relation to its duties to the Iraqi people, to prisoners of war, and to fully finance reconstruction of Iraq.
- 3) support efforts within the UN General Assembly and beyond for reform of the structure and processes in the UN to achieve a more democratic institution.

4) provide information to the public as to the agencies through which Canadian reconstruction and aid funds to Iraq have been channeled since March 2003. (adapted from the Physicians for Global Survival position):

5) work locally with CANDIL to encourage thoughtful dialogue and action on issues strengthening our democracy, renewing community spirit, especially among Arabic and Muslim people and offer direct citizen support to people in Iraq.

The international resistance to the invasion of Iraq in 2003 heralded new hope in an unprecedented solidarity of

people around the world against war. It inspired millions in the realization that all people in democracies have a right and responsibility to participate in national and international decisions that threaten international law, democracy and peace. This citizens' movement caused many democratic governments around the world to withhold support for this reckless and illegal US action against Iraq. These same caring people must take the next steps to build the conditions for peace as if our children's lives depended on it: they do!

Get involved and help to address the roots of genuine human security, peace and health. ♪

IN THIS ISSUE

- Iraq - It's Not Enough to be Against War! 1
- Making the United Nations Function 2
- Security Council Backs US on Iraq 3
- A Doubly Damaged UN Needs to Change 3
- Pakistan and Saudis Await Iraq Invite 4
- What We Believe 2
- Activist Profile 3

WEB LINKS

- www.un.org
- www.globalpolicy.org
- www.commondreams.org
- www.candil.org
- www.activist.ca

UPCOMING EVENTS

SUNDAY NOV. 29/03
Project Ploughshares 19th Annual Holiday Peace Fair
Crafts and Gifts to Support Social Justice and Fair Trade Groups
9:00am-3:00pm
Holy Spirit Catholic Church
10827 24 Street SW
(between Southland and Anderson)

A wide variety of items for sale from over 20 non-profit groups, including CANDIL (Canada, Democracy and International Law), Tibetan Women's Association, Youth Mine Ambassador Program and many more!

Admission: \$2 adults, children under 12 free. Concession available, lots of free parking

For more information: Project Ploughshares office 270-9669
office@ploughsharescalgary.ca

Newsletter designed by Doug Ward Design

Printed by MinuteMan Press
4A-1941 Uxbridge Drive N.W.

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.

SERGIO VIEIRA DE MELLO, A NATIVE OF RIO DE JANEIRO, Brazil, was the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights and the top U.N. envoy in Iraq. He and 22 others died on August 19, when a bomb exploded outside the United Nations headquarters in Baghdad. He published this commentary in *O Estado de São Paulo* on June 1, the day before he flew to Iraq. The newspaper published the piece again on August 20, 2003.

Making the United Nations Function

by Sergio Vieira de Mello, U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights

O Estado de São Paulo (conservative), São Paulo, Brazil, Aug. 20, 2003

force. If we want a world system based on something other than the rule of force, then member states will have to turn to the institution they created to avoid such world in the first place: the United Nations. This institution is confronting a serious crisis. We must find ways to resolve it. If not, we will face grave consequences.

The debates about Iraq, before and after the war, showed that the major world powers have been incapable of communicating with each other in a common language. This disunity is particularly acute in the U.N. Security Council and the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The council found it difficult to reach a consensus about the United Nations' proper role in Iraq. In the same way, the Commission on Human Rights' last annual session, which ended in late April, demonstrated its incapacity to discuss human rights whenever serious security issues were involved.

Is there a way to renew or rediscover a common language that will allow us to overcome the current impasse? I believe so, as soon as we radically change the relationship between security and human rights.

Debates in the Security Council need to go beyond the narrow view that sees questions of security as limited to the longstanding discussion about weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Members may have been unable—or unwilling—to perceive that their mandate is broader and must include other issues of obvious interest to the council members, such as the absence of democracy in Iraq, or the frequent terror campaigns launched by the former government against its political enemies, real or imagined.

The central question is how to deal with the international security risks inherent in a country that was run by a regime that notoriously violated the human rights of its citizens and attacked its neighbors. At the end of the day, the principal participants in the Iraq debate gave the impression that they were talking about one thing, but had something entirely different in mind. Perhaps Security Council members thought that it was more logical to leave human-rights issues to the Commission on Human Rights.

In the last session of the commission, though, many of the 53 states said they thought Iraq was the Security Council's responsibility, that the council was already working to correct the problem, and that the matter wasn't within the commission's jurisdiction. It didn't matter which argument was used: A majority

of the member states, in Geneva as well as New York, wished to avoid initiating any discussion about human rights in Iraq.

In the weeks before the war, I spoke with many of the principal actors involved in the debates at the Security Council. All of them demonstrated an interest in reaching a consensus on Iraq. Meanwhile, they lacked the political judgment and competence to realize it. The impasse at the Commission on Human Rights was similar, maybe even worse than it was at the Security Council.

What is missing in both bodies is the recognition that flagrant and systematic violations of human rights are frequently the principal cause of global insecurity. They are at the heart of insecurity, both domestically and internationally. The problem isn't new. One has only to recall the United Nations' incapacity to stop the genocide in Rwanda and the massacres in Srebrenica (Bosnia).

What do these failures have in common? Both are examples of emergency situations, followed by horrific bloodshed. Neither crisis fit into the Security Council or the Commission on Human

Rights' concept of what it was meant to do. Neither crisis was seen as posing a threat to international security.

A sign of the political failure of our time, such episodes show the lack of understanding that flagrant and systematic violations of human rights represent a grave threat to international security and that there

is a crying need to reach consensus about exactly how to respond to this type of risk. Reflecting upon the tragic consequences that 24 years of tyranny and international negligence have bequeathed to Iraq, we see that the price of our chronic political failure has been, and will continue to be, high.

We must turn to the member states of the United Nations, especially to those with permanent seats on the Security Council—China, the United States, France, the United Kingdom, and Russia—and suggest that they take a long, hard look at their own failures in this regard and try to overcome them, and that they do so bearing their responsibilities to the Security Council and to the United Nations more in mind than their own rivalries.

To criticize the United Nations for not having managed to reach a consensus about Iraq is missing the real extent of the problem. When the member states ignore the rules of the game, or dismantle the collective political architecture of the Security Council, it is unjust to blame the United Nations or its secretary-general, whose good offices were not solicited as they should have been. Kofi Annan had tirelessly sought a consensus on these vital questions, but he could not impose it, just as I could not impose it on the Commission on Human Rights, where power is, correctly, in the hands of its member states.

The members of the United Nations have an unparalleled opportunity. Their recent actions revealed once again the deficiencies of the institution they created, while at the same time pointing out some of their important qualities. This crisis, which has affected the entire world, has revealed the uselessness

Sergio Vieira de Mello died August 19, 2003 in the bombing of United Nations headquarters in Iraq

of our traditional definitions of security and has shown them to be barely adequate for today's reality. The Iraqi people, who have suffered much, are the ones who bear the consequences of the war and, right now, the consequences of a contested and controversial peace.

It seems evident that the time has come for all states to redefine global security, placing human rights at the center of this debate. To do this, each nation must exercise its responsibilities in proportion to its means. Only the responsible—and not the merely powerful—will be able to offer our world lasting stability. ☺

the text were not put to the vote when it became clear they would not attract the necessary support.

A concession announced earlier this week, setting a deadline for Iraq's US-appointed governing council to draw up a timetable to a new constitution and elections, allowed France, Russia and Germany to support the resolution. But the US still had to postpone the vote - originally scheduled for yesterday - to allow the three to discuss the final draft and decide whether to support it.

The German chancellor, Gerhard Schroeder, told reporters at an EU summit in Brussels that the leaders had agreed their line believing the resolution to be an "important step in the right direction".

But their backing does not in itself guarantee that the US will receive the financial and military support it is seeking.

France had demanded that the resolution set a date for the handover of sovereignty to the Iraqi people but instead agreed to a date for that process to begin.

Speaking before the vote, Mr. Chirac's spokeswoman, Catherine Colonna, said France, like Russia and Germany, was "very far from being able to commit financially or militarily" to the reconstruction of Iraq and other countries may share that view.

If they do, the US has a lot more difficult diplomacy ahead of it.

"Really the goal is to try to get something more than a piece of paper, to try to get money and troops. We hope the resolution combined with the upcoming donor conference will help," a US official, speaking on condition of anonymity, told the Associated Press.

In an unexpected move, Syria, the only Arab nation on the council and an opponent of the US-led war, backed the resolution rather than opposing it or abstaining.

The foreign secretary, Jack Straw, said in a press conference after the vote that the resolution was an important step to a "free Iraq run by the Iraqi people". ☺

Security Council Backs US on Iraq

by Simon Jeffery and Agencies

The Guardian, October 16, 2003

The UN security council today gave its unanimous approval to a US-drafted resolution authorising its occupation of Iraq.

Its adoption means that countries who had been reluctant to aid the US in Iraq may now be more inclined to give troops and money to

improve stability and speed up the reconstruction effort in the country.

Domestic political pressures in countries such as India and Pakistan would have made it difficult to send troops to Iraq without some form of UN blessing. Washington also needed to obtain UN legitimacy ahead of an international conference in Madrid next week to secure donations for reconstruction.

Both are important to the US president, George Bush, who is facing increasing criticism at home over the cost of the occupation in terms of men and money.

The resolution was however contentious and earlier versions of



A Doubly Damaged UN Needs to Change

by Ramesh Thakur

The International Herald Tribune September 26, 2003

TOKYO -- As we learn yet again in Iraq, it is easier to wage war without UN blessing than it is to win the peace - but victory in war is pointless without a resulting secure peace. If the United States is the world's indispensable power, the United Nations is the indispensable font of international authority:

only it can build, consolidate and use military force in our collective name.

The urgent task therefore is not to evade or circumvent the United Nations, but to make it work better, to hold it accountable for its global responsibility to protect people against the likes of Saddam Hussein in the future and, in many cases still, even today.

Washington surely had a point in its bitter complaints about the

ACTIVIST PROFILE

The activist this month is Dennis Halliday, former United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq

For those of you familiar with CANESI's work to end the sanctions on Iraq, you'll remember a quote we frequently used: "We are in the process of destroying an entire society. It is a simple and terrifying as that. It is illegal and immoral." The man who said this is Dennis Halliday. He was the United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq and headed the 'Oil for Food' program. In 1998, he resigned from the UN in protest against the humanitarian crisis created by the UN sanctions on Iraq and gave up his career with the UN because he believed strongly that the sanctions on Iraq were causing genocide. He had worked for the UN for 34 years.

Since he resigned, Mr. Halliday has been a very vocal in his condemnation of the UN's policy on Iraq. He educates citizens on the conditions in Iraq due to the sanctions. He believes that if the average citizen understood that Iraq is not populated with 22 million Saddam Hussein's but instead by 22 million families like yours and mine, then they would not support sanctions and bombings that resulted in the death of approximately 4000 children per month before the latest war. Due to this belief, Mr. Halliday has toured around the world enlightening people about Iraq, has spoken to the UN in New York, and has participated in the making of the film, "The Hidden Wars of Desert Storm."


Mr. Halliday has inspired many in his willingness to contradict conventional 'wisdom' for the truth even at the cost of his career.

If you are interested in learning more about Mr. Halliday's work, please go to <http://www.nonviolence.org/vitw/pages/newPages/SBhalliday.html> which contains a selection of his interviews.

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

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.

"The value of a man resides in what he gives and not in what he is capable of receiving"
— Albert Einstein

Doubly Damaged UN Needs to Change
continued from page 3

inadequacies of the existing UN machinery and modalities for confronting and eliminating today's real threats. But Bush was wrong in suggesting a year ago that in Iraq, the choice for the United Nations lay between relevance and irrelevance. Rather, it was among irrelevance, centrality and complicity.

And so today the United Nations stands doubly damaged: in the countries that went to war for not having authorized it; in many more countries for not having stopped it. The more aggressive recent statements from Secretary General Kofi Annan ("Outlook for UN," IHT, Sep. 20-21) mark an acknowledgment that the real threat of irrelevance to the world body lies in failure to realign the organization to the new realities.

It is worth revisiting the passions swirling around the Iraq war with this in mind. For Washington, the issues could hardly have been more serious. Could one of the world's most brutal regimes have been permitted to remain in power until it succeeded in acquiring the world's most dangerous weapons? The concurrent crisis with North Korea proved the wisdom of dealing with Saddam Hussein before he got his hands on nuclear or other equally powerful weapons - for it would have been impossible to defang him after he had usable weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems. The failure to find such weapons in 2003 does not change the historical record of his known past pursuit and use of them.

America's threat of war, unilaterally if necessary, galvanized the United Nations into putting teeth into the inspection machinery and produced unprecedented cooperation from Iraq. But cooperation from Baghdad would not have lasted long. As outside

pressure slackened in time, Saddam would have returned to his familiar game of cheat and retreat. His continuation after the full U.S. military mobilization would have dented U.S. global credibility. With that the UN, with no independent military capability, would have lost its most potent enforcement agent (the United States)

It is easier to wage war without UN blessing than it is to win the peace – but victory in war is pointless without a resulting secure peace

even as other would-be tyrants were emboldened.

The second point of view acknowledged the need to confront Saddam, But ruled out acting without UN authorization. The Security Council lies At the center of the international law enforcement system. Bypassing it undermined it and put at risk the very foundations for a secure and Just world order. The UN is our only hope for unity in diversity in a World where global problems require multilateral solutions. Poll after poll in almost all countries showed that the people of the world have an intuitive grasp of this fundamental fact, better in some cases than their more sophisticated governments. The desire for overhauling the UN system comes from the people, the obstructions are thrown up mainly by governments.

The third argument accepted UN authorization as necessary, but not sufficient, and preferred irrelevance to complicity There is grave disquiet, probably without cause, that the UN is being subverted to The U.S. appetite and agenda for serial war. It risks becoming "a Stalking horse for the imperial ambitions of the United States" (IHT, Sep. 20- 21). The Bush administration was seen as determined to wage war not because it had to, but because it wanted to and could. Saddam was on its agenda when it came into office: "Sept. 11 provided the excuse, not the reason. There was a widely held sentiment that if the UN was bribed and bullied into submission and sanctioned war, instead of UN legitimacy being stamped on military action against Iraq, the legitimacy of the UN itself, as the guardian of the rule of law and the protector of the weak, would have been eroded.

Many years ago, during the Cold War, Alexander Solzhenitsyn commented that at the UN, the people of the world are served up to the designs of governments. The time has come to reverse such cynicism through bold surgical reforms of the structure and processes of the Security Council, General Assembly, Economic and Social Council, and the World Court - and of the relations among them. The challenge is to avoid the extremes of irrelevance and subservience and stay focused on making and keeping it central to the great issues of the day as well as being a humanitarian service delivery agency.

The writer is senior vice rector of the UN University in Tokyo and assistant secretary-general of the UN. This is a personal comment.

Copyright © 2002 The International Herald Tribune ☞

Pakistan and Saudis Await Iraqi Invite

From Associated Press
October 20, 2003

ISLAMABAD, PAKISTAN – Facing opposition from Muslim conservatives, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan said Sunday that they would be reluctant to send troops to Iraq without a clear invitation from the Iraqi people.

The United States wants

to broaden the occupation forces in Iraq, especially with soldiers from Muslim nations. Washington has turned to Pakistan in particular with a request for at least 10,000 troops.

"If the people of Iraq ask for help, Pakistan as a brotherly country will do what it can. But we will wait for that to happen," Pakistan's foreign minister, Mian Khursheed Mehmood Kasuri, said at a news conference with his Saudi counterpart.

The Saudi foreign minister, Prince Saud al Faisal, said it was premature to talk about sending troops to Iraq until it is clear that Iraqis want them.

"The express opinion of the Iraqi people has not been shown to us, and until that time we will not send any troops," Saud said.

The comments came four days after the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution urging all U.N. member states to contribute money and troops for Iraq's reconstruction. Pakistan currently holds one of the rotating seats on the 15-nation council. ☞