

U.N. imposes death sentence on Iraq

by Joseph Brewda

The United Nations Security Council revealed what the "new world order" means for the Third World in the cease-fire demands on Iraq that it adopted, in a 12-to-1 vote, on April 3. The conditions demanded in Resolution 687 would usurp sovereign powers properly retained by the government of Iraq and relegate them to the U.N. These powers include the right to set debt repayment policy and economic development policy, the right to engage in bilateral negotiation on its boundary disputes without external interference, and retain sole control over its oil fields. If Iraq were to accept the resolution it would, in effect, become a U.N.-administered trusteeship, and serve as a model for a new type of colonialism. If Iraq rejects the cease-fire resolution it faces renewed war, and certainly a continuing blockade of food and medical shipments to its war-ravaged population.

The pretext for the U.S.-led and U.N.-sanctioned war against Iraq had been the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait that began Aug. 2, 1990. On Aug. 2, the U.N. Security Council, under pressure of the U.S. and British governments, rammed through Resolution 660, which demanded that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait. All other resolutions passed by that body since that period were formally adopted to enforce that withdrawal, including Resolution 678 which authorized war with Iraq to enforce that withdrawal.

Now that the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait has ended, and instead, U.S. forces occupy Iraq, the U.N. has shifted its demands to focus on areas that formally have nothing to do with the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait or prior resolutions, but everything to do with the real motivation of the war.

An exercise in eliminating sovereignty

While Resolution 687 focuses solely on Iraq, the demands it makes are those that the U.S. and Britain have long demanded be enforced against the entire Third World. Now

that Iraq has been destroyed, the enforcement of this resolution is meant to prevent Iraq from ever rebuilding, and at the same time provide a model for future demands against other Third World states. States that are high on this list include Brazil, Argentina, India, Pakistan, Nigeria, and Indonesia, and any others with significant development potential.

Among the resolution's demands are that Iraq "scrupulously adhere" to the payment of its foreign debt obligations, which total billions of dollars as a result of the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq war. The U.S. and Britain had armed both Iran and Iraq during that war in order to ruin both countries, but especially to ruin Iraq. The U.N. imperiously declared in its resolution that Iraq's previous repudiation of this war-incurred debt was "null and void," a precedent for related measures against other Third World states needing debt relief.

In a related measure, the resolution would establish a U.N.-administered mechanism whereby an unspecified percentage of Iraq's oil revenue (which had accounted for almost all of its foreign exchange earnings) would be diverted to paying "reparations" for damages to Kuwait and other nations incurred in the war. Kuwait has already demanded some \$60 billion in reparations. This measure would effectively reimpose the type of looting of natural resources of oil-producing nations which existed prior to the foundation of OPEC and the nationalization of foreign-controlled oil fields. Now that the U.S. is militarily occupying the Gulf's oil fields, that nationalization has been reversed.

On the military side, the resolution would impose a total international ban on the sale of any arms of any kind to Iraq, thereby destroying the Iraqi military. The resolution also calls for the systematic destruction of Iraqi missiles and other weapons which the U.N. terms "aggressive." The elimination of Iraqi military capacity leaves the nuclear-armed Anglo-American client state of Israel as the remaining regional power.

Banning Third World development

More importantly, the resolution would impose an international ban on the sale of technology to Iraq which could conceivably be used in the manufacture of weapons. Since any modern plant—for example, a fertilizer plant or truck plant—could also produce chemical poisons and military jeeps, this provision would ensure that Iraq will never again become an industrializing nation.

That this measure is intended for the entire Third World is otherwise indicated by the Bush administration's Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative, an administrative procedure which will take effect in mid-April. The initiative will extend severe restrictions, including export licenses, on the U.S. sale of supposed weapons-producing technology to the Third World.

The U.N. also demands that Iraq agree to the Geneva Protocol banning the production of chemical and biological weapons—a protocol not adhered to by Israel, the United States, or any other permanent member of the Security Council. Iraq would further be compelled to accept U.N. or related international agency personnel on its territory to inspect its factories to ensure compliance with this protocol. The U.N. also demands that Iraq reaffirm its compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—which implicitly outlaws the production of nuclear weapons by non-white-ruled states—and to allow inspection of its industrial facilities by U.N. agents deployed to ensure compliance. The wording of the resolution makes clear that Iraq will never be allowed to build or purchase nuclear power plants or research reactors.

On the political side, the resolution demands that Iraq refuse to accept "terrorist organizations" on its territory, a reference to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and other organizations unwanted by the new world order. The U.N. also demands that Iraq denounce "terrorism," a vague term typically used against opponents of imperialism.

The resolution also demands that Iraq accept U.N.-dictated borders with Kuwait, despite the fact that no Iraqi government—whether royalist, Soviet-backed, or Baathist—has ever recognized the existence of Kuwait, which the British had seized in 1898 from the Arab lands which became Iraq. This is the first time that the Security Council has ever taken it upon itself to dictate international borders. It is intended to be a precedent for related measures against other Third World states.

Following the vote, a gloating U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Thomas Pickering, called the resolution "tough but fair," while Soviet Ambassador Yuli Vorontsov stated that the resolution was "a serious warning to all those who might be tempted to commit aggression."

While Iraq, as of April 5, has not yet indicated whether or not it will accept the resolution, the Iraqi newspaper *Al Jumhuriyah* termed its "an American resolution designed to impose direct hegemony on the region and control the world's resources and wealth," in its commentary on April 4.

The U.N. war on Iraq systematically destroyed the prerequisites of modern life, not sparing bridges, irrigation pumps, sewage plants, power plants, telephone relay stations, or food production or processing plants or warehouses, and inflicted an estimated \$150 billion in damage to Iraqi infrastructure. Moreover, according to the estimates of Patriarch Raphael Bidawid, the leader of Iraq's Chaldean Catholic community, possibly 500,000 Iraqi civilians and soldiers were killed in the war. Iraq is in no condition to comply with any U.N. demands.

Committed to mass murder

Even a March report by U.N. Undersecretary General Martii Ahtisaari (see page 46) demonstrates that without emergency assistance Iraq faces epidemics and famine. Without a massive airlift of food and medicine, and the restoration of Iraq's sewage and water systems, several other experts estimate, millions of Iraqis will die over the coming months.

Yet, because Iraq might not comply with U.N. demands, or, more likely, to make Iraq an even more horrible example of what happens to those who resist them, the U.N. Security Council is considering further demands of Iraq intended to provide a pretext to reopen the war.

One way the war may be reopened is over the supposed international concern over the repression of Kurdish rebels in northern Iraq. The Kurds are a non-Arab people living in an area that straddles parts of Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and Syria. They had been provoked into revolt by the intelligence agencies of the U.S., Britain, France, Israel, Iran, Turkey, and Syria, as part of the effort to destroy Iraq. The strength of the rebellion and related deaths caused by it appears to be being systematically exaggerated by Western media in order to obscure the real reason for the mass death in Iraq: the U.S. Air Force.

On the same day that the Security Council adopted its demands of Iraq, French President François Mitterrand told the French cabinet that "the political and moral authority of the United Nations" would be badly damaged if the Security Council failed to condemn Iraq's effort to suppress these rebels.

For his part, George Bush told the *New York Times* that day that "I feel frustrated any time innocent civilians are being slaughtered," in reference to the suppression of the Kurdish revolt. Bush said that he did not feel that this supposed slaughter of Kurds demanded a U.S. military response—at this time.

Meanwhile, others are demanding that Saddam Hussein step down as President of Iraq, if Iraq is ever to receive food or medicine again. Following the Security Council resolution vote, British Ambassador Sir David Hannay cited the Kurdish revolt and said, "My government believes it will be impossible for Iraq to rejoin the family of civilized nations while Saddam Hussein remains in power."