



War Without End

The global war against terror from a British perspective

[FAQ](#) [Popular Topics](#) [Search](#) [Memberlist](#) [Usergroups](#) [Register](#)
[Profile](#) [Log in to check your private messages](#) [Log in](#)
[UK and World News](#) [Spam Audit](#) [Ignore List](#)

www.2ID.net
Stop ID cards and the database state

DOWNING STREET MEMO HEARING: US WENT TO WAR FOR ISRAEL



[War Without End Forum Index](#) -> [Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

[View previous topic](#) :: [View next topic](#)

Author

Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

Message

Posted: Fri Jun 17, 2005 7:55 am Post subject: DOWNING STREET MEMO HEARING: US WENT TO WAR FOR ISRAEL



washingtonpost.com
Democrats Play House To Rally Against the War
By Dana Milbank

Friday, June 17, 2005; A06

In the Capitol basement yesterday, long-suffering House Democrats took a trip to the land of make-believe.

They pretended a small conference room was the Judiciary Committee hearing room, draping white linens over folding tables to make them look like witness tables and bringing in cardboard name tags and extra flags to make the whole thing look official.

Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.) banged a large wooden gavel and got the other lawmakers to call him "Mr. Chairman." He liked that so much that he started calling himself "the chairman" and spouted other chairmanly phrases, such as "unanimous consent" and "without objection so ordered." The dress-up game looked realistic enough on C-SPAN, so two dozen more Democrats came downstairs to play along.

The session was a mock impeachment inquiry over the Iraq war. As luck would have it, all four of the witnesses agreed that President Bush lied to the nation and was guilty of high crimes -- and that a British memo on "fixed" intelligence that surfaced last month was the smoking gun equivalent to the Watergate tapes. Conyers was having so much fun that he ignored aides' entreaties to end the session.

"At the next hearing," he told his colleagues, "we could use a little subpoena power." That brought the house down.

As Conyers and his hearty band of playmates know, subpoena power and other perks of a

real committee are but a fantasy unless Democrats can regain the majority in the House. But that's only one of the obstacles they're up against as they try to convince America that the "Downing Street Memo" is important.

A search of the congressional record yesterday found that of the 535 members of Congress, only one -- Conyers -- had mentioned the memo on the floor of either chamber. House Democratic leaders did not join in Conyers's session, and Senate Democrats, who have the power to hold such events in real committee rooms, have not troubled themselves.

The hearing was only nominally about the Downing Street Memo and its assertion that in the summer of 2002 Bush was already determined to go to war and was making the intelligence fit his case. Joseph C. Wilson IV, a former ambassador whose wife was outed as a CIA operative, barely mentioned the memo in his opening statement. Cindy Sheehan, who lost a son in Iraq, said the memo "only confirms what I already suspected."

No matter: The lawmakers and the witnesses saw this as a chance to rally against the war. Rep. Maxine Waters (D-Calif.) proclaimed it "one of the biggest scandals in the history of this country." Conyers said the memos "establish a prima facie case of going to war under false pretenses." Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) concluded that "the time has come to get out" of Iraq.

The session took an awkward turn when witness Ray McGovern, a former intelligence analyst, declared that the United States went to war in Iraq for oil, Israel and military bases craved by administration "neocons" so "the United States and Israel could dominate that part of the world." He said that Israel should not be considered an ally and that Bush was doing the bidding of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.

"Israel is not allowed to be brought up in polite conversation," McGovern said. "The last time I did this, the previous director of Central Intelligence called me anti-Semitic."

Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), who prompted the question by wondering whether the true war motive was Iraq's threat to Israel, thanked McGovern for his "candid answer."

At Democratic headquarters, where an overflow crowd watched the hearing on television, activists handed out documents repeating two accusations -- that **an Israeli company had warning of the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks** and that there was an "insider trading scam" on 9/11 -- that previously has been used to suggest Israel was behind the attacks.

The event organizer, Democrats.com, distributed stickers saying "Bush lied/100,000 people died." One man's T-shirt proclaimed, "Whether you like Bush or not, he's still an incompetent liar," while a large poster of Uncle Sam announced: "Got kids? I want yours for cannon fodder."

Conyers's firm hand on the gavel could not prevent something of a free-for-all; at one point, a former State Department worker rose from the audience to propose criminal charges against Bush officials. Early in the hearing, somebody accidentally turned off the lights; later, a witness knocked down a flag. Matters were even worse at Democratic headquarters, where the C-SPAN feed ended after just an hour, causing the activists to groan and one to shout "Conspiracy!"

The glitches and the antiwar theatrics proved something of a distraction from the message the organizers aimed to deliver: that for the Bush White House, as lawyer John C. Bonifaz put it, the British memo is "the equivalent to the revelation that there was a taping system

in the Nixon White House."

Of course, Democrats controlled the real committees back then -- though Conyers was not deterred. "We have a lot of work to do as a result of this first panel," he told his colleagues. " 'Tis the beginning of our work."

http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/showstory.php?pn_sid=295

Ray McGovern to Dana Milbank

You used to get your facts straight, at least. It appears that in your new assignment meticulousness is not a requirement. Even your "search of the congressional record" concerning mention of the Downing Street Minutes came up short. Do you not consider Sen. Harry Reid a member of Congress?

It troubles me that you should find it "awkward" that I mentioned Israel and its interests as perceived by the "neocons" as a motivating factor in the Bush administration's decision to launch an unprovoked war on Iraq. That, Dana, is a no-brainer. Let me suggest you simply familiarize yourself with the documents of the "neocon" Project for a New American Century.

I did not say that "Israel should not be considered an ally." I think the transcript will show that I simply noted the fact that Israel is not an ally of the United States. It is a point of fact. And I, for one, object not only to the president's repeated references to such an "alliance," but to his behaving as though there were one. Is it possible that he actually believes there is one? If so, I doubt that any in his shrinking circle of advisers would take the risk of disabusing him of that notion, particularly if his father's national security adviser, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, is correct in saying that our current president has been "mesmerized" by Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.

I am among the first to defend Israel's right to exist within secure and internationally recognized borders, and to deplore our nation's slowness in recognizing and doing something to stop the Holocaust. (And I deplore violence of all kinds—whether against Israel, or initiated by it.) But, unless I am mistaken, an alliance requires a treaty ratified by the Senate. Have I missed something?

What is saddest of all is your willingness to be enlisted in the cabal against Rep. James Moran (D-VA). The record will show that Moran's question to the panel did NOT, as you write, include "wondering whether the true motive [for the attack on Iraq] was Iraq's threat to Israel." The thought was all mine, and I stand by it.

What does merit the word "awkward" is that I have to write you this note. I used to look forward to reading your column. Until now, I had thought that your professional standards—like those of an intelligence analyst—ruled out the kind of slant reflected in your column today.

Were I not to have admired your past record, I might even think you are campaigning for a Gold Star from your editors, since your inaccurate, tendentious report dovetails so well with their torturous effort to play down the implications of the Downing Street Minutes. Those minutes are, indeed, a smoking gun. You'll see.

Yours truly,

Ray McGovern

Congressman James Moran/Ray McGovern:

Mr. Moran:

What I would like to do is to get back to why we did do it. We understand that the reasons we were given were part of an endemic pattern of deceit, they were not the real reasons. What do you think was the real reason?

It has been suggested that the oil companies were concerned, Saddam was giving contracts to Russia and France and maybe that's what it was. We wanted to get control over the oil. It has been suggested that rather than being the president of a failed economy, which was the situation in 2003, that being commander and chief of a mighty military was a lot better political position to be in. There was the suggestion that while Iraq was no threat to the United States, Iraq could have been a threat to our ally in the Middle East.

What was the real motivation in your mind for why we did go to war?

Mr. McGovern:

All of the above. I use the acronym O.I.L. O for oil. I for Israel. And L for the logistical base deemed necessary by the so-called neocons – and it reeks through all their documents – the logistical military base whereby the United States and Israel could dominate that area of the world. It's a very strategically important area of the world, mostly because it has oil, but also because Israel, which is traditionally described as our "ally" - and I don't know of any alliance we have with Israel - has been very influential in our policy. Witness the fact that the first President Bush's national security advisor [Brent] Scowcroft has described the president as being mesmerized by Ariel Sharon who has the president wrapped around his finger. OK?

So what I'm saying here is oil was a major factor. Israel was another factor. And I have to say that Israel is something that is not allowed to be brought up in polite conversation. The last I did this the previous director of Central Intelligence called me "anti-Semitic."

And the other thing is the ideological strategic vision of the so-called neocons. You can see it in their documents: "We are the sole remaining superpower in the world. We would be remiss in our duty were we not to use this power in every strategically important part of the world. And what's more important than the Middle East." That would be my answer.

Subject: Is it possible to wipe the sneer off your face

To: Milbankd@washpost.com

Your article "**Democrats Play House to Rally Against the War**" is another example of what has happened to the Washington Post, a newspaper that used to be revered. Do you think it's funny that the Democrats were put into a basement room and denied the use of a venue for their hearing? Do you find it amusing that Cindy Sheehan lost her son in Iraq? And that Joe Wilson's wife lost her job, because the Bush administration wanted him to lie about the yellow cake in Niger, and he wouldn't?

You chose, instead, to sneer at Conyers, the 122 representatives, and the 560,000 of us citizens who have signed a document to force Bush and the neo-cons to tell the truth about

invading Iraq.

The session did not take any kind of awkward turn when Ray McGovern talked about going to war for Israel. In 2002, Sharon bragged, "I want to tell you something very clear: Don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We, the Jewish people, control America, and the Americans know it."

Finally, to suggest that the hearing was not about the Downing Street Memo is ridiculous. Everything we saw and heard yesterday is a direct result of that memo and the perfidy of this administration.

Greta Berlin

Washington, DC

Milbankd@washpost.com

Dear Mr. Milbank,

Your article is just another in a series of examples as to why people call reporters, WHITE HOUSE STENOGRAPHERS!

Let me point to the remarks of Paul Wolfowitz to explain why we are in this disastrous quagmire.

From the FIFTH Downing Street Memo:

Meyer added: "Wolfowitz thought that this would go a long way to destroying any notion of moral equivalence between Iraq and Israel."

<http://thinkprogress.org/wp-images/upload/meyermemo.pdf>

Let me point out something else for your education:

05/04/2003

White man's burden

By Ari Shavit

The war in Iraq was conceived by 25 neoconservative intellectuals, most of them Jewish, who are pushing President Bush to change the course of history. Two of them, journalists William Kristol and Charles Krauthammer, say it's possible. But another journalist, Thomas Friedman (not part of the group), is skeptical...

Is the Iraq war the great neoconservative war? It's the war the neoconservatives wanted, Friedman says. It's the war the neoconservatives marketed. Those people had an idea to sell when September 11 came, and they sold it. Oh boy, did they sell it. So this is not a war that the masses demanded. This is a war of an elite. Friedman laughs: I could give you the names of 25 people (all of whom are at this moment within a five-block radius of this office) who, if you had exiled them to a desert island a year and a half ago, the Iraq war would not have happened.

<http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=280279>

Thank God that we have the foreign press to rely on. You people have become less than worthless and will never be a William Shirer!

Have a nice day!

"By Way Of Deception Thou Shalt Do War"

Just saw the following linked at www.whatreallyhappened.com :

Dissing Conyers Reveals Truth: Invasion was for Israel

<http://kurtnimmo.com/blog/?p=728>

Conyers Gives Both Barrels to Milbank, Shoots Himself in the Foot:

<http://kurtnimmo.com/blog/?p=733>

Just saw the following at www.whatreallyhappened.com

<http://www.estripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=28991&archive=true>

Relatives of some troops killed in Iraq seek hearings on Downing Street memo

By Leo Shane III, Stars and Stripes
Pacific edition, Friday, June 17, 2005

Leo Shane III / S&S

Rep. Walter Jones, R-N.C., left, speaks to members of Military Families Speak Out about his experience at a soldier's funeral last month. With him are, from left, Dianne Davis Santorello, Celeste Zappala and Bill Mitchell. All three had a son killed serving in Iraq.

Leo Shane III / S&S

Rep. James McGovern, D-Mass., listens to members of Military Families Speak Out.

WASHINGTON — Several parents of soldiers killed in Iraq visited Capitol Hill on Wednesday to ask for congressional hearings on the Downing Street memo, which one mother called President Bush's "Watergate."

Critics say the document, which contains minutes from a meeting in July 2002 between British Prime Minister Tony Blair and top aides, shows that Bush was determined to go to war with Iraq and ignored evidence that showed the country had no weapons of mass destruction.

"Military action was now seen as inevitable," the memo reads. "Bush wanted to remove

Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy."

The memo was first revealed by the Sunday Times of London in May. Earlier this month, both Bush and Blair dismissed the accusations, saying that the war in Iraq was justified because Saddam Hussein was ignoring international law.

But members of Military Families Speak Out, whose members are relatives of troops killed in Iraq, said Congress must investigate whether the president lied to the country to justify military action.

"This war was based on lies and deception," said Celeste Zappala of Philadelphia, whose son was killed in April 2004 while providing security for investigators searching for WMD. "The only way we can understand how we've come to this disastrous position is to find out what the truth is."

The group, which has frequently criticized the administration, met with congressmen and left flyers petitioning for a full investigation at the offices of Republican House leaders.

"I envy the parents who support this war, because if I did I'd sleep better," said Dianne Davis Santorello, a Pennsylvania resident whose son was killed in August 2004. "But I don't sleep well. My son died for a lie."

She said the Downing Street memo would "bring down the house of cards" if lawmakers choose to investigate it, and compared it to the Watergate scandal which eventually forced President Richard Nixon from office.

Rep. James McGovern, D-Mass., said if true the allegations in the memo are "shameful" and told the parents, "Those who are responsible should be held accountable."

"This clearly wasn't a war of necessity; it was a war of choice," he said.

The group also petitioned lawmakers to set a specific date for the full withdrawal of troops from Iraq. Rep. Walter Jones, R-N.C., and other Republicans who last month supported an unsuccessful measure to mandate an exit date were presented with a certificate of thanks from the group.

Jones, who plans to introduce similar legislation on Thursday, said he was "heartsick" at the families' loss and pledged to help them in their efforts.

Also on Thursday, Democrats have planned a meeting concerning the memo, to be followed by a rally outside the White House.

It is hardly 'anti-Semitic' to convey the truth that Israelis were in fact warned prior to the 9/11 attack as the following article from an Israeli newspaper (Haaretz) conveys:

<http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=77744&contrassID=/has%5C>

Odigo says workers were warned of attack
By Yuval Dror

Odigo, the instant messaging service, says that two of its workers received messages two

hours before the Twin Towers attack on September 11 predicting the attack would happen, and the company has been cooperating with Israeli and American law enforcement, including the FBI, in trying to find the original sender of the message predicting the attack.

Micha Macover, CEO of the company, said the two workers received the messages and immediately after the terror attack informed the company's management, which immediately contacted the Israeli security services, which brought in the FBI.

"I have no idea why the message was sent to these two workers, who don't know the sender. It may just have been someone who was joking and turned out they accidentally got it right. And I don't know if our information was useful in any of the arrests the FBI has made," said Macover. Odigo is a U.S.-based company whose headquarters are in New York, with offices in Herzliya.

As an instant messaging service, Odigo users are not limited to sending messages only to people on their "buddy" list, as is the case with ICQ, the other well-known Israeli instant messaging application.

Odigo usually zealously protects the privacy of its registered users, said Macover, but in this case the company took the initiative to provide the law enforcement services with the originating Internet Presence address of the message, so the FBI could track down the Internet Service Provider, and the actual sender of the original message.

Also, check out the article from the 'Forward' (a respected Jewish publication out of New York) which mentions that the Israelis detained were Mossad operatives with a specialization in ordinance and surveillance:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=3425>

Check out this article as well (from the Sunday Herald in Scotland):

<http://ww1.sundayherald.com/37707>

Last edited by Alpha on Sun Jun 19, 2005 7:21 pm; edited 17 times in total

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Fri Jun 17, 2005 8:01 am Post subject: James Bamford (author of 'A Pretext for War') in front row..



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

James Bamford (author of 'A Pretext for War') was in the front row of audience at 'Downing Street Memo' hearing

'A Clean Break' (war for Israel) agenda (from pages 261-269 of James Bamford's 'A Pretext for War' book) provides the foundation of the 'Downing Street Memo':

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=28769>

After the Downing Street Memo: Case for Impeachment Builds:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=35872>

Congressmen probe Iraq war memo

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4101420.stm>

One can watch the re-broadcast of this 'Downing Street Memo' hearing on C-SPAN 2 later today (June 17th, 2005) at 5 PM on the west coast of the USA and at 8 PM on the east coast of the USA (12 PM GMT) as it can also be viewed via computer using the C-SPAN 2 broadcast feed link near the bottom of www.c-span.org (the hearing is also archived at www.c-span.org as you can search for it there as well).

Last edited by Alpha on Fri Jun 17, 2005 7:01 pm; edited 3 times in total

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Fri Jun 17, 2005 8:09 am Post subject:



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

The issue in Iraq was not as much for oil as it was for Israel (in accordance with the 'A Clean Break' agenda of the JINSA/CSP/PNAC Neocons as discussed by esteemed US intelligence author James Bamford on pages 261-269/321 of his 'A Pretext for War' book). The oil companies were actually against the war in Iraq as they wanted the sanctions against Saddam lifted (the neocons certainly didn't want that!) as Saddam was willing to sell as much oil as they wanted for bargain prices (see the article which is included at the following URL):

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?p=138032&sid=1f06132cdaa5daa452c47c71801cac05#138032>

However, the neocons seemed like they wanted to get at Saddam's oil like their crony Khodorkovsky was doing with Yukos in Russia (I had heard that he had met with JINSA/PNAC Zionist extremist Richard Perle in Israel):

SECRETS US PLANS FOR IRAQ's OIL:

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=31432>

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sat Jun 18, 2005 8:21 pm Post subject: Downing Street Memo



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

From: "Stephen Sniegowski" <hectorpv@comcast.net>
To: "Sniegowski, Stephen" <hectorpv@comcast.net>
Subject: Downing Street Memo
Date: Sat, 18 Jun 2005 10:51:21 -0400

Friends,

Downing Street Memo

The recently revealed British secret documents clearly show that the Bush administration had decided upon war on Iraq by July 2002, and the British government believed it had to go along but sought some cover in order to make the aggressive attack appear legal by the standards of international law. The US, the British were informed, was going to try to provide a legal cover for the war. Richard Dearlove – then director of the Brit equivalent of the CIA – told Blair that "Bush wanted to remove Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy."

Instead of trying to make an objective assessment of any danger that Iraq posed to the United States, the Bush administration selectively used the most exaggerated intelligence from the most unreliable sources, such as Ahmed Chalabi, in order to gain popular and Congressional support for a war on Iraq. The WMD story was simply a means to achieve a war that had other hidden motives, which apparently would not gain public support nor justify an attack on a country by the standards of international law.

The establishment media--the Washington Post, Michael Kinsley, Dana Milbank, Andrea Mitchell of MSNBC--have dismissed the new British revelations as, in the Post's words, adding nothing new to what "was publicly known in July 2002." The Post claims that "it was argued even then, and has since become conventional wisdom, that Mr. Bush, Vice President Cheney and other administration spokesmen exaggerated the threat from Iraq to justify the elimination of its noxious regime." Certainly, if the Post knew that the administration was deceiving the American people about the alleged danger from Iraq, it didn't make much effort to inform its readers. The Post views all this deception in a rather cavalier fashion, as if deception is to be expected in justifying wars; in fact, the Post and the other Establishment folk almost take the position that the war lies were simply a device, perhaps a necessary device, to gain public support for a "good war" against a "noxious" leader; and the Post did, in fact, support the attack on Iraq.

Yes, knowledgeable people should have discerned that the Bush administration WMD claims were false--that even if Saddam had some type of poison gas, as he had in the 1980s, he posed no threat to the US--but the great majority of the people needed to have this drilled into their minds in order to counteract the pro-war drumbeat from the Bush administration and its followers. The mainstream media not only failed to emphasize the Bush administration falsehoods but usually parroted the Bush propaganda, which the Establishment folk now claim they knew to be false.

Of course, this elitist concept of America's rulers doing what they deem to be "good" while lying to the American public completely contradicts the current justification of the war as a fight for democracy (though it does reflect the thinking of the neocon's anti-democratic icon Leo Strauss). In short, in order to bring about democracy, it is presumably necessary to act in completely undemocratic ways, undermining the existence of democracy where it already exists. That type of illogic resembles that of Dostoevsky's revolutionary-ideologue character Shigalov in *The Possessed* who explains with respect to his own plan for a future society: "I have started out with the idea of unrestricted freedom and I have arrived at unrestricted despotism."

As Prather points out in the first article, the Bush administration clearly violated American law in its deceptive justification for the war. And the issue was not simply one of not telling the truth. For if the administration had admitted that the US was not seriously threatened by Iraq, there would have been no justification to launch an attack. Prather points out how such a national emergency was absolutely essential for Bush to legally use the National Guard.

The second article is the Washington Post's editorial dismissing the importance of the recently-revealed British documents--the nothing-new spin.

<http://www.antiwar.com/prather/?articleid=6351>

June 18, 2005
The Damning Downing Street Memo

by Gordon Prather

No thanks to the domestic and international neo-crazy media sycophants, you probably now know about the "Downing Street memo."

The memo is actually the minutes – stamped "Secret and Strictly Personal – UK Eyes Only" – of a meeting between British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his senior national security team.

The meeting was held at Downing Street on July 23, 2002, and the leaked minutes were first published by the Sunday Times of London on May 1, 2005.

No one in Bush's or Blair's government has questioned the accuracy or validity of what the Sunday Times published.

No one!

Perhaps the most damning revelation is that Richard Dearlove – then director of the Brit equivalent of the CIA – told Blair that "Bush wanted to remove Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy."

Remember that these are minutes of a meeting, not an actual transcript. And much of the meeting concerned Bush's plans and decisions. So Bush and Blair have discounted the Downing Street memo, claiming that most of those plans and decisions were never implemented.

Consequently, the neo-crazy media sycophants are claiming the reason they didn't tell you about the Downing Street memo is that "there is nothing in it that we didn't know about at the time."

Well, maybe they already knew in July of 2002 that Bush-Cheney-Bolton-Wolfowitz-Feith had been "fixing" the intelligence for almost a year to fit the upcoming war of aggression. But did you?

For example, did you know that Bush-Cheney-Bolton had conspired in early 2002 to get Jose Bustani, director-general of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), fired? Why did Bustani "have to go"? According to unnamed Bolton aides, because "he was trying to send [OPCW] chemical weapons inspectors to Baghdad and that might have helped defuse the crisis over alleged Iraqi weapons and undermined a U.S. rationale for war."

As a result of the revelations contained in the Downing Street memo, constitutional lawyer John Bonifaz has established AfterDowningStreet.org and called for a "Resolution of Inquiry"; a formal congressional investigation into whether President Bush committed impeachable offenses in the run-up to – and launching of – Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Of course, once the inquiry is under way, it need not concern itself with the undisputed revelations contained in the Downing Street memo.

For example, since the war began in March 2003, at least 163 members of the National Guard – plus 45 Army Reservists and 45 Marine Reservists – have died in Iraq.

Until the president or Congress declares a national emergency, the president has no authority over National Guard units or the Guardsmen themselves.

Governors do, but not the president.

On Sept. 14, 2001, President Bush did issue a "Declaration of National Emergency by Reason of Certain Terrorist Attacks" on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and "the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on the United States."

On the same day, citing that declaration, Bush issued an executive order "Ordering the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces to Active Duty." But, that executive order – citing that declaration – makes no mention of the National Guard or the Reserves.

Bush has, nevertheless, misused that declaration and executive order to justify the federalization of the National Guard and the dispatch of National Guard and Reserve units to fight in Iraq.

By law, the constitutional powers of the president to "introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities" are limited, and can only be exercised "pursuant to (a) a declaration of war, (b) specific statutory authorization, or (c) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces."

On March 19, 2003, in invoking the authority of the "Joint Resolution to Authorize the Use of U.S. Armed Forces Against Iraq," President Bush sent his "determination" that Iraq posed "a continuing threat to the national security of the United States" by "continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations."

But isn't that exactly what Richard Dearlove told Tony Blair on July, 23, 2002 that Bush had decided to do, and had been "fixing" the intelligence to that end?

And don't we now know that Bush did send members of our U.S. armed forces – including National Guardsmen and Reservists – to their deaths in Iraq on the basis of "fixed" intelligence?

if (show_doubleclick_ad && (adTemplate & SKY_RIGHT) == SKY_RIGHT) { placeAd ('ARTICLE',commercialNode,4,"true) ; } http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/06/14/AR2005061401383_pf.html

washingtonpost.com

Iraq, Then and Now

Washington Post

Wednesday, June 15, 2005; A24

AFTER LAGGING for months, debate on Iraq in Washington is picking up again. That's a needed and welcome development, but much of the discussion is being diverted to the wrong subject. War opponents have been trumpeting several British government memos from July 2002, which describe the Bush administration's preparations for invasion, as revelatory of President Bush's deceptions about Iraq. Bloggers have demanded to know why "the mainstream media" have not paid more attention to them. Though we can't speak for The Post's news department, the answer appears obvious: The memos add not a single fact to what was previously known about the administration's prewar deliberations. Not only

that: They add nothing to what was publicly known in July 2002.

Three summers ago the pages of this and other newspapers were filled with reports about military planning for war to remove Saddam Hussein and Mr. Bush's determination to force a showdown. "Debate over whether the United States should go to war against Iraq," we stated in a lead editorial on Aug. 4, "has lurched into a higher gear." Concern that the Bush administration was not adequately prepared for a postwar occupation -- another supposed revelation of the British memos -- prompted widely reported public hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee starting on July 31, 2002.

One observation in the memos is vague but intriguing: A British official is quoted as saying that the "intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy." Yet it was argued even then, and has since become conventional wisdom, that Mr. Bush, Vice President Cheney and other administration spokesmen exaggerated the threat from Iraq to justify the elimination of its noxious regime. And the memos provide no information that would alter the conclusions of multiple independent investigations on both sides of the Atlantic, which were that U.S. and British intelligence agencies genuinely believed Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction and that they were not led to that judgment by the Bush administration.

Debate over whether the war should have been fought is appropriate and no doubt will continue for many years. But it ought not distract from what should be an urgent discussion of the present situation in Iraq. After a lull following January's elections, violence -- and U.S. casualties -- have returned to the level of last fall; the political process is stuck on the inability of Shiite and Sunni leaders to reach an accommodation, even as the time allotted to completing a constitution slips away. Recent in-depth reports by The Post and the New York Times have suggested that training of the new Iraqi army continues to yield mixed results and that it will be several more years, at least, before Iraqi units can take the place of U.S. troops.

All this should call into question the Bush administration's present rhetoric and apparent strategy, which assumes that the Iraqi insurgency is, as Mr. Cheney put it, in its "last throes"; that Iraqi units will be ready before the U.S. military, now facing a recruiting crisis, is broken by the strain of deploying more than 130,000 troops; and that the United States can still afford to take a relatively hands-off approach to the political process, leaving Baghdad without an ambassador for months at a time. In fact, the U.S. mission in Iraq seems to be drifting dangerously -- and the president, once again, is not talking frankly to the country about the sacrifice that may be required, or where the troops and other resources for such an effort will come from. Those ought to be the questions at center stage this summer.

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sat Jun 18, 2005 8:31 pm Post subject: Memos Show British Concern Over Iraq Plans



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

Memos Show British Concern Over Iraq Plans

By THOMAS WAGNER, Associated Press Writer
17 minutes ago

When Prime Minister Tony Blair's chief foreign policy adviser dined with Condoleezza Rice six months after Sept. 11, the then-U.S. national security adviser didn't want to discuss Osama bin Laden or al-Qaida. She wanted to talk about "regime change" in Iraq, setting the stage for the U.S.-led invasion more than a year later.

President Bush wanted Blair's support, but British officials worried the White House was rushing to war, according to a series of leaked secret Downing Street memos that have renewed questions and debate about Washington's motives for ousting Saddam Hussein.

In one of the memos, British Foreign Office political director Peter Ricketts openly asks whether the Bush administration had a clear and compelling military reason for war.

"U.S. scrambling to establish a link between Iraq and al-Qaida is so far frankly unconvincing," Ricketts says in the memo. "For Iraq, 'regime change' does not stack up. It sounds like a grudge between Bush and Saddam."

The documents confirm Blair was genuinely concerned about Saddam's alleged weapons of mass destruction, but also indicate he was determined to go to war as America's top ally, even though his government thought a pre-emptive attack may be illegal under international law.

"The truth is that what has changed is not the pace of Saddam Hussein's WMD programs, but our tolerance of them post-11 September," said a typed copy of a March 22, 2002 memo obtained Thursday by The Associated Press and written to Foreign Secretary Jack Straw.

"But even the best survey of Iraq's WMD programs will not show much advance in recent years on the nuclear, missile or CW/BW (chemical or biological weapons) fronts: the programs are extremely worrying but have not, as far as we know, been stepped up."

Details from Rice's dinner conversation also are included in one of the secret memos from 2002, which reveal British concerns about both the invasion and poor postwar planning by the Bush administration, which critics say has allowed the Iraqi insurgency to rage.

The eight memos — all labeled "secret" or "confidential" — were first obtained by British reporter Michael Smith, who has written about them in The Daily Telegraph and The Sunday Times.

Smith told AP he protected the identity of the source he had obtained the documents from by typing copies of them on plain paper and destroying the originals.

The AP obtained copies of six of the memos (the other two have circulated widely). A senior British official who reviewed the copies said their content appeared authentic. He spoke on condition of anonymity because of the secret nature of the material.

The eight documents total 36 pages and range from 10-page and eight-page studies on military and legal options in Iraq, to brief memorandums from British officials and the minutes of a private meeting held by Blair and his top advisers.

Toby Dodge, an Iraq expert who teaches at Queen Mary College, University of London, said the documents confirmed what post-invasion investigations have found.

"The documents show what official inquiries in Britain already have, that the case of weapons of mass destruction was based on thin intelligence and was used to inflate the evidence to the level of mendacity," Dodge said. "In going to war with Bush, Blair defended the special relationship between the two countries, like other British leaders have. But he knew he was taking a huge political risk at home. He knew the war's legality was questionable and its unpopularity was never in doubt."

Dodge said the memos also show Blair was aware of the postwar instability that was likely

among Iraq's complex mix of Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds once Saddam was defeated.

The British documents confirm, as well, that "soon after 9/11 happened, the starting gun was fired for the invasion of Iraq," Dodge said.

Speculation about if and when that would happen ran throughout 2002.

On Jan. 29, Bush called Iraq, Iran and North Korea "an axis of evil." U.S. newspapers began reporting soon afterward that a U.S.-led war with Iraq was possible.

On Oct. 16, the U.S. Congress voted to authorize Bush to go to war against Iraq. On Feb. 5, 2003, then-Secretary of State Colin L. Powell presented the Bush administration's case about Iraq's weapons to the U.N. Security Council. On March 19-20, the U.S.-led invasion began.

Bush and Blair both have been criticized at home since their WMD claims about Iraq proved false. But both have been re-elected, defending the conflict for removing a brutal dictator and promoting democracy in Iraq. Both administrations have dismissed the memos as old news.

Details of the memos appeared in papers early last month but the news in Britain quickly turned to the election that returned Blair to power. In the United States, however, details of the memos' contents reignited a firestorm, especially among Democratic critics of Bush.

It was in a March 14, 2002, memo that Blair's chief foreign policy adviser, David Manning, told the prime minister about the dinner he had just had with Rice in Washington.

"We spent a long time at dinner on Iraq," wrote Manning, who's now British ambassador to the United States. Rice is now Bush's secretary of state.

"It is clear that Bush is grateful for your (Blair's) support and has registered that you are getting flak. I said that you would not budge in your support for regime change but you had to manage a press, a Parliament and a public opinion that was very different than anything in the States. And you would not budge either in your insistence that, if we pursued regime change, it must be very carefully done and produce the right result. Failure was not an option."

Manning said, "Condi's enthusiasm for regime change is undimmed." But he also said there were signs of greater awareness of the practical difficulties and political risks.

Blair was to meet with Bush at his ranch in Crawford, Texas, on April 8, and Manning told his boss: "No doubt we need to keep a sense of perspective. But my talks with Condi convinced me that Bush wants to hear your views on Iraq before taking decisions. He also wants your support. He is still smarting from the comments by other European leaders on his Iraq policy."

A July 21 briefing paper given to officials preparing for a July 23 meeting with Blair says officials must "ensure that the benefits of action outweigh the risks."

"In particular we need to be sure that the outcome of the military action would match our objective... A postwar occupation of Iraq could lead to a protracted and costly nation-building exercise. As already made clear, the U.S. military plans are virtually silent on this point."

The British worried that, "Washington could look to us to share a disproportionate share of the burden. Further work is required to define more precisely the means by which the

desired end state would be created, in particular what form of government might replace Saddam Hussein's regime and the time scale within which it would be possible to identify a successor."

In the March 22 memo from Foreign Office political director Ricketts to Foreign Secretary Straw, Ricketts outlined how to win public and parliamentary support for a war in Britain: "We have to be convincing that: the threat is so serious/imminent that it is worth sending our troops to die for; it is qualitatively different from the threat posed by other proliferators who are closer to achieving nuclear capability (including Iran)."

Blair's government has been criticized for releasing an intelligence dossier on Iraq before the war that warned Saddam could launch chemical or biological weapons on 45 minutes' notice.

On March 25 Straw wrote a memo to Blair, saying he would have a tough time convincing the governing Labour Party that a pre-emptive strike against Iraq was legal under international law.

"If 11 September had not happened, it is doubtful that the U.S. would now be considering military action against Iraq," Straw wrote. "In addition, there has been no credible evidence to link Iraq with OBL (Osama bin Laden) and al-Qaida."

He also questioned stability in a post-Saddam Iraq: "We have also to answer the big question — what will this action achieve? There seems to be a larger hole in this than on anything."

—
On the Net:

<http://hosted.ap.org/specials/dowdoc/fcolegal020308.pdf>

<http://hosted.ap.org/specials/dowdoc/manning020314.pdf>

<http://hosted.ap.org/specials/dowdoc/meyer020318.pdf>

<http://hosted.ap.org/specials/dowdoc/ods020308.pdf>

<http://hosted.ap.org/specials/dowdoc/ricketts020322.pdf>

<http://hosted.ap.org/specials/dowdoc/straw020325.pdf>

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2089-1648758,00.html>

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1593607,00.html>

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sun Jun 19, 2005 2:07 am Post subject: Bush an easier target than Israel for Conyers



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 2005 17:37:39 -0700
From: "Jeff Blankfort" <jblankfort@earthlink.net>
To: "John Conyers" <John.Conyers@mail.house.gov>
Subject: **Bush an easier target than Israel for Conyers**

"In what can only be described as a deliberate effort to discredit the entire hearing, Milbank quotes one of the witnesses as making an anti-semitic assertion and further describes anti-semitic literature that was being handed out in the overflow room for the event. First, let me be clear: I consider myself to be friend and supporter of Israel and there were a number of other staunchly pro-Israel members who were in attendance at the hearing. I do not agree with, support, or condone any comments asserting Israeli control over U.S. policy, and I find any allegation that Israel is trying to dominate the world or had anything to do with the September 11 tragedy disgusting and offensive. " JOHN CONYERS to the Washington Post June 17, 2005

While it is important to recognize John Conyers' efforts to raise the issue of the Downing St. Memo before Congress and the American public, that he had to cast former CIA agent Ray McGovern's accurate description of the war being for OIL (oil, Israel, and location of bases for the US military) as anti-semitic is not only distressing but represents yet another example of who controls the purse strings of the Democratic Party. There was a time when Conyers was a champion of the Palestinian cause, as were other members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and they were taken out or forced to retire one after another thanks to the machinations of the pro-Israel lobby and lack of support from "the left." The lobby obviously don't have to worry about Conyers any more. This is proof that he has learned his lessons well.

The Washington Post article follows Conyers' letter.

Jeff B

Congressman Conyers Hammers the Washington Post

By Congressman John Conyers

t r u t h o u t | Letter

Friday 17 June 2005

Mr. Michael Abramowitz, National Editor;

Mr. Michael Getler, Ombudsman;

Mr. Dana Milbank

The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Sirs:

I write to express my profound disappointment with Dana Milbank's June 17 report, "Democrats Play House to Rally Against the War," which purports to describe a Democratic hearing I chaired in the Capitol yesterday. In sum, the piece cherry-picks some facts, manufactures others out of whole cloth, and does a disservice to some 30 members of Congress who persevered under difficult circumstances, not of our own making, to examine a very serious subject: whether the American people were deliberately misled in the lead up to war. The fact that this was the Post's only coverage of this event makes the journalistic shortcomings in this piece even more egregious.

In an inaccurate piece of reporting that typifies the article, Milbank implies that one of the obstacles the Members in the meeting have is that "only one" member has mentioned the Downing Street Minutes on the floor of either the House or Senate. This is not only incorrect but misleading. In fact, just yesterday, the Senate Democratic Leader, Harry Reid, mentioned it on the Senate floor. Senator Boxer talked at some length about it at the recent confirmation hearing for the Ambassador to Iraq. The House Democratic Leader,

Nancy Pelosi, recently signed on to my letter, along with 121 other Democrats asking for answers about the memo. This information is not difficult to find either. For example, the Reid speech was the subject of an AP wire service report posted on the Washington Post website with the headline "Democrats Cite Downing Street Memo in Bolton Fight". Other similar mistakes, mischaracterizations and cheap shots are littered throughout the article.

The article begins with an especially mean and nasty tone, claiming that House Democrats "pretended" a small conference was the Judiciary Committee hearing room and deriding the decor of the room. Milbank fails to share with his readers one essential fact: the reason the hearing was held in that room, an important piece of context. Despite the fact that a number of other suitable rooms were available in the Capitol and House office buildings, Republicans declined my request for each and every one of them. Milbank could have written about the perseverance of many of my colleagues in the face of such adverse circumstances, but declined to do so. Milbank also ignores the critical fact picked up by the AP, CNN and other newsletters that at the very moment the hearing was scheduled to begin, the Republican Leadership scheduled an almost unprecedented number of 11 consecutive floor votes, making it next to impossible for most Members to participate in the first hour and one half of the hearing.

In what can only be described as a deliberate effort to discredit the entire hearing, Milbank quotes one of the witnesses as making an anti-semitic assertion and further describes anti-semitic literature that was being handed out in the overflow room for the event. First, let me be clear: I consider myself to be friend and supporter of Israel and there were a number of other staunchly pro-Israel members who were in attendance at the hearing. I do not agree with, support, or condone any comments asserting Israeli control over U.S. policy, and I find any allegation that Israel is trying to dominate the world or had anything to do with the September 11 tragedy disgusting and offensive.

That said, to give such emphasis to 100 seconds of a 3 hour and five minute hearing that included the powerful and sad testimony (hardly mentioned by Milbank) of a woman who lost her son in the Iraq war and now feels lied to as a result of the Downing Street Minutes, is incredibly misleading. Many, many different pamphlets were being passed out at the overflow room, including pamphlets about getting out of the Iraq war and anti-Central American Free Trade Agreement, and it is puzzling why Milbank saw fit to only mention the one he did.

In a typically derisive and uninformed passage, Milbank makes much of other lawmakers calling me "Mr. Chairman" and says I liked it so much that I used "chairmanly phrases." Milbank may not know that I was the Chairman of the House Government Operations Committee from 1988 to 1994. By protocol and tradition in the House, once you have been a Chairman you are always referred to as such. Thus, there was nothing unusual about my being referred to as Mr. Chairman.

To administer his coup-de-grace, Milbank literally makes up another cheap shot that I "was having so much fun that [I] ignored aides' entreaties to end the session." This did not occur. None of my aides offered entreaties to end the session and I have no idea where Milbank gets that information. The hearing certainly ran longer than expected, but that was because so many Members of Congress persevered under very difficult circumstances to attend, and I thought - given that - the least I could do was allow them to say their piece. That is called courtesy, not "fun."

By the way, the "Downing Street Memo" is actually the minutes of a British cabinet meeting. In the meeting, British officials - having just met with their American counterparts - describe their discussions with such counterparts. I mention this because that basic piece of context, a simple description of the memo, is found nowhere in Milbank's article. The fact that I and my fellow Democrats had to stuff a hearing into a room the size of a large closet to hold a hearing on an important issue shouldn't make us the object of

ridicule. In my opinion, the ridicule should be placed in two places: first, at the feet of Republicans who are so afraid to discuss ideas and facts that they try to sabotage our efforts to do so; and second, on Dana Milbank and the Washington Post, who do not feel the need to give serious coverage on a serious hearing about a serious matter - whether more than 1700 Americans have died because of a deliberate lie. Milbank may disagree, but the Post certainly owed its readers some coverage of that viewpoint.

Sincerely,
John Conyers, Jr.

-

The Washington Post

June 17, 2005

Democrats Play House To Rally Against the War

Dana Milbank

In the Capitol basement yesterday, long-suffering House Democrats took a trip to the land of make-believe.

They pretended a small conference room was the Judiciary Committee hearing room, draping white linens over folding tables to make them look like witness tables and bringing in cardboard name tags and extra flags to make the whole thing look official.

Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.) banged a large wooden gavel and got the other lawmakers to call him "Mr. Chairman." He liked that so much that he started calling himself "the chairman" and spouted other chairmanly phrases, such as "unanimous consent" and "without objection so ordered." The dress-up game looked realistic enough on C-SPAN, so two dozen more Democrats came downstairs to play along.

The session was a mock impeachment inquiry over the Iraq war. As luck would have it, all four of the witnesses agreed that President Bush lied to the nation and was guilty of high crimes -- and that a British memo on "fixed" intelligence that surfaced last month was the smoking gun equivalent to the Watergate tapes. Conyers was having so much fun that he ignored aides' entreaties to end the session.

"At the next hearing," he told his colleagues, "we could use a little subpoena power." That brought the house down.

As Conyers and his hearty band of playmates know, subpoena power and other perks of a real committee are but a fantasy unless Democrats can regain the majority in the House. But that's only one of the obstacles they're up against as they try to convince America that the "Downing Street Memo" is important.

A search of the congressional record yesterday found that of the 535 members of Congress, only one -- Conyers -- had mentioned the memo on the floor of either chamber. House Democratic leaders did not join in Conyers's session, and Senate Democrats, who have the power to hold such events in real committee rooms, have not troubled themselves.

The hearing was only nominally about the Downing Street Memo and its assertion that in the summer of 2002 Bush was already determined to go to war and was making the intelligence fit his case. Joseph C. Wilson IV, a former ambassador whose wife was outed as a CIA operative, barely mentioned the memo in his opening statement. Cindy Sheehan, who lost a son in Iraq, said the memo "only confirms what I already suspected."

No matter: The lawmakers and the witnesses saw this as a chance to rally against the war. Rep. Maxine Waters (D-Calif.) proclaimed it "one of the biggest scandals in the history of

this country." Conyers said the memos "establish a prima facie case of going to war under false pretenses." Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) concluded that "the time has come to get out" of Iraq.

The session took an awkward turn when witness Ray McGovern, a former intelligence analyst, declared that the United States went to war in Iraq for oil, Israel and military bases craved by administration "neocons" so "the United States and Israel could dominate that part of the world." He said that Israel should not be considered an ally and that Bush was doing the bidding of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.

"Israel is not allowed to be brought up in polite conversation," McGovern said. "The last time I did this, the previous director of Central Intelligence called me anti-Semitic."

Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), who prompted the question by wondering whether the true war motive was Iraq's threat to Israel, thanked McGovern for his "candid answer."

At Democratic headquarters, where an overflow crowd watched the hearing on television, activists handed out documents repeating two accusations -- that an Israeli company had warning of the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks and that there was an "insider trading scam" on 9/11 -- that previously has been used to suggest Israel was behind the attacks.

The event organizer, Democrats.com, distributed stickers saying "Bush lied/100,000 people died." One man's T-shirt proclaimed, "Whether you like Bush or not, he's still an incompetent liar," while a large poster of Uncle Sam announced: "Got kids? I want yours for cannon fodder."

Conyers's firm hand on the gavel could not prevent something of a free-for-all; at one point, a former State Department worker rose from the audience to propose criminal charges against Bush officials. Early in the hearing, somebody accidentally turned off the lights; later, a witness knocked down a flag. Matters were even worse at Democratic headquarters, where the C-SPAN feed ended after just an hour, causing the activists to groan and one to shout "Conspiracy!"

The glitches and the antiwar theatrics proved something of a distraction from the message the organizers aimed to deliver: that for the Bush White House, as lawyer John C. Bonifaz put it, the British memo is "the equivalent to the revelation that there was a taping system in the Nixon White House."

Of course, Democrats controlled the real committees back then -- though Conyers was not deterred. "We have a lot of work to do as a result of this first panel," he told his colleagues. " 'Tis the beginning of our work."

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sun Jun 19, 2005 5:30 am Post subject: Fw: "Dean Condemns 'Anti-Semitic Literature'"



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

----- Original Message -----

From: Kathy and Bill Christison

Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2005 6:59 PM

Subject: Fw: "Dean Condemns 'Anti-Semitic Literature'"

Kathy and Bill write:

Howard Dean's groveling before Israel and the pro-Israel lobby in the U.S. is one more example of the utter inability of the Democratic Party's dominant faction to show any honesty, independence, or willingness to criticize any of Israel's policies or any policies of the Bush administration supportive of Israel. The evidence is simply overwhelming that former intelligence analyst Ray McGovern was correct when he told Conyers and other House Democrats that the war was part of an effort to allow the United States and Israel to "dominate that part of the world." That may not have been the only reason for the war, but it was certainly one significant reason -- far more important than the pretexts of WMD and spreading democracy. Dean's condemnation of McGovern's statement is depressing to those of us who entertained any hope that we might be able one day to vote for a Democratic Party that stood for honest policymaking and particularly for justice and human rights around the world.

Ken and Leslie: Would you please distribute this to your lists.

Bill and Kathy Christison

----- Original Message -----

From: Ed Herman

To: hermane@w...

Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2005 2:02 PM

Subject: FW: "Dean Condemns 'Anti-Semitic Literature'"

Groveling seems now to be built-in to the Democratic Party.

Ed Herman

-----Original Message-----

From: davidepet@c... [mailto:davidepet@c...]

Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2005 12:32 PM

To: davidepet@c...

Subject: RE: "Dean Condemns 'Anti-Semitic Literature'"

(* Get a load of this one.)

Associated Press Online

June 17, 2005 Friday

HEADLINE: Dean Condemns 'Anti-Semitic Literature'

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

A handful of people at Democratic National Headquarters distributed

material critical of Israel during a public forum questioning the Bush administration's Iraq policy, drawing an angry response and charges of anti-Semitism from party chairman Howard ! Dean on Friday.

"We disavow the anti-Semitic literature, and the Democratic National Committee stands in absolute disagreement with and condemns the allegations," Dean said in a statement posted on the DNC Web site.

Rep. John Conyers of Michigan, the senior Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, organized the forum on Thursday at the Capitol to publicize and discuss the so-called Downing Street memo. That document suggests that the Bush administration believed that war with Iraq was inevitable and that the administration was determined to use intelligence about weapons of mass destruction to justify the ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

The Sunday Times of London has reported that the prewar document, which recounts a meeting of Prime Minister Tony Blair's national security team, was leaked from inside the British government. The White House has rejected the memo's assertions.

Conyers' event occurred in a small Capitol meeting room, and an overflow crowd watched witnesses on television in a conference room at DNC headquarters. According to Dean, some material distributed within the DNC conference room implied that Israel was involved in the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

One witness, former intelligence analyst Ray McGovern, told Conyers and other House Democrats that the war was part of an effort to allow the United States and Israel to "dominate that part of the world," a statement Dean also condemned.

"As for any inferences that the United States went to war so Israel could 'dominate' the Middle East or that Israel was in any way behind the horrific September 11th attacks on America, let me say unequivocally that such statements are nothing but vile, anti-Semitic rhetoric," Dean said.

"The inferences are destructive and counterproductive, and have taken away from the true purpose of the Judiciary Committee members' meeting," he said. "The entire Democratic Party remains committed to fighting against such bigotry."

--- End forwarded message ---

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sun Jun 19, 2005 5:45 am Post subject: Re: Fwd: PRIORITY: dean



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 2005 21:07:25 -0700
From: "Jeff Blankfort" <jblankfort@earthlink.net>

Subject: **Re: Fwd: PRIORITY: dean**

...What happened with Dean in 2004 was that he and his manager at the time, Joe Trippi,

were being bombarded by his supporters on the internet who were asking why Dean was taking the basic AIPAC line on Israel and Palestine which was, in their eyes, inconsistent with his opposition to the Iraq War. At one point Trippi even denied in an interview that former AIPAC president, Steve Grossman, who was Dean's first campaign hire, was still involved in Dean's campaign, and then when folks emailed him that this wasn't true, Trippi wouldn't respond.

In any event, Dean finally came out with the statement that the US should be even-handed and the first two people to jump all over him were John Kerry and Nancy Pelosi, followed, as I recall, by Uncle Joe Lieberman. What was at work here and what threatened the Democrats was that rather than relying on the usual source for presidential campaign contributions, i.e., wealthy pro-Israel Jews, Dean was getting his money from thousands of supporters on the internet and therefore wasn't beholden to the big Jewish donors. He was soon advised of the lay of the land and what the party required and then he proceeded to backslide and apologize to every Jewish organization he could find. It wasn't just the media that did him in. It was his own party.

Ironically, the Democrats, that claims to be the party of the people, do far less grass roots fundraising than do the Republicans, and rely mainly on two sources for the majority of their contributions, wealthy Jews and pro-Israel PACs and the big labor unions which have been a cornerstone of the lobby from the beginning. Moreover, US labor unions have purchased an estimated half a billion dollars in State of Israel Bonds which obliges them to keep Israel's economy afloat if for nothing else, for the benefit of their pension funds. Now, Dean, as the head of the party knows who holds the purse strings and he won't make the same mistake twice.

Hope this has been of help and really appreciated your comments yesterday.

Jeff Blankfort



[Back to top](#)

Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sun Jun 19, 2005 5:49 am Post subject: Howard Dean's Anti-Semitism Problem



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

Howard Dean's Anti-Semitism Problem

<http://kurtnimmo.com/blog/?p=735>

Last edited by Alpha on Sun Jun 19, 2005 9:35 am; edited 1 time in total

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sun Jun 19, 2005 2:25 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 27949

URGENT: Downing Street Memo hearing with Ray McGovern and company repeats today at 11:10 PT & 2:10 PM ET (6:10 PM GMT) on C-SPAN

Click on the C-SPAN broadcast feed link near the bottom of www.c-span.org in order to watch via computer as this hearing is definitely worth capturing on DVD or on videotape from C-SPAN. Check the latest posts at the following URL:

DOWNING STREET MEMO HEARING: US WENT TO WAR FOR ISRAEL:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=36447>

[Back to top](#)



[War Without End Forum Index](#) -> [Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

All times are GMT

Page 1 of 1

Jump to: [Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

You **cannot** post new topics in this forum
You **cannot** reply to topics in this forum
You **cannot** edit your posts in this forum
You **cannot** delete your posts in this forum
You **cannot** vote in polls in this forum

Powered by phpBB © 2001, 2005 phpBB Group