



:

---

---

## Letter from Your Executive

Dear Fellow VANA Members:

**V**ANA's "Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Since" exhibition is on the move, and we expect it to appear in several locations in Vancouver, as well as in Montreal and Victoria. More on this below.

The incredible belligerence of the Bush administration since its "victory" over Afghanistan is now the prime threat to world peace. The most likely target for this belligerence is Iraq. The seriousness of any such US attack on Iraq and its potential as a trigger for the use of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons if Israel or Iran become involved, does not have to be explained to VANA members.

A refreshing change in Prime Minister Chretien's usual subordination to Washington's policies, has been his apparent reluctance for Canadian involvement in a US attack on Iraq. "At this moment we are not implicated in any plans for Iraq or other nations," Mr. Chrétien said during a visit to Moscow. Yesterday he joined Vladimir Putin, the Russian President, to call on George Bush not to take unilateral military action against Iraq. (*National Post* 15Feb02). However the presence of several Canadian warships in and adjacent to the Persian Gulf indicates that Canada is already "implicated." An article in Britain's *Guardian* on US plans and preparations for war with Iraq appear below.

**O**ne of President Bush's repeated charges against Iraq concerns "weapons of mass destruction." The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) recently inspected Iraq's nuclear facilities and found them in compliance with IAEA requirements. An article on this appears below.

**At our next members meeting on Monday 25 February 2002, 1:30 p.m., at the Fireside Room, Unitarian Church, 49th Avenue at Oak, we will welcome Riadh Muslih to speak on Iraq. Riadh came from Iraq many years ago and edits the paper "Al Shouruq" for Vancouver's Arabic-speaking community. Don't miss this informative and up-to-the-minute presentation.**

Finally an article warning against US belligerence towards Iraq "No time to be trigger happy" from the *Globe and Mail* (12 Oct 1990) - over eleven years ago - by VANA member David Morgan. (We told them so!)

Keep sending in your news, information, articles, writing, questions, beefs and bouquets.

Best wishes,  
Your VAN BC exec:

Ed Livingston President, (604-730-6990, Fax: 604-730-6931 e-mail:<phcl@netcom.ca>  
Cynthia Llewellyn Secretary, Ted Powis, Treasurer,  
David Morgan, News Letter, 604-985-7147, Fax: 604-985-1260 e-mail:dmorgan@web.net,  
240 Holyrood Road, North Vancouver, BC, V7N 2R5  
Bas Robinson, Membership Coordinator  
At Large: Emil Grieshaber, Joyce Lydiard, Ed Shaffer

## **“Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Since” Exhibition on the Move**

VANA’s “Hiroshima, Nagasaki & Since” exhibition, which was so well-received during its 1-14 July display at the Vancouver Public Library last year, will be traveling this year.

Its first booking will be at Langara College 11-16 March, when it will help illustrate a section on nuclear weapons, presented by Mary Goldie, Coordinator of Peace and Conflict Studies. Later it will probably be on display at Concordia University, Montreal during the Anti-War Conference in mid May. Students at Simon Fraser University, UBC and Capilano College have also expressed interest in hosting this exhibition. Looking further ahead, we hope to place this exhibition at the University of Victoria this fall and at the Vancouver “Round House” next year.

If out of town VANA members want to arrange exhibits in Kelowna, Penticton, Nanaimo Victoria, let us know and we will send you all the details.

---

### **US Targets Saddam**

*The Guardian*, February 14, 2002

Pentagon and CIA making plans for war against Iraq this year

By Julian Borger in Washington and Ewen MacAskill

The Pentagon and the CIA have begun preparations for an assault on Iraq involving up to 200,000 US troops that is likely to be launched later this year with the aim of removing Saddam Hussein from power, US and diplomatic sources told the Guardian yesterday.

President George Bush's war cabinet, known as the "principals committee", agreed at a pivotal meeting in late January that the policy of containment has failed and that active steps should be taken to topple the Iraqi leader.

But, according to a US intelligence source familiar with CIA preparations, the plans for a parallel overt and covert war only landed on the president's desk in the past few days.

"I will reserve whatever options I have. I'll keep them close to my vest. Saddam Hussein needs to understand that I'm serious about defending our country," Mr Bush said yesterday. Since the principals committee decision, Colin Powell, the secretary of state and the dove of the administration, has pointedly added his voice to the calls for a "regime change". "We are looking at a variety of options that would bring that about," he told the Senate budget committee.

The blueprint for a campaign against Iraq has evolved from a contingency plan drawn up by the joint chiefs of staff that envisaged the use of a 200,000-strong US force, the bulk of which would invade from Kuwait.

However, it may be that the actual force used will be less numerous, relying more on covert and special forces operations. Central Command has already set up forward headquarters in the Gulf from which each of the component services will be able to coordinate the war.

The air force headquarters (Afcen) is at the Prince Sultan air base in Saudi Arabia. The army headquarters (Arcent) is in Kuwait, while the navy (Navcent) is in Bahrain.

Central Command's marine component (Marcent) is also expected to move to Bahrain in the next few days, weeks after the main marine force left Afghanistan.

The US, Israel and Turkey were due to hold joint exercises codenamed Anatolian Eagle this year, but in another sign of accelerated preparations there will be three such exercises in the next few months, based at the Turkish air force base at Konya. Once upgraded, Konya could be used alongside Incirlik as a base for air strikes on northern Iraq.

The Pentagon's military planners are reported to have agonised over the Iraq plan because of the significant risk that Saddam - aware that unlike during the Gulf war his own life is at stake this time - would use chemical and biological weapons against US troop concentrations and Israel. (continued on page 3\_

## US Targets Iraq (continued from page 2)

**T**he danger would be minimized by intensive bombing of missile launchers, but the generals reportedly remain extremely concerned that the risks cannot be eliminated entirely.

The CIA's covert war would involve arming and training Kurdish fighters in northern Iraq and Shi'ite forces in Kuwait. CIA trainers and special forces troops have already been dispatched to Kuwait for that purpose, and may already have begun work.

Meanwhile, CIA and special forces will launch a campaign of sabotage and information warfare in the next few months. The CIA puts very little faith in the military capacity of the main opposition movement, the Iraqi National Congress, but it has begun intensive consultations with INC officials about the logistics of training and arming the movement's supporters.

The trigger could be the expected row over weapons inspections in three months' time. America's allies are clinging to the hope that US military action will be forestalled by Baghdad's acceptance of unconditional and unfettered weapons inspections when the international sanctions regime comes up for review at the United Nations in May.

However, Iraq's vice-president, Taha Yassin Ramadan, said yesterday there was no need for "spies" from the UN weapons inspection teams to return to the country.

**A** US state department official said he thought it very unlikely that the Iraqi regime would be prepared to accept the stringent program of inspections the US will demand. As the American intelligence source put it, the White House "will not take yes for an answer", suggesting that Washington would provoke a crisis. He added that he expected the war to begin soon after the May ultimatum.

US allies in the Middle East have been informed that a decision to attack Iraq has already been taken, and diplomats from the region said yesterday they were resigned to the inevitability of a war that may threaten the stability of a string of Arab regimes. "It is a nightmare situation for us," said one Arab diplomat in Washington. "We feel the Americans will take very drastic action and we have to be prepared for such a reality. But the public opinion in the street will not see this as a benign attempt to restore order, but as American imperialism."

France, Germany and others in the European Union have been queuing up to make clear to Mr Bush that they will not support him in military action against Iraq. The German foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, this week joined the French foreign minister, Hubert Védrine, by expressing publicly his concern about US policy towards Iraq.

But Tony Blair and the foreign secretary, Jack Straw, have refused to join the public outcry. A Foreign Office official said yesterday that military action was not imminent, but would be "a question of months". A Foreign Office spokesman later said: "The prime minister has made it clear from the outset that the campaign would have two phases: the first focusing on Afghanistan and the second looking at different aspects of international terrorism. In that context, we have to look at issues such as weapons of mass destruction."

There are regular exchanges between the US state department and the Foreign Office on strategy for tackling Iraq. The Foreign Office spokesman said: "We will proceed in consultation with our allies and the precise methods of action will be for consultation in due course."

In the months after September 11, the Foreign Office repeatedly ruled out military action against Iraq, other than the regular bombing along its border with Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Its line at the time was that there was no evidence linking Iraq to terrorist activity. Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Turkey, all US allies neighbouring Iraq, expect to sustain significant economic and political damage from a new conflict. Jordan believes it stands to lose \$800m (£500m) from the interruption of deliveries of cheap Iraqi oil, and has already begun to hint at the need for compensation.

## **Iraq Cooperated with Nuclear Inspection- IAEA**

31 January 2002

AMMAN (Reuters) - The head of a team from the U.N. nuclear watchdog IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] said on Thursday Baghdad had co-operated fully with its routine annual inspection in Iraq. The IAEA mission was completed on Wednesday, one day after President Bush accused Baghdad of developing weapons of mass destruction.

The International Atomic Energy Agency team arrived in Jordan from Baghdad where it had carried out the five-day mission in which it inspected several undisclosed sites. Anrzey Pietruzewski, head of the team, told reporters in Amman the mission went smoothly.

``During our inspection, representatives from the Iraqi Atomic Energy commission were present for the whole time and all help that is necessary to perform the inspections was provided by Iraqi authorities," he said.

Pietruzewski said a statement about the results of the inspection would be made to the Iraqi authorities. The inspection by the Vienna-based IAEA, a U.N. agency that monitors the peaceful use of nuclear power worldwide, was intended to guard against any diversion of nuclear material to a military program.

It was not connected to more intrusive U.N. inspections in Iraq conducted prior to 1998 under a Security Council resolution ordering Baghdad to eliminate all its weapons of mass destruction following its 1990 invasion of Kuwait. Those U.N. weapons inspectors left Iraq in 1998 just before a U.S.-British bombing blitz and Iraq has refused to allow them back since.

Bush vowed on Tuesday to prevent ``terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world." He singled out Iraq, Iran and North Korea by name. Iraq dismissed Bush's comments as ``stupid and improper," saying the U.S. leader was laying the groundwork for another U.S. assault on Iraq, whose troops were driven from Kuwait in 1991 by a U.S.-led coalition.

---

### **No time to be trigger happy**

by David Morgan

(*Globe & Mail*, 12 October 1990

)  
Why is America so eager for war? Sure, Saddam Hussein is a ruthless dictator and U.N. embargos and possibly police action are necessary. But why has America gone for its gun with such obvious enthusiasm?

America was not always like this. The American people were once a very peace loving people. President Woodrow Wilson had great difficulty in getting the American people into the first World War in 1917. They had a very natural reluctance to go to war back then, because they could still remember the horrors of their own civil war just 52 years before. The reality of war comes home forcefully when you see your cities, towns and your own street turned into smoking ruins. One American in 52 died in the Civil War.

There were plenty of bloody losses and smoking ruins in the two World Wars, but not for America. These World Wars brought America a booming economy, no destruction and leading world-power status; the horror was far away.. Casualties of 292,000 dead in World War II, were less than half the 600,000 killed in the Civil War , and were borne by a population five times as big. Not a single American house was destroyed. Soviet losses amounted to one person in 7 killed; American losses were one person in 513. So America's dangerously misleading experience of modern war is this: War times are boom times and wars happen somewhere else outside America.

Maybe Americans are allowing themselves to be whipped up into a warlike mood now, because they believe that whatever happens 'over there' they will be quite safe and comfortable 'over here.' But are they so safe? Consider these two points:

(continued on page 5)

## Trigger Happy (continued from [age 4])

Point number one concerns delivery systems. When Americans think about nuclear attacks on their country they generally think in terms of attack from above- bombers and missiles. The defences against such elaborate and costly attacks are also very elaborate and costly. The military and the defence contractors never tire of showing what wonderful technology Americans have to deliver or to prevent nuclear attack.

But while American eyes are watching the proudly thundering jets overhead, a man may be entering New York with a suit case full of hellfire. Thermonuclear weapons used to be enormous. The first hydrogen bomb, exploded on November 1st, 1952 at Eniwetok atoll in the South Pacific, weighed 65 tons. But our wonderful technology has made thermonuclear weapons smaller and smaller, so that now they can be delivered anywhere by hand, like pizzas. If Americans can't keep drugs out of their country they certainly could not exclude these far smaller shipments, which would be brought in with so much more care and determination. For all the trillions that have been spent on their defense, they might as well hide in paper bags. Point number one, therefore, is that we can not prevent the delivery of nuclear weapons to our cities

Point number two is an even more disturbing idea: A nuclear attack may be anonymous. Traditional warfare provided a clearly defined enemy. The villainous enemy leader could be attacked in the media and compared with Hitler. Threats could be made; Leaders could be assassinated; 'Surgical' strike bombing attacks could be made against cities; villages could be napalmed; Bodies could be counted. Victory could be announced when convenient.

But how can Americans or anybody, defend themselves against the anonymous enemy? Suppose that a hydrogen bomb went off in New York City or Tel Aviv with no warning, no threats, no ultimatum, no deal and no clue as to who did it or why. What then? How does 'mutually assured destruction' work if you do not know who the enemy is? Does the United States or Israel have so few enemies in the world that it would be obvious? To retaliate, do you nuke the most likely culprit? Or do you list the suspects and nuke 'em all?

Modern war is a bottomless Pandora's box of horrors. To be ignorant of the possibilities of modern war and to be eager to wage it is madness. There are big enough dangers even when force is used only most scrupulously through the U.N. and even then, only with obvious reluctance.

Americans should remember Lincoln's words: "The best way to get rid of an enemy is to make him into a friend." Today when one man alone can literally destroy a city we can not afford to have enemies. Poet Auden's words written in New York at the outbreak of World War II in his poem "September 1939", should both haunt and guide us: "I and the public know what all schoolchildren learn, those to whom evil is done do evil in return... We must love one another or die." Eagerness for war today, means eagerness for suicide.

---

## VANA MEMBERSHIP

To renew your membership in or to join VANA, please fill out the form below and send, along with a cheque payable to VANA, to Ted Powis, Treasurer, #603-1745 Esquimalt, W. Vancouver, V7V 1R7 The dues are \$30, \$20 of which go to the national office and \$10 to the branch. (You can use the enclosed addressed envelope)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Code \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ Prov \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address \_\_\_\_\_

## On the Heavy Side

**T**he Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Top Five List of Nuclear Events in 2001

1. The US gives notice of withdrawal from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.
2. US Boycotts the UN Conference to Advance the Entry Into Force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
3. US President George W. Bush pledges to reduce the US nuclear arsenal to between 1,700 and 2,200 strategic nuclear weapons over a period of ten years.\*\* Russian President Vladimir Putin says that he will "respond in kind."
4. The Ukraine destroys its last nuclear missile silo, fulfilling its pledge to give up the nuclear arsenal it inherited after the dissolution of the USSR.
5. Germany decides to phase out nuclear power by 2025.

\*\* (Subsequently, Bush said the "reduced" weapons would be stored, NOT destroyed.)

## On the Light Side:

**“A**ll the men that I ever slept with are dead,” complained a ninety-year old woman member of Britain’s House of Lords at a banquet.

“Oh no they’re not,” came a quavering male voice from further down the table.

“Oh,” said the ninety year old. “Yes. I forgot all about you.”

(From George Galloway, MP in Vancouver Jan 2002)