

We May Attack Iraq this Spring

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE: THE TEACHING OF THE KORAN / CATHOLIC HOMOSEXUAL SCANDALS
MULTIPLY / NEARING A NATIONAL ID CARD

I am writing this on February 26. The press is rather silent on the subject, but there are hints that President Bush is preparing for war; and that it may start within a few weeks or this spring, at the latest. It may already have begun by the time you receive this mailing. Because this is a matter that affects all of us, I will briefly provide you with some information.

- Word has leaked from the White House that President Bush wants to eliminate Saddam Hussein prior to January 2005, when his own term ends. Uncertain whether he will be reelected, Bush is convinced that now is the ideal time to get rid of Saddam; and that it would be much more difficult later and unlikely that a later president would tackle the job.

- Right now we have a relatively huge military force massed in the Near East. It is costly to keep it stationed there; and if an attack is to be made—it should be done very soon. This is a crucial factor in the timing. Otherwise, we need to begin bringing our men and equipment back to the States.

- Military experts have stated that the spring of the year is the ideal time to wage war in the Near East.

- In his January 29 State of the Union address, Bush called Iran and Iraq, along with North Korea, “an axis of evil,” aiding terrorists and arming themselves with weapons of mass destruction, “to threaten the peace of the world.”

- It is highly significant that the vast majority of the American public are not objecting to those militaristic words.

- In order to test whether the American people would be opposed to such an operation, a steadily increasing amount of subsequent “war talk” has since been made. To date, the public are solidly behind their president “in his war on terrorism.”

- Many in the Pentagon have been frustrated that Bush, Sr., did not complete the job during the Gulf War. Especially since September 11, our military is clearly ready for this, an even bigger war.

- On February 15, Vice President Richard Cheney told the Council on Foreign Relations that Iraq is developing fearful weapons and is harboring terrorists such as Abu Nidal. Therefore it has

to be a nation which the U.S. military focuses on. He added that we will use all means at our disposal to eliminate the problem.

- Condoleezza Rice, National Security Advisor, in a television interview on February 3, said, “We’ve seen, in this war on terrorists, that speaking plainly is the way to rally people, not the other way around . . . These countries are a clear and present threat to us and to all of the responsible and civilized world . . . Because they spread and support terror around the world, and proliferate weapons . . . They’ve been on notice for some time . . . [Bush’s] speech was a call to the international community, to our friends and our allies, to do what all of us must do in terms of cutting off the vehicles for these regimes to get these weapons.”

- There is a definite possibility that a war on Iraq might be followed by an engagement with Iran; but, of course, that might not happen.

- For fear of a general Arab uprising, the U.S. government has, for years, hesitated to take overt military action in the Middle East. But events in the last few months have revealed that there may be little to fear from that possibility. Neither the other Muslim nations, nor their inhabitants, stand around and complain. As with everyone else in the world, they are astonished at the display of our technological military superiority.

- Although a majority of the American public is solidly backing Bush’s militancy, European allies are not. This could delay the attack for a time while efforts are made to bring other nations, especially the British, on board.

- Bush could attack Somalia first. That possibility has been mentioned. The reason we lost the last war with them was Clinton’s mousy decision to send in very little firepower and equipment. A nice win there would add to American resolve; but there is danger that, if it developed into a lingering quagmire, this would render a subsequent attack on Iraq more problematic.

Here are additional facts:

- Last week, the Pentagon announced that it was moving the Marine commander for Central Asia from Hawaii to Bahrain. This transfer will consolidate the top combat branches of the four service

branches at forward battle stations along the Persian Gulf.

- With military operations in Afghanistan winding down, U.S. forces in Central Asia remain strongly in place and are not being sent home. In addition to Marine and Navy commands in Bahrain, the Army command in Kuwait and the Air Force command in Saudi Arabia are bolstered with 1,000 war logisticians. Each morning at 11 a.m., Eastern Standard Time, the four commands teleconference with General Tommy Franks, who directs the unified Central Command from his headquarters at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida.

This command covers 25 nations from the Horn of Africa to Central Asia, including Iraq, and is well-acquainted with how to carry on such multitasking operations successfully. The Tampa command managed the successful Operation Desert Storm, as well as a besieged military intervention in Somalia.

- In his State of the Union address, Bush named names, thus opening the door to a confrontation that could include military action, especially against Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. He said, "The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons." Arms proliferation experts have long cited those three nations as secretly producing and selling such weapons.

- *Regarding North Korea*, at a UN Conference on Disarmament, Undersecretary of State John Bolton told reporters it is "just a fantasy" to say that North Korea is living up to an agreement to halt nuclear weapons production. That pact, made with the Clinton administration in 1994, would give North Korea two nuclear power generators in exchange for an end to weapons making. But defectors, including a nuclear weapons researcher who fled to China late last year, say Pyongyang instead moved its nuclear program to underground bunkers away from U.S. inspectors.

I predict that the U.S. will not dare to attack North Korea because China would surely become involved, as it did in the Korean War. Far more dangerous is China itself, but Bush was careful not to name that country as the fourth of the terrible nations. If time were to last, our war with China would come later.

- *Regarding Iran*, its alliance with Russia and with opposition groups in Afghanistan, including open hostility toward the Taliban, hinted at the possibility of improved relations toward the U.S. But the fact remains that Iran is a major weapons supplier in the Near East.

Since April 2001, sixty parliamentarians in Iran have been summoned to court on political charges;

many have received prison sentences and heavy fines. "Iran is the mother of all terrorism," Michael Leedeon, resident scholar at American Enterprise Institute recently said.

If we have to invade Iraq, it will be a terrible and costly war; but, if we take on Iran after that, as some believe we may, our losses could be even heavier.

- *And then there is Iraq*. It has been steadily amassing chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. No UN arms inspectors have been there since December 1998.

- An increasing number of calls for action against Saddam Hussein is coming from both Republican and Democrat legislators on Capital Hill. Even Henry Kissinger is for it.

- Earlier this month during a visit to America, Muhammad Jassem al-Saqer, chairman of the Kuwait Parliament's foreign affairs committee, told U.S. officials, "The clock is ticking; the later you move [to get rid of Saddam], the more dangerous he becomes."

- Meanwhile prior to Bush's speech, on January 17 in Iraq, Saddam said in a nationwide speech, "The United States [since September 11] is a metropolis of force that is going headlong in antagonizing the world. It is an untamable horse that will be killed if it is let loose without rider or rein to control it . . . Breaking loose [in warfare on Islamic nations] will definitely be neck-breaking for the United States. It is the road to its collapse towards the abyss."

- If we do try to invade Iraq this spring, you can expect that Israel will be bombed—and they will then also begin attacking Iraq. This could significantly enlarge the scope of the war, since many Middle East nations deeply hate Israel. Because it is so very close to Baghdad, it is very possible that our military may use Israel as a key staging area for their attack.

- It is of interest that no one mentions one little item: It was obvious to me, at the time, that Bush, Sr., terminated the Gulf War in one hundred days, before the war had hardly started; this was because, if Iraq was crippled too badly,—Iran might afterward invade it and unite the two oil-rich nations into one!

If Bush, Jr., now completes what his father did not finish, the same danger would exist.

I do not normally write articles of this nature. But I would think you might want to know that we are on the verge of an international war, far bigger and more dangerous than the one we just completed.

The Teachings of the Koran

Some call Islam the most peace-loving religion in the world. Others call it the most violence-ridden one. Who is right? Go to the holy book of Islam, the *Koran*, and find out for yourself. You will be surprised what you will learn. The complete text of the Koran is

available on a number of websites, including the following:

hti.umich.edu/k/koran.html

usc.edu/dept/MSA/reference/searchquran.html

Here are some of the commands in this unusual book:

Have nothing to do with Christians or Jews, who are evil people—“O you who believe! Do not take the Jews and the Christians for friends; they are friends of each other; and whoever amongst you takes them for a friend, then surely he is one of them; surely Allah does not guide the unjust people.”—*Sura 5:51*.

Have nothing to do with blacks—“On the day when [some] faces shall turn white and [some] faces shall turn black; then as to those whose faces turn black; Did you disbelieve after your believing? Taste therefore the chastisement because you disbelieved. And as to those whose faces turn white, they shall be in Allah’s mercy; in it they shall abide.”—*Sura 3:106-107*.

Kill the unbelievers—“So when the sacred months have passed away, then slay the idolators wherever you find them, and take them captives and besiege them and lie in wait for them in every ambush.”—*Sura 9:5*.

If they resist—“The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and His apostle and strive to make mischief in the land is only this, that they should be murdered or crucified or their hands and their feet should be cut off on opposite sides or they should be imprisoned.”—*Sura 5:33*.

Finish them off completely—“Strive hard against the unbelievers and the hypocrites and be unyielding to them; and their abode is hell, and evil is the destination.”—*Sura 9:73*.

Our god will reward you for your efforts—“And let not those who disbelieve think that they shall come in first; surely they will not escape. And prepare against them what force you can on horses tied at the frontier, to frighten thereby the enemy of Allah and your enemy and others besides them, whom you do not know [but] Allah knows them; and whatever thing you will spend in Allah’s way, it will be paid back to you fully and you shall not be dealt with unjustly.”—*Sura 8:59-60*.

CATHOLIC HOMOSEXUAL SCANDALS MULTIPLY

As we disclosed in an earlier in-depth report, homosexuals are taking over the Roman Catholic priesthood (*Catholic Priests and Homosexuality—Part 1-2 [WM-1032-1033]*). Young gays know that, if they become priests, they will have abundant opportunities for contacts with fellow priests and altar boys. And it is now costing the church a lot of money. Here is a brief report on the latest news:

“A scandal that has already cost the Roman Catholic Church dearly in moral authority is beginning to take a serious economic toll.

“In a landmark agreement in Ireland last week, the church offered \$110 million to compensate thousands of victims of sexual and physical abuse that occurred over several decades in church-run schools there. Meanwhile, a Tucson, Arizona, diocese settled for an undisclosed sum with former altar boys who said they were molested by their priest, a quiet deal that typifies how these cases are handled in the U.S.

“Less common is the very public court battle for John Geoghan, a priest who has so far cost the Archdiocese of Boston more than \$10 million to settle just some of pedophilia suits he faces.

“A *Boston Globe* investigation revealed last week that as many as 70 priests in Boston came to the

attention of church officials there in sex-abuse allegations—a potentially massive pool of victims who could bring suits.

“ ‘The financial impact of these cases is severe,’ says Mark Chopko, general counsel for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. Chopko points to fragile relationships with skittish insurers and to a Santa Fe, New Mexico, diocese that was nearly bankrupted in the early 1990s by sex-abuse suits there.

“Not everyone is buying the pleas of poverty, however. ‘The way you browbeat people into taking less money is to convince them there isn’t any,’ says Fred Halstrom, a Boston lawyer representing a plaintiff in a sex-abuse suit there. ‘But the Catholic Church worldwide has immense assets.’

“The Vatican itself doesn’t cut checks or direct legal strategies to its diocese around the world. But it is hammering out new procedures for handling future abuse allegations in a ‘desire to coordinate actions in these delicate matters,’ says Monsignor Tarcisio Bertone, a Vatican official.

“The Vatican’s new involvement has a potential danger: It could actually make its deep pockets more vulnerable to those seeking damages down the road.”—*Time*, February 11, 2002.

NEARING A NATIONAL ID CARD

After September 11, the Bush Administration has sought desperately for every possible way to protect the nation against terrorism. One is a proposal to create a mandatory national identification card. It has caught the interest of government leaders.

In mid-October, U.S. Attorney General, John Ashcroft, asked Mr. Ellison, the chairman and CEO of Oracle, to fly to Washington to confer with him about implementing the idea. Recognizing that such a plan would bring increased employment to her district, Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif) has given it her strong endorsement. Other cybertech executives have eagerly jumped on the bandwagon, and even some prominent civil libertarians (normally opposed to privacy invasion) are seriously considering the idea.

Ellison’s plan, which may be made mandatory before the year is out, would involve a national ID card that everyone in America would have to carry.

On October 29, the Pentagon began passing out the first high-tech ID cards. Soon these cards will be in the hands of all four million military and civilian defense workers. The size of a credit card, it will allow the holder to access secure Defense Websites, log into computers, digitally encrypt and sign e-mail, open secure doors, get cash, buy food, and even check out weapons and military hardware.

This “smart card,” a variant of which will eventually be in the hands of every American, has a bar code, circuit chip, and magnetic strip. It stores a person’s digital picture, fingerprint, and personal identification number; this can quickly be deactivated if lost. Medical data may also be encoded.

Similar smart cards are already being used in Europe, South Africa, and Argentina.