

Letters on US war plans against Iraq

5 October 2002

Dear Editor,

Thanks for the continuing coverage of the looming catastrophe in the Middle East. Whereas the liberal press continually implores the US and British governments to obtain the UN's approval before waging war against Iraq, the WSWS has from the outset adopted a principled stance against this war, no matter the pretext under which it will be waged.

Yours,
EG

19 September 2002

We, in the trenches, have known from day one (9-11-01) Bush cronies will wage war to get what they want—control of Middle East oil. You think the Enron debacle was bad, wait until the US military-industrial complex (including the Bushes, Cheneys, and Rumsfelds) get world control over oil. The price we are paying for oil will be nothing compared to what the Cheneys of the world will do to feed their greed. Maybe this will force us to reduce our oil dependency and demand alternatives.

MB

18 September 2002

I totally agree on what you say about Bush using the war on Iraq to cover the problems that he has created in the interest of his rich buddies. He doesn't seem to know when to stop. He is obsessed with war and after Iraq it will be some other country which incurs his wrath. The rich get richer and the poor masses get poorer. I am personally insulted by the regime in the White House at the moment. I feel that the German justice minister said the right thing and should stick by her guns.

TH

23 September 2002

Thank you very much for the thoughtful analysis of the US media's role in pressing for military action against Iraq and establishing an imperialist discourse of deceit about the United States' supposed "civilising mission". The idea that the Republicans could recognise, never mind create, a "progressive" government is typically ludicrous.

In Britain we have been treated to the propaganda of Blair's dossier on weapons of mass destruction. Apparently the regime of Iraq could eventually attack Cyprus if its

experiments are successful! There is as yet no compelling evidence that the dictator is committed to such an atrocity, but that does not bother the British prime minister.

There should be dossiers produced about the misconduct and misdeeds of Britain, Israel and the United States. Unfortunately such dossiers could not be confined to 55 pages!

Even though many ordinary British people are instinctively against the war, none of the main political parties has unambiguously opposed the proposed latest stage of the extension of the American government's empire. Britain remains a client state, riding happily in the wake of the United States, kept buoyant by copious amounts of hypocrisy.

Ordinary people around the world must try to resist the new imperialism which is just as pernicious as the old. Our elites seem to be reaching new levels of cynicism and corruption. Socialist solutions seem the only answers to the global problems caused by concentration of wealth and power without responsibility or conscience.

JL

25 September 2002

Regarding your article dated 18 September 2002 "The Bush administration wants war": In the lacuna left by the collapse of the Soviet Union, in terms of a balance of power, the US feels unchallenged to carry out the not-so-hidden agenda of the conservative party which is in power now. The conservative party in the United States has always served as a facade for the more radical right-wing elements and it's easy to see that the foreign policy of the US is a manifestation of the party's own agenda.

Back in 1991 they used Saddam's annexation of Kuwait as a pretext, and now they claim to wage a war against terrorism. Saddam has been accused of many things, most of which are in all probability true, but what one can't accuse Saddam, and by extension the Iraqis, of is Islamic fundamentalism. Before "Desert Storm," those in the know say, the nightlife in Baghdad could rival that of any major European city. This fact doesn't seem to jibe with the image of Spartan, radical Islam.

With the attacks on the US last year, the Americans have awakened to the fact that they are not invincible. Countering

terrorism is one thing but using it as a pretext to accomplish one's own imperialist goals is another.

The US wants to check Iraq's stockpile of weapons, fine! But as a concerned citizen of the world, I would like to see the weapon stockpiles of the following nations examined:

1. United States of America
 2. Russia
 3. North Korea
 4. China
 5. India
 6. Pakistan
 7. Uzbekistan
 8. Kyrgyzstan
- among others...

Military action by the US against Iraq could prove disastrous; it will result in the suppression of legitimate struggles. Under the pretext of preventing terrorism, it will set a precedent for other regimes to follow in America's footsteps and of course it will embolden the US to make forays into other territories.

Regards,
RP

18 September 2002

On "What really happened to the League of Nations"

David North,

Thank you so much for this article. I thought Will was reaching pretty far back to justify a US invasion of Iraq, but, not being the student of American history I should be, I couldn't rebut his argument. Your response clarifies the matter and turns the table on Will. We certainly are acting in parallel with Italy.

I fear that we are on course to go down just like the Titanic. We have so much pride about being able to fight a war without Europe, to go the unilateral route. And yet look at our unraveling economy. I would bet that for every WorldCom and Enron exposed there are at least a hundred companies committing the same abuses. The commanders of the Titanic wanted to press on and arrive in New York ahead of schedule. Their ambition and will to power blinded them to the huge iceberg in their path. In our path, however, lies a more subtle and destructive force, to which our leaders are totally blind. Thanks again.

RM

20 September 2002

Dear Editor,

I particularly enjoyed Mr. North's article today. Of course, people like Mr. Will depend upon the historical ignorance which is so pervasive today. However, Mr. Will and other pundits do not only depend upon the large-scale ignorance of history, but actively cultivate it.

What is astonishing though is that there is such widespread

ignorance about a relatively recent historical event, namely the Second World War and the events leading up to it. To anyone who has a knowledge of this period, it should immediately be clear that Saddam Hussein is not Adolf Hitler, and that the actions of the USA closely resemble the methods of the Nazis. However, Mr. Will and his ilk have been hard at work, attempting to erase historical fact and erect, in its place, a cardboard cut-out replica.

Yours,

EG

20 September 2002

Hello,

Thanks for your article "US, UK warplanes bomb civilian airport in Iraq", which I read with great interest. Truly horrifying, it certainly implies that the US will push through its plans for attacking Iraq regardless of what happens in the UN. (Not that a Security Council resolution could ever justify putting the Iraqis through such misery.)

I have one question regarding the article, which I was hoping you might be able to answer. You write that Pentagon planners have projected the civilian death toll at tens of thousands—could you send me a reference for this? I've heard others make the same claim, and whereas I don't doubt it, I would like to know where the figures come from. This is important for me when engaging in discussions and participating in public debate here in Denmark.

Again, thanks for the inspiring—although depressing—writing. Keep up the good work.

TC

27 September 2002

Thank you for a most informative article. It is foolish to believe that Bush and associates believe that the war with Iraq can be won with missiles alone. As a vet of both Korea and Vietnam, I know that young Americans will be coming home in body bags. Both Bush and Cheney should be compelled to bury each and every one.

Thank you,

RC

28 September 2002



To contact the WSWS and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact