

British-led undeclared war continues against Iraq

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

“U.S.-British Planes Involved in More Violations of Iraqi Airspace”

Baghdad, July 22, INA (14:00)

Ten formations of U.S. and British warplanes on Wednesday carried out 22 sorties from Saudi Arabia, backed by an AWACS, and 4 sorties from Kuwait, backed by an A-2C.

An Iraqi Air Defense Command spokesman told INA that Iraqi anti-aircraft defenses had opened fire on the planes, which flew over areas in the provinces of Basra, Thi-Qar, Meisnam and Muthanna, forcing them to flee back to their bases.

Since Dec. 17, 1999 and up to July 21, the U.S. and British military aircraft conducted a total of 10,309 sorties from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Turkey, of which 8,430 from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

This is the dispatch communicated on the Iraqi News Agency's Web page, on July 22, 1999. It is a bulletin of war, updating the events on a daily basis, in the continuing, undeclared war of the United States and Great Britain against Iraq.

“But,” the reader might object, “why isn't my newspaper reporting on this war? And, how could there be a war, if I recently read—in my newspaper—that some new arrangement had been made at the United Nations, to lift the sanctions? Didn't I read that the Clinton administration supported the initiative, and that for the first time, Washington was talking about lifting these sanctions?”

Yes, reader, that may be what your newspaper told you. However, your newspaper was lying to you, and it was not the first time. The real story is completely different, a story of a war which defies all norms of justice or logic. It is a war, whose purpose it is, to replace the process of politics, or of diplomacy, with the brute force of military power. Thus, it is a conflict provoked and conducted in order to establish the implementation of what was presented last April in Washington, D.C., as the “new NATO doctrine.” It is a war conducted to assert the hegemony of an Anglo-American oligarchy, as its only response to the imminent demise of its financial empire.

The new UN doctrine

What appeared in the international press in June, was the news that the United Nations Security Council was preparing debate on a resolution regarding the sanctions regime against Iraq. The resolution was drafted by the British and the Dutch, and presented as an initiative to “loosen” the restrictive sanctions regime. The substance of the proposal, was to re-create a UN inspections team, like the old discredited UN Special Commission (UNSCOM), this time under a new, high-falutin' name. The purpose of the new organism would be to conduct intrusive inspections of Iraq's supposed weapons production sites, and report back to the UN.

Following the routine established by UNSCOM under British intelligence agent Richard Butler, the new agency would identify sites to search which it knew would be considered off-limits by the Iraqi government, force itself into such sites, and loudly protest that Baghdad was “not cooperating” with the UN. This, once documented in a few cases, with dates and names, would be compiled in the form of a report to the UN Security Council, which, in turn, would issue a condemnation of Saddam Hussein's behavior. Such steps would pave the way for escalating the military conflict, in the direction of the attacks scheduled for February and November 1998, and January 1999.

The British-Dutch resolution was prepared months in advance, with the creation of three “panels” inside the UN, which were to review the Iraqi situation in the wake of UNSCOM's unceremonious departure from the country. The new “panel of experts” produced a report at the end of March, recommending a refurbished monitoring operation, with more nationalities represented, outside experts, and independent funding. The report said, “The substantive relationship with intelligence providers should be one-way only,” i.e., that intelligence on presumed weapons capabilities should be reported to the UN only. The specification was necessary, considering the notorious spying done by UNSCOM for Israel, the U.K., and the United States, under the former arrangement. The other two panels were to deal with the humanitarian situation and the issue of Kuwaiti reparations.

Even before all the panels had presented their reports, the British launched a proposal, ostensibly to upgrade the

Now we have a very, very sad story. According to the statistics of the UN, Iraq is the poorest country in the world now—even poorer than a lot of countries in Africa or in Asia. Besides this, of course, you have the ugly, tragic stories of deprivation and sickness.—relief organizer Muthanna Hanooti

humanitarian program in Iraq. What British Ambassador Sir Jeremy Greenstock presented to the UN, was a scheme for blocking any Iraqi oil exports eluding direct UN control, under the “oil-for-food” program. The Iraqis were quick to recognize that the new proposal meant even greater controls over the country’s economy. “It is clear that the unofficial British paper,” said an Iraqi Information Ministry spokesman, “aims at imposing a complete tutelage on Iraq . . . and holding its people hostage to the unjust embargo forever.” He added, “All that is missing from this paper, is to nominate Britain as the guardian of the Iraqi people.” He went on, “The British movement is suspicious and malicious because the Security Council is still waiting for the presentations of the three panels it formed on Iraq.”

Then, in May, the British sat down with their Dutch partners, and pulled together their draft resolution which was presented in June. This was handed over to the Clinton administration, whose representative to the UN okayed it. Then it was foisted on the American public, through the all-too-willing media, as a wonderful humanitarian gesture, aimed at relieving the plight of the Iraqi population under sanctions. The basis for this fraud, was the idea that the amount of oil Iraq was allowed to sell, in the oil-for-food program, would be increased. However, at the same time, Iraq’s ability to import was to be further restricted.

The other important feature of the British-Dutch initiative, which has been utterly ignored in media accounts, is that it is intended to replace or preempt any other, more serious initiatives, presented by the remaining three permanent members of the Security Council—Russia, China, and France. Moscow, in fact, has been demanding an end to the sanctions, in an orderly fashion, and has received support from Beijing and also Paris, which has drafted its own proposal. In fact, the Russian representative to the UN, Sergei Lavrov, rejected the British ploy, saying, “The British-Dutch proposal is a great step backward, and is far from [UN] Resolution 687, which states that the embargo is unconditionally lifted when weapons of mass destruction are demolished.”

The British reckon that they can organize a horse-trading process within the UN leadership, and debate the issue into the ground. Whether an agreement emerges from the process, is essentially irrelevant; because, as the events of December 1998 showed, the U.K. and its colleagues in the United States will continue their military aggression against Iraq, in any

TABLE 1
Total number of deaths due to Iraq embargo, selected causes

Year	Age groups		Total
	Under 5	Over 5	
1989	7,110	20,224	27,334
1990	8,903	23,561	32,464
1991	27,473	58,469	85,942
1992	46,933	76,530	123,463
1993	49,762	78,261	128,023
1994	52,905	80,776	133,681
1995	55,823	82,961	138,784
1996	56,997	83,284	140,281
1997	58,845	85,942	144,787
1998	71,279	88,760	160,039
1999 January-May	29,282	42,561	72,343
Grand total	438,702	701,105	1,159,807

Selected causes

Under 5 mortality

1. Respiratory infection
2. Diarrhea and gastroenteritis
3. Malnutrition

Over 5 mortality

1. Cardiac diseases
2. Hypertension
3. Diabetes mellitus
4. Renal diseases
5. Liver diseases
6. Malignant neoplasms

Infant mortality rate = 92.7 per 1,000 live births

Maternal mortality rate = 117 per 100,000 births

case. The only purpose of the entire United Nations charade is to prevent any effective Russian or Chinese move from changing the game. Given that the same Anglo-American force directly and indirectly targetted Russia and China during the recent Balkans war, they appear to be convinced that they can prevail in the Security Council farce sessions, without facing an outright veto from Moscow or Beijing. Essentially, as an unstated corollary to the new NATO doctrine, which decreed that NATO could attack anywhere and any time it liked, there was a “new UN doctrine” slipped in as a footnote, whereby that body acquiesces to being

rendered impotent, irrelevant, nonexistent.

Thus, the bombing is to continue, more or less every day, in southern and northern Iraq. The so-called “no-fly zones” imposed by the French, British, and Americans after the war, and kept in force by the U.K.-U.S. warplanes in the region, will continue to be used as the pretext for aerial bombardments.

The real costs of the war

With world public opinion lulled by the press into believing that some “progress” is being made toward lifting the sanctions imposed on Iraq, actually the opposite is true. And, the continuation of the embargo over the past nine years, has not produced linear effects on the population. It is not the case, in other words, that the country, cordoned off from trade with the rest of the world, has somehow become accustomed to it, and achieved autarky to satisfy the needs of the population. On the contrary, with each passing day and week, the situation worsens in the country, as a vicious, entropic spiral has taken hold. The initial aggression in 1990-91 destroyed infrastructure, paralyzing the economic and social life. The continued sanctions prevented Iraq from restoring its infrastructure, especially crucial areas like sanitation, fresh water and food supplies, and health. In addition, the deployment of deadly weapons, including depleted uranium shells that were dropped on Iraq, introduced a new factor into the destructive process, whereby the soil and water of the country were essentially poisoned, with effects on health that became manifest only over time.

As Muthanna Hanooti describes in painstaking detail (see interview), the population of Iraq has become prisoner in what *EIR* has compared to a vast concentration camp: Deprived of adequate food, water, and hygienic conditions, people’s health has deteriorated and their resistance to disease has waned. Struck by illness—any illness, even the most common—people suffer, wither, and die, simply because they are deprived access to the most basic medical treatment. For serious illnesses, such as cardiac disease, kidney disease, or cancer, for example, there is by definition no hope: Without treatment, people will die.

Iraq’s population is being subjected to genocide. That is the effect, and that is the intention of the combined sanctions policy and military aggression. Iraq is being subjected to genocide, because it has refused to buckle under and accept the dictates of the “new NATO doctrine,” and its corollaries. Yet, as in the past, those in a position to halt the mass murder, “do not know” what is going on, or do not wish to know. This is the case emphatically of the members of the United States Congress, who have not bothered to find out, to visit Iraq on a fact-finding mission, and report back on what the reality is.

Why should they bother? they ask themselves. Aren’t “our boys” in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Turkey making sure that Saddam doesn’t start any trouble? Thus, war has replaced politics.

Interview: Muthanna Hanooti

Iraq has become a death camp because of the UN embargo

Mr. Hanooti is the head of the Michigan-based Arab-American organization called Life for Relief and Development. He was interviewed in June by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach.

EIR: Can you tell me what Life for Relief and Development is, when it was founded, and what it does?

Hanooti: The organization is basically a charitable humanitarian organization. It has the category of 501(c)(3) [a registered tax-exempt charity]. It was established in 1993 to meet the needs of the victims of the embargo, or the blockade in Iraq. So, it started just for that—I mean, as a focus.

Then, with time, we realized, especially in the United States, we cannot help just one country. We have to work with different countries, especially when it comes to emergencies. So, now, we’ve expanded to accommodate more than five countries.

But, still, the focus is on Iraq. We just added a country in West Africa, Sierra Leone, and other emergencies; like, for instance, the Kosovar refugees—we have a refugee camp in a city in Albania called Peqin.

So, whenever there’s an emergency, we try to do something, as we did earlier with Bosnia, Kashmir, Lebanon, and Palestine.

But still, I would say about 80% of the focus is on Iraq. Basically, the work is to try to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people and save some lives, though we know that our work with all the NGOs [non-governmental organizations] working in Iraq, meets about 5% of the needs of the people. But still, we believe that we have a key role when it comes to helping the people.

As you know, according to the United Nations statistics, the situation in Iraq is beyond description now.

EIR: When were you most recently in Iraq?

Hanooti: Most recently, I was there in October. And I’ll be there by the end of this month.

EIR: Can you tell me how the situation is, as you saw it?

Hanooti: Actually, this last visit was the seventh visit after the embargo. The way I see it, everything is getting worse and worse each time. Basically, we thought that this oil-for-food program, or UN Resolution 986, would make it better, but for