



The Betty Letters

My Dear Grandchild,

Perhaps, you can assist me for a change. You know, President George W. Bush continuously states that the United States (US), today, is a much safer place than before because of thrashing that its army gave to the armed forces of the former President of Iraq Saddam Hussein. In fact, President George W. Bush has gone as far as to state that the world is, now, a much safer place than before, with Saddam Hussein out of the picture as a leader of any country. Even Senator John Kerry, the archrival of President George W. Bush to be the 44th President of the US, agrees with the President. The reason for the invasion of Iraq by the armed forces of the US and the United Kingdom was that Iraq was supposed to have had weapons of mass destruction, biological weapons, and the capability to manufacture in part, if not in whole, as well as to disseminate, nuclear weapons. Also, Iraq was said to have been in cahoots with al-Qaeda/Osama bin Laden, the latter-named, being al-Qaeda's Number One international killer, having been responsible for the planning of the attacks on the US homeland on September 11, 2001. The US Congress was told by President George W. Bush of the growing threat that was being posed by the former leader of Iraq; that the only avenue open to the US was for Congress to allocate sufficient sums of money to fund an armed incursion into Iraq in order 'to liberate' the country from the oppressive rule of Saddam Hussein. President George W. Bush made statements to the effect that Iraq might be selling, or had the ability to sell, nuclear technology to al-Qaeda/Osama bin Laden. He must be stopped because it jeopardised the security of the US. It has, now, been confirmed by the objective report of Mr Charles Dolfer that (a) Iraq has not had weapons of mass destruction since 1991 (b) Iraq had no biological weapons at the time of the US invasion of the country in March 2003 (c) the former Regime of President Saddam Hussein had had no links with al-Qaeda/Osama bin Laden and (d) Iraq had had no hand in the attacks on the US homeland on September 11, 2001. So here is my question, Mr Dear Grandchild: How could Iraq/Saddam Hussein have ever been a threat to the US, prior to the invasion of the country in March 2003 by US and UK armed forces, in view of the fact that (a) it possessed no weapons of mass destruction (b) it had not the facilities to produce even the smallest amount of nuclear material in order to start to consider producing any kind of nuclear weaponry, and, (c) other than pesticides, used to kill unwanted insects in its fields, it had no biological weapons?

I have no qualms in stating that Saddam Hussein is an evil bastard (excuse my French) and that he was a tyrant to his people, but that did not make him a threat to the security of the US or the UK. It would appear to me that North Korea and Iran could, possibly, pose a bigger threat to the US than Iraq ever could have posed. Both Iran and North Korea are known to have nuclear capability, you know. The difference, I suppose, between North Korea and Iran and Iraq is that Iraq was the easiest and softest target of the three countries. Also, it is known that North Korea is for sale, but Iran, with its Muslim, fundamentalistic government, is intransigent in its avowed plan to be a nuclear power (although its leaders claim that its nuclear capabilities are for peaceful purposes, only). There is, also, a fundamental similarity in respect of North Korea and Iran: They both have large armies, manned by fanatics. Any war with these two countries is likely to be a very costly and bloody one. So far, only about 1,050 US servicemen have been killed in Iraq, nearly all of whom has died after the invasion (which was labelled as being the 'liberation' of the country), with about ten thousand US servicemen, having

been badly wounded. The number of Iraqi civilians, who have been killed and maimed, is said to be in the neighbourhood of about one hundred thousand. That's a lot of dead and injured people, don't you think? And all of this killing and bloodshed was brought about by a falsehood, perpetrated by the Administration of President George W. Bush.

It is, now, very apparent that the war, instigated by the US against Iraq in March 2003, was an act, which was contrary to international law. It was, also, contrary to the promises that the US had given to the world body, known as the United Nations. The idea of the United Nations, according to its Charter, is to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights; to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations, arising from treaties and other sources of international law, can be maintained; and, to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. Its primary purpose, therefore, is to maintain international peace and security. Other important objectives, listed in Chapter One of the Charter of the United Nations, include developing friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; achieving worldwide cooperation to solve international economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems; respecting and promoting human rights; and, serving as a centre where nations can coordinate their actions and activities toward these various ends. Good stuff, don't you think? But, to the US, they are only words, clearly – because the US, without the sanction of this illustrious world body, illegally invaded Iraq, resulting in the deaths of many tens of thousands of people.

Consider, My Dear Grandchild: What would be the result if the Motherland invaded Taiwan on the premise that Taiwan posed a grave threat to the Motherland? Which, in fact, it does because of its social philosophy. Of course, the US would complain in the United Nations most aggressively if the Motherland attacked Taiwan. There would, without question, be more rattling of war sabres in Washington, perhaps, leading to the threat of the 'liberation' of Taiwan in the same manner that the US 'liberated' Iraq. Who knows what would happen because the US had, in the past, guaranteed to come to the assistance of Taiwan in the event of an attack by the Motherland. But, of course, those US promises to Taiwan were made many years ago: One's memory fades with the passage of time, does it not? Which makes me wonder whether or not the United Nations might consider black-balling the US from the Security Council of the United Nations on the grounds that the US Government fails to follow the spirit of the rules of the United Nations. Could the United Nations do such a thing? Would the US Government tolerate such a slap in the face? Or is the US such a powerful force in the world, today, that the United Nations cannot afford to take such an action for fear that the US would, immediately, establish a US-sponsored world body in competition to the United Nations? I am certain that the US Government would much prefer to have its own world body, in which it controlled the strings of the national 'puppets' which sat on its security council, to the present situation in the United Nations where representatives of countries, such as France, Germany, Russia and the People's Republic of China refuse to kowtow to the bullying tactics of the world's only superpower. It is said that if you give someone a white shirt and a tie and a ring of keys, you'll find out what kind of a son of a bitch he is. Give them to him in the morning and you'll know before noon. Or, put another way: A cock has great influence on his own dunghill. I await your reply to my questions, but, in the meantime, know that I love all of my people.

The Chief Lady of Hongkong

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com or targnews@hkstar.com. TARGET does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.