



Letter from Your Executive

Dear Fellow VANA Members in BC:

It is astonishing how quickly the brutal and lawless US-led aggression against Iraq is being accepted and forgotten by our corrupt media. Assisting in this shameful and dangerous process, the UN Security Council gave a false legitimacy to this criminal attack and the equally criminal occupation of Iraq, and awarded the US de facto sovereignty over Iraq and its immense resources of oil. This was accomplished on Thursday 22 May 2003, when the Council unanimously (with the exception of absent Syria) passed Resolution 1483 which had been crafted by the US and UK.

An unsparing analysis of this surrender, "The Security Council that betrayed its mission," written by Hasan Abu Nimah, former ambassador and permanent representative of Jordan to the UN, appears below.

The power of the media to influence public opinion has been demonstrated very clearly during the US/UK aggression against Iraq. Our media are now hard at work trying to influence Canadian opinion to be receptive to a Canadian Star Wars involvement. News Watch Canada, a news media monitoring project based at SFU, follows such media manipulations. Its co-director is Professor **Bob Hackett who is an authority on media power and processes. He will be speaking to us at our monthly meeting on Monday 23 June at 1:30 p.m., Fireside Room, Unitarian Church, 49th Avenue and Oak street.** Professor Hackett has taught in the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University since 1984. Don't miss this very illuminating talk.

Canada's involvement in the US missile defense system (Star Wars) is currently presented in our

media as an undecided issue. Defense Minister John McCallum stated Thursday (12 June '03) that Canadian officials will open formal talks in Washington later this month on whether Ottawa should sign up to the controversial U.S. missile defense system. However, Matthew Behrens, writes that "Canada is ALREADY involved in Star Wars." This article of his, which appear below, shows how Canada's military, Defence departments and industry have laid all of the groundwork for our role in this US mega-project in space. Prime Minister Jean Chretien says Canada will not sign up to the shield if it becomes clear it would lead to the weaponization of space, so keep sending him your letters, faxes and emails. This is not yet a 'done-deal.'

VANA Honorary member Joseph Rotblat, speaking a year ago, told us the key issues regarding nuclear weapons are moral issues and issues of law. The lawlessness of the US aggression against Iraq has been mentioned. The article, "Is There Anything Left That Matters?" below deals very strongly and simply with some current moral issues.

Few people are in a stronger moral position to criticize the Bush administration's reckless nuclear weapons policies, than Mayor Tadatoshi Akiba of Hiroshima. His 21 April 2003 letter to President Bush appears below.

Finally, VANA Vancouver members were delighted when world renowned peace activist Helen Caldicott accepted a certificate of Honorary Membership in VANA during her speaking engagement in Vancouver on Monday 28 April 2003.

Please keep sending in your news, views, questions, articles, and letters. (*continued on page 2*)

Exec Letter (continued from page 1)

With this update, your executive retires, as usual at this time of the year, for a two-month summer break. Have a wonderful sunny summer and we will meet again in the fall to resume the good fight for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Best wishes,

Your VANA 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, Ed Shaffer

The Security Council that Betrayed its Mission,

by **Hasan Abu Nimah**, former ambassador and permanent representative of Jordan to the UN.
Jordan Times, May 28, 2003

(Condensed)

The latest Security Council resolution on Iraq, 1483, has been a flagrant betrayal of the UN Charter, a scandalous resultant of power politics and opportunistic superpower compromises, and a dangerous submission to the *fait accompli* of war and aggression, at the expense of principle and international legality.

Earlier, in the weeks leading to the war, the council had stood firm in the face of immense American and British pressure. That effort, spearheaded by the French-declared warning to use the veto, had successfully blocked the war resolution, rendering the attack on Iraq an illegal, naked aggression.

It is amazing how, on May 22, the council dramatically abandoned its steadfast position by suddenly legitimizing aggression, endorsing devastation of an innocent country and its weary people, and by licensing their indefinite, unwarranted occupation.

The resolution opens by "affirming the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq." It then details how all real power is in the hands of the "Authority", and the Authority here means Washington. It also fails to clarify how the sovereignty and integrity of any country can be preserved under an occupation which has left the country in total chaos. Neither does the resolution explain how the partition of the country by the "Authority" into three separate units along sectarian and ethnic lines guarantees any territorial integrity.

The resolution "reaffirms the importance of the disarmament of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and of the eventual confirmation of the disarmament of Iraq". The resolution obviously needed to affirm the existence of the WMDs to save the occupiers the embarrassment, indeed the legal responsibility, of waging a war on false basis; and that the resolution did.

More contradictions in this resolution:

1) "Stressing the right of the Iraqi people freely to determine their own political future and control their own natural resources...", at the same time as the resolution legitimizes the occupation, and grants the occupying "Authority" full unlimited control of Iraq's resources. (Especially, its gigantic oil reserves)

2) The UN resolves to "play a vital role in humanitarian relief, the reconstruction of Iraq, and the restoration and establishment of national and local institutions for representative government." In reality, this disguises the fact that the UN will have NO role and its officials will have NO power of their own, except perhaps as useful tools in the hands of the "Authority".

3) The UN "stressing the need for respect for the archaeological, historical, cultural, and religious heritage of Iraq." The occupiers left those historic treasures to be pillaged and destroyed right in front of the eyes of their soldiers, and of the whole watching world. (continued on page 3)

Security Council *(continued from page 2)*

The council "welcomed the willingness of member states to contribute to the stability and security in Iraq by contributing personnel, equipment and other resources under the Authority". How could this be anything but an open UN invitation to its member states to support an illegal occupation?

The resolution "determines that the situation in Iraq, although improved, continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security". Clearly, this was a justification for the council to act under Chapter VII of the Charter; (Ch.VII: "Action with respect to

threats to the peace, breaches of the peace & acts of aggression.") But how could a country, that the occupation allowed to be ravaged and pillaged, that descended into total chaos, that is totally under the control of its occupiers, be a threat to world peace?

It was the precious hope of many, that those who stood firm by the principle at the UN of the rule of law rather than the blind arrogance of power, should prevail as the guiding force in international relations and as a guarantee for our peaceful future, would stay firm on their position. They, sadly, did not, as the current resolution proves.

Canada is ALREADY involved in Star Wars

Matthew Behrens of Homes not Bombs

May 2003

Asking Canada at this stage of the game not to be part of Star Wars is a bit like asking Hell's Angels not to be involved with motorcycles. Just as bikes are a central element to the biker gang identity, so is the development of space warfare an essential part of Canadian military strategy.

In October, 1997, the U.S. and Canadian militaries signed a joint Statement of Intent for military space cooperation on the understanding that such an agreement to militarize the heavens "is in the mutual security and economic interests" of both countries. This followed on the 1994 "defence" white paper, which allowed for research and development of space warfare.

The Canadian government's Technology Investment Strategy 2000 goes even further, declaring, "**Space soon will be the fourth medium of warfare, it will not only bind all war fighting forces together but will also become strategically critical to the survival of war fighters...For future coalition warfare, space superiority will be fundamental.**"

Leading the research charge is **Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC)**, an umbrella grouping of five federally-funded research facilities that includes an Ottawa-based space warfare research and development facility (DREO).

Committed to "exploit the electromagnetic spectrum" for military purposes, DREO's website also boasts of

its capacity to develop a diverse range of war fighting technologies, including "Electronic Warfare, Information Warfare, Space Systems and Technologies for Defence Applications, Detection and Identification of NBC [nuclear, biological, chemical] Agents." (DREO stands for Defence Research Establishment Ottawa. It has since become DRDO, Defence Research and Development Ottawa. New name, same space warfare mission)

The DRDC 2001-2002 annual report notes that one outcome of the Canadian Defence Industrial Research program has been the development of products useful for, among other things, the Star Wars "Exo-Atmosphere Kill Vehicle."

In 2000, the Canadian Defence Industries Association produced a paper called, "The National Missile Defense Program: An Assessment of Market Opportunities for Canadian Industry." "Canada has the capability to support the industrial requirements of the National Missile Defense program," the report concludes. "Under the existing conditions, **Canada can expect, at a minimum, about \$270 million in NMD-related exports over the next 15 years.** With appropriate levels of Government and industry action, there is a potential for that to increase to more than \$1 billion in exports."

Thus, while public debate is framed in the narrow "should Canada join" question, *(continued on page 4)*

Star Wars (continued from page 3)

it misses the point that this country has already made a commitment to the overall framework that space will be the newest, most profitable medium for warfare

For more information, contact:

Homes not Bombs

tasc@web.ca

PO Box 73620, 509 St. Clair Ave. West, Toronto,
ON M6C 1C0

Is there anything left that matters?

By Joan Chittister, OSB

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article3565.htm>

National Catholic Reporter 5-30-2003

This is what I don't understand: All of a sudden nothing seems to matter. First, they said they wanted Bin Laden "dead or alive." But they didn't get him. So now they tell us that it doesn't matter. Our mission is greater than one man.

Then they said they wanted Saddam Hussein, "dead or alive." He's apparently alive but we haven't got him yet, either. However, President Bush told reporters recently, "It doesn't matter. Our mission is greater than one man."

Finally, they told us that we were invading Iraq to destroy their weapons of mass destruction. Now they say those weapons probably don't exist. Maybe never existed. Apparently that doesn't matter either.

Except that it does matter.

I know we're not supposed to say that. I know it's called "unpatriotic." But it's also called honesty. And dishonesty matters.

It matters that the infrastructure of a foreign nation that couldn't defend itself against us has been destroyed on the grounds that it was a military threat to the world.

It matters that it was destroyed by us under a new doctrine of "pre-emptive war" when there was apparently nothing worth pre-empting.

It surely matters to the families here whose sons went to war to make the world safe from weapons of mass destruction and will never come home.

It matters to families in the United States whose life support programs were ended, whose medical insurance ran out, whose food stamps were cut off, whose day care programs were eliminated so we could spend the money on sending an army to do what did not need to be done.

It matters to the Iraqi girl whose face was burned by a lamp that toppled over as a result of a U.S. bombing run. It matters to Ali, the Iraqi boy who lost his family - and both his arms - in a U.S. air

attack.

It matters to the people in Baghdad whose water supply is now fetid, whose electricity is gone, whose streets are unsafe, whose 158 government ministries' buildings and all their records have been destroyed, whose cultural heritage and social system has been looted and whose cities teem with anti-American protests.

It matters that the people we say we "liberated" do not feel liberated in the midst of the lawlessness, destruction and wholesale social suffering that so-called liberation created.

It matters to the United Nations whose integrity was impugned, whose authority was denied, whose inspection teams are even now still being overlooked in the process of technical evaluation and disarmament.

It matters to the reputation of the United States in the eyes of the world, both now and for decades to come, perhaps.

And surely it matters to the integrity of this nation whether or not its intelligence gathering agencies have any real intelligence or not before we launch a military armada on its say-so.

And it should matter whether or not our government is either incompetent and didn't know what they were doing or were dishonest and refused to say. The unspoken truth is that either as a people we were misled, or we were lied to, about the real reason for this war. Either we made a huge - and unforgivable - mistake, an arrogant or ignorant mistake, or we are swaggering around the world like a blind giant, flailing in all directions while the rest of the world watches in horror or in ridicule. If Bill Clinton's definition of "is" matters, surely this matters. If a president's sex life matters, surely a

(continued on page 5)

Is there anything left *(continued from page 4)*

president's use of global force against some of the weakest people in the world matters. If a president's word in a court of law about a private indiscretion matters, surely a president's word to the community of nations and the security of millions of people matters.

And if not, why not? If not, surely there is something as wrong with us as citizens, as thinkers, as Christians as there must be with some facet of the government. If wars that the public says are wrong yesterday - as over 70% of U.S. citizens did before the attack on Iraq - suddenly become "right" the minute the first bombs drop, what kind of national morality is that?

Of what are we really capable as a nation if the considered judgment of politicians and people around the world means nothing to us as a people?

What is the depth of the American soul if we can allow destruction to be done in our name and the name of "liberation" and never even demand an accounting of its costs, both personal and public, when it is over?

We like to take comfort in the notion that people

make a distinction between our government and ourselves. We like to say that the people of the world love Americans, they simply mistrust our government. But excoriating a distant and anonymous "government" for wreaking rubble on a nation in pretense of good requires very little of either character or intelligence.

What may count most, however, is that we may well be the ones Proverbs warns when it reminds us "Kings take pleasure in honest lips; they value the one who speaks the truth." The point is clear If the people speak and the king doesn't listen, there is something wrong with the king. If the king acts precipitously and the people say nothing, something is wrong with the people.

It may be time for us to realize that in a country that prides itself on being democratic, we are our government. And the rest of the world is figuring that out very quickly.

From where I stand, that matters.

A Benedictine Sister of Erie, Sister Joan is a best-selling author and well-known international lecturer

Mayor of Hiroshima's letter to Bush

His Excellency George W. Bush
The President, The White House
The United States of America ,21 April 2003

Letter of Protest

I have received a report that your administration has submitted to Congress a 2004 Defense Authorization Bill that requests funds for the development of small nuclear weapons with a yield of five kilotons or less, which development has been prohibited since 1993, and that would repeal the Furse-Spratt prohibition on the development of such weapons.

This clear indication that the United States intends to develop small nuclear weapons raises the horrifying spectre that nuclear weapons will actually be used. As mayor of the A-bombed city Hiroshima I am outraged by the barbarism that has led you not only to attack Iraq, killing or injuring thousands of innocent Iraqi citizens, but also to develop new nuclear weapons. You are trampling viciously on the hopes of the vast majority of people around the world who seek peace and, on behalf of the residents of

Hiroshima, I vehemently protest.

Coming as it does on the eve of the UN NPT Review Conference Preparatory Committee, this announcement, together with statements regarding the necessity of resuming underground testing and rapidly developing new tactical nuclear weapons, represents an extremely regrettable frontal attack on the process of nuclear disarmament.

I demand that you immediately begin demonstrating a willingness to implement the "unequivocal undertaking" to eliminate your nuclear arsenal promised at the previous NPT Review Conference, take a clear decision to terminate all nuclear testing, and devote the full strength of your great country to achieving a genuinely peaceful 21st century free from nuclear weapons.

Tadatoshi Akiba
Mayor of Hiroshima

On the Light Side

US Forms its own UN:

(Excerpted with thanks from US humor website: <http://www.theonion.com>)

WASHINGTON, DC—Frustrated with the United Nations' "consistent, blatant regard for the will of its 188 member nations," the U.S. announced Monday the formation of its own international governing body, the U.S.U.N.

The new organization will be based in Houston, where a \$400 million U.S.U.N. Building is currently under construction. The U.S.U.N. Charter, ratified unanimously by delegates in a four-minute vote Monday, sets forth the mission of the organization as "the proliferation of peace and international economic, social, and humanitarian progress through

deference to the U.S."

"The U.S.U.N. resembles the original in almost every way, right down to all the flags outside our headquarters," said Condoleezza Rice, a U.S. delegate to the U.S.U.N. "This organization will carry out peacekeeping missions all over the world, but, unlike the U.N., these missions will not be compromised by the threat of opposition by lesser nations."

More on Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction

Ed Shaffer

Below is a letter of mine, replying to a column, originally published in the *Washington Post*, which the *Vancouver Sun* reprinted. Robert Kagan is the director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, located in Washington. He had previously worked for the State Department. On October 3, 2001, less than a month after 9/11, he wrote an article "What to do about Iraq" for the *Washington Post*, in which he advocated the invasion of that country. He is also a supporter of Star Wars. In February of this year he published *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, which called for American dominance of the world. (The term, interestingly enough, "New World Order" is the one the Nazis used to define their objectives.) Henry Kissinger, as well as other like-minded hawks, praised this book.

One question undercuts accusations against Saddam

Friday, June 13, 2003

Robert Kagan cited a number of sources to show that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction ("If Bush is lying, so is everyone but Saddam," Editorial Page, June 11). Significantly, Mr. Kagan did not explain why such a ruthless, power-hungry dictator as Saddam Hussein never used them. Unless he can provide a credible answer to this question, we have to assume Saddam did not have the weapons and the leaders of the U.S. and Britain were less than frank in justifying the war.

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 Shayle Duffield, RR#1 Z-46, Bowen Island, BC V0N 1G0 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 _____