

---

Subject: "U.S. government objectives in Iraq"  
Posted by [sg]theOne on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 23:02:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You should click on over to my thread on a trip down memory lane with Saddam & the UN here.

Allow me to quote from this thread to dispell the steaming coils you've laid before us that 'Saddam doesn't have any weapons'.

IAEA report to UN on July 21st 1995  
--THIS IS IN RELATION Resolutions 687&751 of 1991--  
[http://www.iaea.org/worldatom/Programmes/ActionTeam/reports/s\\_1995\\_604.pdf](http://www.iaea.org/worldatom/Programmes/ActionTeam/reports/s_1995_604.pdf)  
(Pages 3 and 4)

programme and present situation,  
a large number of errors and inconsistencies have been identified in the documents, typified by the following:

Linguistic correctness and conformity with Iraqi practice:  
These documents contain technical wording which differs from that

conformance with  
standard Iraqi usage.  
Conformity of layout and construction of documents with established  
Iraqi practices:

The layout of the documents is not consistent with contemporary Iraqi  
usage. In addition, the documents reveal errors in construction,  
suggesting poor adaptation of authentic Iraqi documents.

Scientific validity:

Some technical elements of the programme, inferred from the documents,  
have been assessed as unlikely by experts from Nuclear Weapon States. Some of those  
elements are also  
inconsistent with available information on the status of Iraq's clandestine programme during the  
last years  
of the programme.

Accuracy:

Significant inaccuracies in qualifications, titles and names of  
individuals, as well as in technical and administrative organizational  
structures, have been clearly established.

As a result of this investigation, the IAEA has reached the conclusion  
that, on the basis of all evidence available, these documents are not authentic. Furthermore, no  
credible  
evidence was found to suggest that the activities reported in these documents were or are being  
carried out in Iraq.

(--"the activities reported" being Iraq's supposed destruction of weapons of mass destruction

WHEN NO ONE WAS LOOKING AND NO ONE  
TOOK AND NOTES as detailed here--)

UNSCOM Report to Security Council January 25th 1999  
ANNEX D

#### ACTIONS BY IRAQ TO OBSTRUCT DISARMAMENT

4. Iraq did not admit to its illegal unilateral destruction until March 1992, approximately nine months after the destruction activities, and even then only after the Commission indicated it had evidence that Iraq retained weapons after its supervised destruction. Iraq states that "The unilateral destruction was carried out entirely unrecorded.

No written and no visual records were kept, as it was not foreseen that Iraq needed to prove the destruction to anybody."

Such an approach also indicates that Iraq intended to pursue a policy of concealment in its relations with the Commission and the IAEA."

So you can post all that \*\*\*\*TRASH\*\*\*\* about Inspection Organizations exonerating IRAQ FOR FULL COMPLIANCE but the FACTS are not on your side. You can look at almost ANY REPORT from ANY organization that has tried to INSPECT & DISARM IRAQ and find THIS ^ kind of stuff.

IRAQ MOST DEFINATLY HAS ILLEGAL WEAPONS. THEY FIRED SOME AT US IN THE PAST ---FEW DAYS---. But no, Saddam could MAIL you a Scud missile and you'd probably still doubt.

Bottom Line :

Iraq had WEAPONS OF MASS DISTRUCTIONS AND ILLEGAL WEAPONS when the 1991 resolution was imposed on them.

The Iraqi regime sought a route of lies and deception in relation to ANY GROUP THAT ATTEMPTED TO INSPECT AND DISARM THEM.

AND IT IS FURTHERMORE A \*\*FACT\*\* that EVEN IN THE MOST RECENT INSPECTIONS Hans Blix WAS STILL WORKING ON THE FIRST 1/2 OF THE \*\*FIRST STEP\*\* IN THE ROAD TO DISARMAMENT.

Step ONE

A) Identification of illegal items

B) Destruction or disposal of illegal items[/b]

Do you know WHY we were still on PART A OF STEP ONE ?? Because Saddam IS A LYING PIECE OF SHIT. Thats why. Not because the big bad EVIL USA OR ISRAEL is sending in Commodo's moving around Saddams weapons so he cant disarm. But because SADDAM IS MOVING AROUND HIS \*\*ILLEGAL WEAPONS\*\* SO HE CAN NOT BE DISARMED. SADDAM HAD NO INTENTION OF DISARMING AND THE UN \*\*\*\*KNEW THIS\*\*\*\*.

You

Iraq was largely disarmed by the time U.N. inspectors left in 1998; it has been under the most stringent military embargo and economic sanctions in history; and it was destroying its al-Samoud missiles as requested by the U.N.

Iraq no nuclear capability according to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

:rolleyes: :rolleyes: :rolleyes:

IAEA report to UN on 16 October 2002

As previously indicated to the Security Council, the greater in-depth analysis carried out since December 1998

of the extensive documentation acquired through the inspection process has refined but not

capabilities as of December 1998.

1998, the clarification of

understanding of that programme, these questions and concerns do not constitute "unresolved disarmament issues", as referred to in Security Council resolution 1284 (1999).

The Agency is continuing to review and assess all available post-1998 information (for example, publications by Member States,

provided semi-annual declarations.

However, as nearly four years have elapsed since IAEA has been able to implement its Security Council mandate in Iraq,

programme and nuclear-related capabilities as of today. It will therefore be important for the Agency, on recommencement of inspections, to resolve, with

nuclear activities and

capabilities since December 1998, and whether Iraq is in compliance with its obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions.

So....if the IAEA is sooooo clear and its sooo obvious Saddam has NOOOOOO nuclear capabilities why do they use words like "clandestine" AS RECENT AS OCTOBER 2002 ?

UN Resolution 1284 on Dec. 17th 1999

Acknowledging the progress made by Iraq towards compliance with the provisions of resolution 687 (1991), but noting that, as a result of its failure to implement the relevant Council resolutions fully, the conditions do not exist which would enable the Council to take a decision pursuant to resolution 687 (1991) to lift the prohibitions referred to in that resolution,

So as one can CLEARLY SEE. The SANCTIONS IMPOSED ON IRAQ were because of THEIR OWN DOING. The length of time the sanctions stayed imposed WAS UP TO SADDAM. IF HE WOULD OF FULLY COMPLIED THEY HAD MECHANISMS IN PLACE TO REMOVE THESE BURDENS. But nooo, fuck feeding the Iraqi people get me some more of that VX nerve gas babe ! It's "Da-bomb" !

So...why are \*you\* defending a --murdering, lying (and HOPEFULLY DEAD) fuck-- ? I'd love to know the reasons why'd you'd want to defend someone who imposes & supports the FOLLOWING

The UPI March 21st

<http://www.upi.com/view.cfm?StoryID=20030321-023627-5923r>

A group of American anti-war demonstrators who came to Iraq with Japanese human shield volunteers made it across the border today with 14 hours of uncensored video, all shot without Iraqi government minders present. Kenneth Joseph, a young American pastor with the Assyrian Church of the East, told UPI the trip "had shocked me back to reality." Some of the Iraqis he interviewed on camera "told me they would commit suicide if American bombing didn't start. They were willing to see their homes demolished to gain their freedom from Saddam's bloody tyranny. They convinced me that Saddam was a monster the likes of which the world had not seen since Stalin and Hitler. He and his sons are sick sadists. Their tales of slow torture and killing made me ill, such as people put in a huge shredder for plastic products, feet first so they could hear their screams as bodies got chewed up from foot to head."

Defending truth & reality 24hrs a day, 7days a week 365days a year for the rest of my life against THOSE WHO WISH TO TWIST AND DISTORT IT.

The One

ps. Why do my post keep expanding the width of the window ? I've made several attempts @ stopping this but nothing is working....