

Canada rejected the George W. Bush attack, invasion, occupation, torture and massacre of Iraq. Now Canada will reject his Ballistic Missile scheme. Canadians stand together with more than half the American population with these decisions.

"!NO,~GWB BMD WMD,~ EH!"Ingmar LeeFebruary 23, 2005Canadians across the political spectrum are grateful that our previous federal government, for all its short-comings, had the sense to listen to the vast majority and stay out of the US invasion of Iraq.

In spite of great pressure, and the subsequent insults and ridicule of our country from some American war-mongers, not participating was the clearly right thing to do. Canadians can continue to hold their heads up as credible and responsible members of the international community for having done so, and our country is safer because of this decision. The world now watches in abject horror, as do about half of US citizens, as George W. Bush's Iraq-attack venture devolves into a morass of destruction, corruption, torture and massacre with no end anywhere in sight. To date, more than 100,000 Iraqi civilians are estimated dead in this latest American assault, (Lancet Medical Journal) with scores and scores of innocents maimed and sickened and made homeless.

The American military and its ever dwindling ?coalition? of the coerced, are now being slowly and systematically defeated in Iraq. An outraged Iraqi resistance is building an ever-increasing guerrilla campaign to rid their country of the invaders.

More than 1400 American soldiers are dead, without counting their hired-gun mercenaries who are also dying in droves. Their Iraqi ?Security Force? trainees (now being trained by Canadians) are being slaughtered by the thousands by resistance fighters, who see them as nothing more than traitors. Recently, US Defence Secretary Donald ?Rubber-Stamp? Rumsfeld crowed about the awesome power and reach of the US Military, while

recruitment centres across America struggle to fill the ranks of 150,000 exhausted troops who are now required to complete multiple tours of duty against their will.

Desertions are up, while voluntary enlistment plummets, domestic reserve forces are sent to Iraq and the draft seems imminent. For all George Bush's hype about freedom and democracy, deep unanswered allegations of serious electoral fraud continue to cast doubt on the legitimacy of the past two American presidential elections.

Serious questions have arisen about vote rigging in Ohio after Walden O'Dell, chief executive of Diebold Inc., the maker of the receiptless voting machines used across the USA, told Republicans in an Aug. 14 2003 fund-raising letter that he is "committed to helping Ohio deliver its electoral votes to the president next year." In Florida, people are documenting incidents of machine malfunctions, discrepancies between exit poll results and actual votes, "disappeared" votes, "extra" votes and other problems.

These irregularities may well have thrown Bush's narrow election victory the other way, and as such, it is no wonder that the leader of the free world is not concerned about maintaining the highest standards for elections in his own country. Last month, hundreds of Canadian election observers guaranteed the legitimacy of Ukraine's democratic exercise after a grossly fraudulent election was discounted by massive, sustained citizen action.

What credibility can be given to the recent American-managed Iraq elections, which have proceeded without any international observation? What credible democratic election can be held in a country held under the siege of foreign military occupation?

Paradoxically for Bush, with the defeat of his puppet, Ayad Allawi, those Iraqi's who risked all to vote have now elected a pro-Iran Shiite government which will demand the immediate removal of the US occupation.

Twelve years of debilitating sanctions and repeated bombing incursions into Iraq left Saddam Hussein's military capability utterly destroyed. Iraq

was a sitting duck for US video-screen, push-button warriors and was only invaded after ensuring that it would be a total cake-walk. After several days of wave upon wave of 'shock and awe' carpet bombing, Bush declared victory. "Major combat operations in Iraq have ended," announced Bush, 'The war has been carried out with a combination of precision and speed and boldness the enemy did not expect, and the world had not seen before.' Seen from an Iraqi perspective, and assuming a similar full-blown sense of fanatic patriotism typical of pro-war Americans, imagine your beloved country facing an imminent frontal assault by the United States Forces. Do you waste what's left of your already defeated, impoverished, demoralized military on some suicidal attempt to face off against the planet's largest weaponry of mass destruction?

A fool would do such a thing, and only total fools would expect it. Once upon a time, the rules of war said that one army dressed up in red, the other in blue, marched off to a field, faced each other 100 yards apart, and blew each other away. Whoever ran out of ammo first was the loser.

This was the respectable way to fight a war. People soon realized that such combatants were easily beaten the unconventional way. The Iraqi resistance patiently, but relentlessly picks off the foreigners with small and cheap rocket-propelled grenades and hand-made road-side bombs, while the economy of the world's largest debtor nation groans over an \$80 billion annual occupation budget. Now the world watches the certain defeat of the American military behemoth unfolding again before our very eyes. (Vietnam defeated the US military in the same way.)

George Bush's Iraq-attack never was a 'war,' insofar as 'war' is defined by a declaration and the acceptance, or even anticipation of a challenge. The rules of war are not obeyed during this occupation, as seen by the bombing destruction of entire cities (Fallujah), and the torture, humiliation and murder of prisoners (Abu Ghraib). Detainees are denied 'Prisoner of War' status and precluded from the Geneva Convention.

How then, is this a 'war' at all that the United States is fighting?

Bush's approach to global domination by the overwhelming use of military

force is a primitive failure which is ruining the reputation of the USA around the world. His policies are greatly endangering American citizens and curtailing their ability to travel freely around the world. What's happening in Iraq is akin to trying to kill mosquitoes with a sledgehammer.

Sure, you wreck the place but the wind of the swing simply blows them out of the way. Then they come back and sting you. Mosquitoes are a nuisance and they can drive people crazy, ~and some of them carry malaria. In a world where the course of history can be changed with a few fifty-cent box-cutters, the brute-force approach is clearly doomed. Now George W. Bush very much wants Canada to participate in his ballistic missile defence scheme. Once again, nationwide polling shows that Canadians are vehemently opposed to this. Will our current government listen to Canadians again this time?

Ingmar Lee is a student of Asian and Environmental Studies at UVic.