
Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"

Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 12:53:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On March 20, the United States began its military campaign against Iraq. The self-stated goal of this action is to remove the current Iraqi government and replace it with a U.S.-friendly regime. Washington has also expressed its desire to occupy Iraq until the Middle Eastern state is stable enough for self-government.

There are a variety of other objectives involved in this military action. Washington would like to remove a regime that in the past has expressed its desire to become a regional power. If Iraq were to become a regional power, it would weaken U.S. control in the region, as Iraq would have an increased ability to take actions opposed to U.S. interests. The Gulf War in 1991 was a conflict meant to neuter the growing power of the Iraqi state.

In removing the Saddam Hussein government, the U.S. will be projecting its power further into the Middle East. Following the ouster of Saddam, Washington will find it necessary to construct military bases in Iraq in order to handle U.S. military activity in the post-war phase. This will follow the model successfully implemented in Afghanistan. With Iraq as a new military launching point, the U.S. will find itself in an incredibly strategic location. Bordering six critical states, Iraq is located at the heart of the Middle East.

Once military bases are active in Iraq, Washington will be able to reshape the Middle East, a term that has been used by administration officials for the last decade. U.S. government officials have expressed their concern with the country of Syria, which is located on Iraq's western border. Damascus has been in a constant state of conflict with Israel, an important U.S. ally in the region and a country with which some officials in the administration strongly identify. Both Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Defense Policy Board chairman Richard Perle have been involved in the formation of Israeli foreign policy. Syria has also been accused by the Bush administration of taking actions counter to U.S. interests. By having an amassed military on Syria's eastern border, Washington would be able to increase its leverage in dealing with a recalcitrant Damascus.

In addition to Syria, Washington would be able to apply pressure more easily on Iraq's eastern neighbor, Iran. The Bush administration has labeled Iran as part of an "axis of evil," and expressed concern over Iran's weapons program. In the same way the U.S. will be able to increase their influence over Syria, Washington will also attempt to apply pressure on Iran by establishing military bases within striking distance of Tehran. Moreover, Washington will greatly improve its military logistics by being able to take military action from Iraqi bases, rather than having to negotiate airbase rights with other states in the region.

This projection of power into the Middle East is the primary reason for invading Iraq. But in addition to increasing its influence in the region, Washington will also be securing its control over the Middle Eastern oil supply. By establishing a strong military presence, Washington will attempt to increase the stability of the oil supply in the global market. The Bush administration believes that U.S. influence in the region will reduce the chances of an oil shortage that would greatly damage the U.S. and other oil dependent economies.

Moreover, the oil lobby in the United States has sway with this administration. Many administration officials have prior experience and service in the oil industry, such as National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, Vice President Dick Cheney and President Bush himself. Therefore, an invasion of Iraq would inevitably lead to contracts for the American energy industry. Iraq's energy industry is currently in a state of disrepair; U.S. companies will be needed to rehabilitate the industry along with possibly increasing national energy output. American companies have already been bidding on contracts and soon the Bush administration will decide which companies to award with lucrative deals.

The Bush administration has also set a new precedent for U.S. foreign policy. By attacking Iraq without U.N. approval, and devoid of support from traditional allies, the Bush administration has established a new international order where the U.S. will take military action despite opposition from international institutions and multilateral arrangements.

These concerns all play an important role in the Bush administration's desire to invade Iraq and replace the Saddam Hussein regime with a new government more beholden to U.S. interests.

Erich Marquardt drafted this report.

SOURCE: <http://www.yellowtimes.org/article.php?sid=1179>

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 13:14:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The excuse from the Pentagon (appropriately shaped -- upside-down) was that the citizens of Iraq should have overthrown their dictator all on their own. Of course, that's easier said than done. Good luck trying to overthrow the US government. Clinton was impeached, yet he continued to stay in office until the end of his last term.

Due to their lack of ability to overthrow their government (assuming they wanted to in the first place) that is why they must pay.

I find it interesting that the same govt. (US) that urges (Iraqi) citizens to overthrow their government is the same one that jails its citizens because they object to what's going on.

I find it hard to reconcile claims that Saddam is a dictator with the reality that Iraqi people have far more gun freedoms under Saddam than US citizens do in this country.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 13:35:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Third veteran US diplomat quits over Iraq war.

Another veteran US diplomat has resigned from the State Department in protest over President George W. Bush's policy toward Iraq, becoming the third and the highest-ranking career foreign service officer to do so since last month, officials said Thursday.

more info link: http://www.prolog.net/webnews/wed/aa/Qiraq-war-us-diplomat.R6d2_DMK.html

Subject: Re: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [sg]theOne on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 14:24:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is some top-noth propaganda you got your mits on this time !
havocsnipe

There are a variety of other objectives involved in this military action. Washington would like to remove a regime that in the past has expressed its desire to become a regional power. If Iraq were to become a regional power, it would weaken U.S. control in the region, as Iraq would have an increased ability to take actions opposed to U.S. interests. The Gulf War in 1991 was a conflict meant to neuter the growing power of the Iraqi state.

Total hot air. This has nothing to do with Saddam's past pipedreams of playing in the big leage. This is about Saddam's repeated lying & deception of EVERY group that tried to INSPECT & DISARM HIM. The UN acknowledged the fact that Saddam indeed did not intend to disarm and intentionally mislead them :
UNSCOM report to the UN

UNSCOM
Reports to the Security Council
25 January 1999

ANNEX D

ACTIONS BY IRAQ TO OBSTRUCT DISARMAMENT

1. The history of the Special Commission's work in Iraq has been plagued by coordinated efforts to thwart full discovery of Iraq's proscribed programmes. These policies and actions began immediately following the adoption of Security Council resolution 687 (1991). It is against this backdrop that the significant positive and negative results described in the weapons annexes should be seen. What follows is a brief summary of the Commission's current understanding of the evolution of these concealment policies and practices.

2. Immediately following the Gulf war, the Iraqi Presidency collected reports on weapons remaining with Iraq's Armed Forces after the war, including its weapons prohibited by recently adopted resolution 687(1991). Such documents were provided to the Presidency in the spring of 1991. A decision was taken by a high-level committee (one of whose members was Deputy Prime Minister Mr. Tariq Aziz) to provide to the Commission only a portion of its proscribed weapons, their components and production capabilities and stocks. The policy, as deduced from a range of evidence available to the Commission including the initial false Iraq's declarations, was based on

the following Iraqi actions:

- provide a portion of their extant weapon stocks, with an emphasis on those, which were least modern.
- retain production capability and the "know-how" documentation necessary to revive programmes when possible
- conceal the full extent of chemical weapons programmes, including its VX project, and retain production equipment and raw materials
- conceal the number and type of BW and CW warheads for proscribed missiles
- conceal indigenous long-range missile production, and retain production capabilities, specifically with respect to guidance systems and missile engines
- conceal the very existence of its offensive biological weapons programme and retain all production capabilities

3. Iraq had initial success in much of its concealment efforts, but, based, presumably, on early experience with the IAEA and the Special Commission in inspection activities, Iraq, took a subsequent decision in late June of 1991 to eliminate some of these retained proscribed materials, on its own, and in secret and in such a way that precise knowledge about what and how much had been destroyed would not be achievable. This decision and action by the high-level committee was a so-called "unilateral destruction". It was taken following an incident in June 1991 when IAEA inspectors, following an inspection that turned confrontational at Abu Ghraib, obtained photographic evidence of retained nuclear weapons production components.

4. Iraq did not admit to its illegal unilateral destruction until March 1992, approximately nine months after the destruction activities, and even then only after the Commission indicated it had evidence that Iraq retained weapons after its supervised destruction. Iraq states that "The unilateral destruction was carried out entirely unrecorded. No written and no visual records were kept, as it was not foreseen that Iraq needed to prove the destruction to anybody." Such an approach also indicates that Iraq intended to pursue a policy of concealment in its relations with the Commission and the IAEA."/size]

So blow all that 'regional regime' crap out your ass. Saddam was taking FOOD UNITS FOR HIM PEOPLE and selling them on the black market for CASH. This was verified when a monitoring group was able to BUY BACK MILK UNITS on the BLACK MARKET that could of ONLY gotten there if Saddam sold them. The first Gulf war was about removing Iraq from a territory that DID NOT belong to them -just like in Iran-. INVADING other peoples land for the purpose of possession via agression. Whereas quiet conversely the US will be GIVING BACK the Iraqi land to the Iraqi people. While the rest of the world protest the Iraqi people are rejoicing in the streets, try turning on the tv.

havocsnipe

This projection of power into the Middle East is the primary reason for invading Iraq. But in addition to increasing its influence in the region, Washington will also be securing its control over the Middle Eastern oil supply. By establishing a strong military presence, Washington will attempt to increase the stability of the oil supply in the global market. The Bush administration believes that U.S. influence in the region will reduce the chances of an oil shortage that would greatly damage the U.S. and other oil dependent economies.

Primary reason to invade Iraq - disarm Saddam & his regime

sub-reason to invade Iraq - liberate the Iraqi people

sub-reason to invade Iraq - to weaken the terrorist movement

There is an obvious link between Iraq and terrorism or why would it be in the *1991* UN resolution ?!?!?

<http://photos.yahoo.com/bc/aashton@sbcglobal.net/vwp?.dir=/&.dnm=UN+Resolution+687+Point+H.+32.jpg&.src=ph&.view=t&.hires=t>

Has Iraq denounced terrorism ? Didn't Saddam post 9-11 say that the US basically got what it deserved ?

Propaganda

The Bush administration has also set a new precedent for U.S. foreign policy. By attacking Iraq without U.N. approval, and devoid of support from traditional allies, the Bush administration has established a new international order where the U.S. will take military action despite opposition from international institutions and multilateral arrangements.

These concerns all play an important role in the Bush administration's desire to invade Iraq and replace the Saddam Hussein regime with a new government more beholden to U.S. interests.

This has been repeated several times. Clinton bombed Serbia during his term with-out UN or the congress's blessing. I don't recall a bunch of anti war protestors out in the streets then.

We are replacing Saddam's regime with a government more beholden to NOT MURDERING ITS OWN CIVILIAN POPULATION, LYING TO AND CONCEALING ILLEGAL WEAPONS FROM THE UN VIA THE UN RES 687 from 1991 and disarming a mad man before he joins the nuclear club. Amongst being in violation of the following :

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) (March 5th 1970)

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (Chemical Weapons Convention)(September 3rd 1992 & April 29th 1997)

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (Biological Weapons Convention)(March 1975)

WMD Terrorism (October 2001)

The ISSUE was the UN didn't have the GUTS to enforce resolutions they made back in 1991 ! Dear Hans'y Blix has been involed with this CRAP since 1991 but he still 'Outlining disarmament tasks for Iraq, Blix laments lack of time for inspections'. What a load of crap. The 'outline' for disaramament is COMPLETING THE FIRST 1/2 OF THE FIRST STEP -- identification. ALL this time HANS & THE GOOF TROOPS haven't been able to even complete STEP ONE because Saddam continues to LIE. An the UN set there wondering things like. ... "it's incomprehensible as to why Saddam wont tell us about his chem weapons program AND wont let us find the facts outself...we just..dont.know.why." <- Paraphrased

Anyways time is up, options are DONE.

Saddam has SECURED HIS DESTINY by :

Not complying with ALL OR ANY of the UN resolutions passed against him STARTING in 1991 AND he remains in violation of UN resolutions passed as far back as --1975--.

Not leaving Iraq and going into exile in the 48hrs President Bush GAVE him.

Chosing to do ALL OF THIS SHIT IN THE FIRST PLACE.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"

Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 15:06:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you talk about propaganda

Bush and co have been lying about iraq weapons.

On NBC's Meet the Press last Sunday, March 16, 2003, Vice President Cheney audaciously reiterated an ominous note.

NBC: "And even though the International Atomic Energy Agency said he does not have a nuclear program, we disagree?"

Cheney: "I disagree, yes. And you'll find the CIA, for example, and other key parts of our

that based on intelligence, that [Saddam] has been very, very good at hiding these kinds of efforts. He's had years to get good at it and we know he has been absolutely devoted to trying to acquire nuclear weapons. And we believe he has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons. I think Mr. ElBaradei, frankly, is wrong."

After 218 inspections of 141 sites over three months by the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohamed ElBaradei charged that the U.S. had used faked and erroneous evidence to support the claims that Iraq was importing enriched uranium and other material, notably the aluminum tubes and small magnets for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. "After three months of intrusive inspections, we have, to date, found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons program in Iraq," the chief atomic weapons inspector had told the U.N. Security Council on Friday March 7, 2003.

In December 2002, the American and British intelligence communities did provide, under Blix's insistence, a list of 25 sites garnered from Iraqi defectors and other intelligence sources. The

inspectors visited all of these sites, including one site that intelligence communities had claimed would be a promising find. Tellingly, the inspectors found nothing and their "hush hush" information was referred to by one inspector as "garbage after garbage after garbage."

So why is Cheney, after the total disrepute of all American misinformation about a rejuvenated Iraqi nuclear weapons program, still claiming that the U.S. has untold intelligence information about this program?

I now tend to believe there is a more sinister implication behind Cheney's continued assertions so late in the misinformation campaign and so close to the war.

Iraq claims it has no nuclear weapons related components left. Cheney claims that U.S. intelligence can prove that Iraq does have these components. What if the U.S. goes in and, after killing possibly hundreds of thousands, cannot find any components?

Would they not want to reiterate up until the last minute, as Cheney seems to be doing, that their "intelligence" does confirm that Iraq has nuclear weapons components to justify their criminal war?

However, in the event that no such components are to be found in Iraq, would it not be past the American intelligence community's bag of dirty tricks to place some bogus evidence (in places where the inspectors have not been so they can't be refuted by them) to vindicate the tens of billions of dollars spent on this war crime and the devastation it will undoubtedly incur?

It would otherwise be hard to challenge the timing and triviality of Cheney's claim on March 16, with Bush declaring war only one day later on March 17.

source: <http://www.yellowtimes.org/article.php?sid=1177>

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 15:16:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We are replacing Saddam's regime with a government more beholden to NOT MURDERING ITS OWN CIVILIAN POPULATION, LYING TO AND CONCEALING ILLEGAL WEAPONS FROM THE UN VIA THE UN RES 687 from 1991 and disarming a mad man before he joins the nuclear club. Among being in violation of the following :

You talk heavily about the resolution 687 back in 19991.

Iraq was disarmed in 1998.

it has no illegal weapons now.

US has no proof. it tried to create forgeries, lies and propaganda.

to convince people that Iraq is violation UN res. when clearly it is not.

What about Israel, I can bring you many UN res that it's violating, yet the hypocrite US is giving Israel US tax payers money worth billions of dollars every year. while

millions of Americans are eating from trash cans.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 15:23:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I do apologise for my spelling mistakes, above. I was typing in a rush.
Next time I will try to be more carefull.

Back to Iraq.

Iraq was largely disarmed by the time U.N. inspectors left in 1998; it has been under the most stringent military embargo and economic sanctions in history; and it was destroying its al-Samoud missiles as requested by the U.N.

Iraq no nuclear capability according to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 22:47:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How can they be lying about the weapons? 3 SCUDS have been fired. Also Iraq said they wouldn't burn oil fields. Well there are 7 on fire as we speak. You can't trust or believe a regime that has a 20+ years of lying.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 23:02:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You should click on over to my thread on a trip down memory lane with Saddam & the UN here.

Allow me to quote from this thread to dispell the steaming coils you've laid before us that 'Saddam doesn't have any weapons'.

IAEA report to UN on July 21st 1995
--THIS IS IN RELATION Resolutions 687&751 of 1991--
http://www.iaea.org/worldatom/Programmes/ActionTeam/reports/s_1995_604.pdf
(Pages 3 and 4)

programme and present situation,
a large number of errors and inconsistencies have been identified in the documents, typified by the following:

Linguistic correctness and conformity with Iraqi practice:
These documents contain technical wording which differs from that

conformance with
standard Iraqi usage.

Conformity of layout and construction of documents with established
Iraqi practices:

The layout of the documents is not consistent with contemporary Iraqi
usage. In addition, the documents reveal errors in construction,
suggesting poor adaptation of authentic Iraqi documents.

Scientific validity:

Some technical elements of the programme, inferred from the documents,
have been assessed as unlikely by experts from Nuclear Weapon States. Some of those
elements are also
inconsistent with available information on the status of Iraq's clandestine programme during the
last years
of the programme.

Accuracy:

Significant inaccuracies in qualifications, titles and names of
individuals, as well as in technical and administrative organizational
structures, have been clearly established.

As a result of this investigation, the IAEA has reached the conclusion
that, on the basis of all evidence available, these documents are not authentic. Furthermore, no
credible
evidence was found to suggest that the activities reported in these documents were or are being
carried out in Iraq.

(--"the activities reported" being Iraq's supposed destruction of weapons of mass destruction
WHEN NO ONE WAS LOOKING AND NO ONE
TOOK AND NOTES as detailed here--)

UNSCOM Report to Security Council January 25th 1999
ANNEX D

ACTIONS BY IRAQ TO OBSTRUCT DISARMAMENT

4. Iraq did not admit to its illegal unilateral destruction until March 1992, approximately nine
months after the
destruction activities, and even then only after the Commission indicated it had evidence that Iraq
retained weapons
after its supervised destruction. Iraq states that "The unilateral destruction was carried out entirely
unrecorded.

No written and no visual records were kept, as it was not foreseen that Iraq needed to prove the
destruction to anybody."

Such an approach also indicates that Iraq intended to pursue a policy of concealment in its
relations with the Commission
and the IAEA."

So you can post all that ****TRASH**** about Inspection Organizations exonerating IRAQ FOR FULL COMPLIANCE but the FACTS are not on your side. You can look at almost ANY REPORT from ANY organization that has tried to INSPECT & DISARM IRAQ and find THIS ^ kind of stuff.

IRAQ MOST DEFINATLY HAS ILLEGAL WEAPONS. THEY FIRED SOME AT US IN THE PAST ---FEW DAYS---. But no, Saddam could MAIL you a Scud missle and you'd probably still doubt.

Bottom Line :

Iraq had WEAPONS OF MASS DISTRUCTIONS AND ILLEGAL WEAPONS when the 1991 resolution was imposed on them.

The Iraqi regime sought a route of lies and deception in relation to ANY GROUP THAT ATTEMPTED TO INSPECT AND DISARM THEM.

AND IT IS FURTHERMORE A **FACT** that EVEN IN THE MOST RECENT INSPECTIONS Hans Blix WAS STILL WORKING ON THE FIRST 1/2 OF THE **FIRST STEP** IN THE ROAD TO DISARMAMENT.

Step ONE

A) Identification of illegal items

B) Destruction or disposal of illegal items[/b]

Do you know WHY we were still on PART A OF STEP ONE ?? Because Saddam IS A LYING PIECE OF SHIT. Thats why. Not because the big bad EVIL USA OR ISRAEL is sending in Commodo's moving around Saddams weapons so he cant disarm. But because SADDAM IS MOVING AROUND HIS **ILLEGAL WEAPONS** SO HE CAN NOT BE DISARMED. SADDAM HAD NO INTENTION OF DISARMING AND THE UN ****KNEW THIS****.

You

Iraq was largely disarmed by the time U.N. inspectors left in 1998; it has been under the most stringent military embargo and economic sanctions in history; and it was destroying its al-Samoud missiles as requested by the U.N.

Iraq no nuclear capability according to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

:rolleyes: :rolleyes: :rolleyes:

IAEA report to UN on 16 October 2002

As previously indicated to the Security Council, the greater in-depth analysis carried out since December 1998

of the extensive documentation acquired through the inspection process has refined but not

capabilities as of December 1998.

1998, the clarification of

understanding of that programme, these questions and concerns do not constitute "unresolved disarmament issues", as referred to in Security Council resolution 1284 (1999).

The Agency is continuing to review and assess all available post-1998 information (for example, publications by Member States,

provided semi-annual declarations.

However, as nearly four years have elapsed since IAEA has been able to implement its Security Council mandate in Iraq,

programme and nuclear-related capabilities as of today. It will therefore be important for the Agency, on recommencement of inspections, to resolve, with

nuclear activities and

capabilities since December 1998, and whether Iraq is in compliance with its obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions.

So...if the IAEA is sooooo clear and its sooo obvious Saddam has NOOOOOO nuclear capabilities why do they use words like "clandestine" AS RECENT AS OCTOBER 2002 ?

UN Resolution 1284 on Dec. 17th 1999

Acknowledging the progress made by Iraq towards compliance with the provisions of resolution 687 (1991), but noting that, as a result of its failure to implement the relevant Council resolutions fully, the conditions do not exist which would enable the Council to take a decision pursuant to resolution 687 (1991) to lift the prohibitions referred to in that resolution,

So as one can CLEARLY SEE. The SANCTIONS IMPOSED ON IRAQ were because of THEIR OWN DOING. The length of time the sanctions stayed imposed WAS UP TO SADDAM. IF HE WOULD OF FULLY COMPLIED THEY HAD MECHANISMS IN PLACE TO REMOVE THESE BURDENS. But nooo, fuck feeding the Iraqi people get me some more of that VX nerve gas babe ! It's "Da-bomb" !

So...why are *you* defending a --murdering, lying (and HOPEFULLY DEAD) fuck-- ? I'd love to know the reasons why'd you'd want to defend someone who imposes & supports the FOLLOWING

The UPI March 21st

<http://www.upi.com/view.cfm?StoryID=20030321-023627-5923r>

A group of American anti-war demonstrators who came to Iraq with Japanese human shield volunteers made it across the border today with 14 hours of uncensored video, all shot without Iraqi government minders present. Kenneth Joseph, a young American pastor with the Assyrian Church of the East, told UPI the trip "had shocked me back to reality." Some of the Iraqis he interviewed on camera "told me they would commit suicide if American bombing didn't start. They were willing to see their homes demolished to gain their freedom from Saddam's bloody tyranny. They convinced me that Saddam was a monster the likes of which the world had not seen since Stalin and Hitler. He and his sons are sick sadists. Their tales of slow torture and killing made me ill, such as people put in a huge shredder for plastic products, feet first so they could hear their screams as bodies got chewed up from foot to head."

Defending truth & reality 24hrs a day, 7days a week 365days a year for the rest of my life against THOSE WHO WISH TO TWIST AND DISTORT IT.

The One

ps. Why do my post keep expanding the width of the window ? I've made several attempts @ stopping this but nothing is working....

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 00:44:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

All this still, does not prove anything.
Though on the report it talks about doubt on iraq's disarmament.

Still there is no solid evidence that Iraq has nukes at this time.

No nation has a right to conquer another nation just because the ruler is a dictater.

KOFI ANNAND the UN Secretary warned the US not to go to war without the UN's permission. United States has gone to war illegally against the UN's charter.

coalition countires which are secretly backing US, they doing this cause they are afraid and the other reason they get financial aid from US to cater american interests.

Turkey one example

Russia and countries are pushing this to the UN.
Wanting the UN to do something about this.

US supports many tyrants around the world.
egypt. president.
pakistan. president
saudi arabia
many more in the middle east.
some tyrants in south america.

These tyrants who are supported by US are hated by their people but they hate the US even more for backing these tyrants.
these tyrants do not support democracy yet they receive AID from US.

There are mass protests around the world almost in every country against this unilateral attack on Iraq.

Also Iraq has nothing to do with 9/11.

No proof Iraq has links with usama.

Iraqi baath party are not muslim, they are socialists. they don't believe in god.
They carry different ideology from al-Qaeda.
in fact 2 weeks ago Usama bin Laden urged the Iraqi population to rise and remove Saddam Hussein.
What is this Bush/Usama alliance to topple Saddam.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 00:48:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

By John Chuckman
YellowTimes.org Columnist (Canada)

I won't listen to, or read, the news of the war. The only news I want to hear is that the murder is over.

Murder? Yes, that word is carefully chosen.

I can easily imagine how the expression "shock and awe" was born. Remember, in America, marketing comes before anything. Everything from breast cancer treatment to Jesus is loudly marketed in this bizarre society. That's not even a slight exaggeration, although if you haven't lived there, you'll have to take my word for it. They are busy marketing terror, insecurity, and xenophobia right now, and that makes your chances of visiting to research questions of this kind not very good.

If you're a full-blooded American, marketing murder, even mass murder, is just like marketing anything else. You can't be squeamish about it. You need a good turn of phrase or slogan, an

eye-catching logo, and perhaps some stirring theme music. You need what will convince jaded consumers that something new and exciting is about to appear on their television screens. The need is greater than ever now that entertainment and information have been fully merged on American broadcasting -- broadcasting, by the way, owned by a remarkably small number of people, all of whom just happen to share the same interest in keeping the Pentagon's furnaces stoked with four hundred billion dollars a year.

I imagine platoons of Pentagon consultants, each earning hundreds of dollars an hour, coming and going for months before the war with their expensive laptops in designer leather cases, making presentations of their marketing proposals, each hoping to land the big contract. Then one day someone stunned the crowd with a super presentation of just the right concept, "shock and awe," with plenty of special effects guaranteed to play well on television.

It can't be that none of the creased-pants innocents in the Pentagon ever heard of the Western Front in the First World War where truly horrifying bombardments, with guns that could shatter your eardrums if you were too close, sometimes went on for days before the troops jumped the tops of their trenches and charged the barbed wire of the other side across fields raked with heavy machine guns and cratered by shell holes where mustard gas lingered like a poison fog ready to blind and burn out the lungs of anyone unfortunate enough to stumble in.

Of course, these bombardments were aimed at soldiers, not at a city like Baghdad, but perhaps I quibble.

Americans don't fight that way anymore. Actually, since Vietnam -- where they were sent running even after they managed to napalm a good portion of the nation's villages -- Americans don't fight at all. There have been attempts to re-institute the practice here and there, as in Mogadishu, but the results weren't happy -- a few dead soldiers and America turned and ran. Of course, it didn't have to be that way if they hadn't muddled a humanitarian mission with the urge to mow down every local who looked at them the wrong way. Maybe they just hadn't done enough focus groups and marketing surveys before that sour-smelling little mission.

Now, America simply commits mass murder with computer-controlled weapons from a safe distance and calls it fighting. When the explosions and screaming stop and the brave American lads set out on their mission of occupation from air-conditioned quarters (they don't do trenches anymore) in their air-conditioned armored cars, dressed in bullet-proof Kevlar suits and equipped with sun-tan lotion and freeze-dried linguini, there isn't a lot for them to do but avoid slipping and falling in the human gore splattered everywhere by missiles and high-tech bombs. They also must remember to don their bubble-boy suits and respirators in areas saturated with tons of vaporized depleted uranium.

There's very little risk to the "boyz" -- all of whom, regardless of steroid-induced, bovine bulk and savage-looking buzzed-off hair, are affectionately regarded as awkward, young Ricky Nelsons (at least, before his cocaine phase), who always say things like "sir" and "aw, heck."

I've written before about the approaching age of American high-tech Puritanism, but I didn't expect it to be upon us so completely quite so quickly, reminding one of the sudden onset of a new ice age. America is able to destroy anyone or anyplace it finds displeasing or just suspicious -- this is Sharon's Israel occupying Palestine on a global scale.

No consultations with others are needed, or if Americans do briefly consult, it will be a marketing ploy taken in full confidence they are free to ignore everyone and push them aside, even when this happens to include, as it does in the case of Iraq, most of the world's people.

In hopes of gaining some outward show of respectability, this time America conducted a very unpleasant behind-the-scenes campaign of threats and bribery. Again, that is not an exaggeration, that is how they obtained that pathetic list of thirty countries not one in ten Americans has ever heard of, but, even then, most of these places are not joined in the killing, just signaling support in some diffuse way as a response to pressure from the world's economic pituitary giant.

When you really think about it, who else could join in the killing? Who else is equipped for long-distance computerized murder? But America always looks to others to occupy and police, relieving the "boyz" even of these tasks.

You might think that if there had been any true case for war, it would be obvious to more of the world's leaders. Why would you need all the browbeating and threats? But the case was not obvious, because some very bright people in the U.N. Security Council, all in fact friends of the United States, thrashed it out and could not agree. Mostly, all they wanted was time and patience for inspections. But Mr. Bush, gifted intellect and learned scholar that he is, knew better than all of them, and besides, in the Texas he comes from, all that matters is that you have the biggest fists or are first out with your gun.

Maybe next time, America will feel it can dispense with respectability. It really got very little for its effort. That's what America's frighteningly rat-like neocons are telling us with their talk about a damaged U.N. and Atlantic Alliance. They just neglect to mention that it is the U.S. that did the damage.

We all know what Lord Acton said about power and absolute power. His words remain perhaps truer than anything ever uttered about human behavior, and they should serve as a warning, but I fear they provide only consolation. Just imagine a world where it has become possible to slaughter any number of people, virtually with impunity -- a world where that kind of power is in the hands of a relatively small group of narrow, earnest, self-satisfied people possessing virtually limitless material resources and believing themselves somehow guided by God as no one else on the planet is privileged to be.

It's a dismaying picture of the future, but if you are watching or listening to the news about Iraq from the Pentagon's just-built, custom-designed, super-deluxe, press-conference studio, you're getting a first hard look at that very future.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 01:21:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, I don't read the forums for half a day and havocsnipe goes completely insane. I don't even know where to begin. Every line I've read is either complete bullshit or has so scewed the facts

there's almost no point in responding, but I'll do what I can.

For the questions about why haven't banned weapons been used, it has been confirmed that several SCUD missiles have been fired by Iraq. These were banned, Iraq claimed there were no more and the inspectors couldn't find any. Also, Saddam is believed to have been severely injured in the first hours and now the entire command structure is failing so no orders are being given.

The writer of the article in your first post is confused. Causes and effects are being mixed up. Yes, it is likely the US will have more influence in the middle east after this, but that is an effect of the war not a cause. I say its a good effect too. The US is taking some big risks in overthrowing a tyrant, and I can only hope we get rewarded for that. Likewise, countries like France should lose influence if they are determined to keep people like Saddam in power no matter what.

That's all I feel like responding to now.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 01:27:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

havocsnipeThat's what America's frighteningly rat-like neocons are telling us with their talk about a damaged U.N. and Atlantic Alliance. They just neglect to mention that it is the U.S. that did the damage.

I just read that line and I'm absolutely stunned someone could say that. I won't get into the crap that happened at the UN, but as far as NATO goes, France did ALL the damage. Turkey requested extra defenses in case war with Iraq happened. It is mandated in the NATO charter that all member nations comply with the request. France refused in clear violation of NATO's charter. Germany and Belgium went along at first, but even they realized it was wrong to block Turkey's request.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [Bearxor](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 01:32:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

havocsnipeBy John Chuckman
YellowTimes.org Columnist (Canada)

lin the Texas he comes from, all that matters is that you have the biggest fists or are first out with your gun.

I was all fine with this persons opinion, before I came up on this quote. Obviously this person has never lived in Texas. Being a native Houstonian, I'd like to tell him to fold his little speech up and stick straight up his ass.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 02:10:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can't even grace that pitiful excuse for an editorial with a response. People like him are such lemmings... I hope they follow each other off a tall cliff and let Darwinism run its course.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 04:36:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's what those animals are called. My wife was right. Geeze please don't tell he I said that.
:oops:

Havoc, the UN has no jurisdiction over how the United States of America is governed. We did NOT sign our rights to the UN. WE FOUND THE UN.
The UN failed now time for action has come. Again, how many times must we go through the facts here for you. Let me give you 2 facts here.

1: Iraq claimed they had no SCUD missiles. 3 were fired at US troops.
Translation: Iraq LIED!

2: Iraq claimed they had no missiles that would go over 92 miles. Most of the missiles fired at US troops came from 100+ miles out.
Translation: Iraq LIED!

Question for you now.

How many more lies must Iraq tell before the world is sorry it didn't react?

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 14:02:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

havocsnip: Proof that you can know enough to be dangerous, while remaining completely ignorant at the same time.

Stop quoting idiotic resources.

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 27 Mar 2003 04:38:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Last week Iran claimed that 3 US Tomahawk Missiles landed in Iran. When Iran went to

investigate the impact areas, they changed the accusation of the US, and confirmed that in fact the missiles were IRAQI SCUDS. Now you have a severely anti-American Muslim country confirming and publicly stating that the missiles were Iraqi SCUDS.

SCUD=Illegal weapon
