

Chapter 15

Reasons for War

Iraq's Ties to Terrorism & Weapons of Mass Destruction

The Miracle on Ice. Possibly the greatest sports upset the world has ever known. A bunch of NCAA college kids taking on the best hockey team in the world hands down. The Soviet Union entered the 1980 Winter Olympics with 2 goals in mind. The first was to showcase the dominance of communism through the sport of hockey. The second was even more simplistic: destroy any and all competition on their way to the gold medal.

The Soviets had recently demolished the NHL, (National Hockey League), All Stars in a 6-0 route. The pre-Olympic showdown against the American college squad ended in a 10-3 win for the USSR. The chances of America outplaying the Soviets were about as good as an 18 handicap golfer winning the U.S. Open.

Then lo and behold the Americans pulled off the impossible. When victory was in sight Al Michaels made the memorable call, "Do you believe in miracles? Yes!"

Many Americans hoped for a victory, but the truth was probably most did not think it would happen. The odds of getting struck by lightning while riding a bucking bronco through Madison Square Garden were more likely to some than the chance of the Americans winning that day. Yet afterwards there were some who said they "knew" it was going to happen. However, if America had not beaten the Soviets, many of these same people would of played the Monday morning quarterback. "I knew that the U.S. wouldn't win. I knew they should have done this or that instead of the strategy they had in place. If I had been the coach things would have been different." Sound familiar?

Fast forward some 25 years. When the United States led a Coalition of countries into Iraq, everybody and their dog said there would be stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. Low and behold none were found, and then everybody and their dog wanted to second guess the President.

"Bush lied, people died." "Blood is on the administrations hands." "It was all for oil and redemption. He knew there were no WMD's all along." Sound familiar?

What is amazing is the same people who said there were WMD's in Iraq before the war now say Bush lied. The list is long and includes: Bill Clinton, Ted Kennedy, Hillary Clinton, Al Gore, John Kerry, Nancy Pelosi, Jacques Chirac, Vladimir Putin, and Gerhard Schroeder. They had the same intelligence President Bush did before the war and came to the same conclusions. They spoke to the fact that Iraq had Weapons of Mass Destruction, but all of the sudden they wanted to change their tune. (More on this later).

Now the Monday morning quarterbacks are all over the nightly news and cable news outlets. "Where are these stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction? Why go on fighting a useless war? Why? Why? Why?"

Then the Bush administration steps up to bat. While the curve ball questions on the Iraq war come his way, the President strikes out time and time again when attempting to answer the questions before him. The world is a safer place without Saddam, he mentions about a half million times, but then he fails to address the real questions. Sure the world is a better place without Saddam running Iraq, but there is so much more to Operation Iraqi Freedom than the ouster of Saddam.

Just like the Miracle on Ice, people want to believe in the Iraq war. Many, if not most of America, want to believe that we are winning in Iraq. While this point has been addressed, another question arises that the American people want answered as well. Why did we go to war in the first place?

Despite what many will say, the Coalition of the Willing went to war in Iraq for two basic reasons given. The first was Iraq's ties to terrorism and second was weapons of mass destruction.

Since these two reasons have been dismissed by most Americans due to the American and foreign media, the facts remain. Iraq had close ties to terrorism and a tight knit relationship with Osama bin Laden. Secondly, the WMD program that was in place in Iraq only needed a kick start for them to be a direct threat to our Coalition Allies.

Put simply, the reasons for war still stand. Iraq was a threat, maybe even beyond what we expected in both ties with terrorism and in their weapons program.

Take a second and let that statement sink in. Now while you clean up the milk that shot out of your mouth at the mere mention of this revelation, there is one thing you still need, the proof. Buckle your seat belts because the facts are about to come at you like an anvil dropping off the Grand Canyon. The facts could indeed change your entire outlook on the war, or at the

very least give you a different perspective on the threat that was Saddam Hussein.

Consider the following:

- 1) Osama bin Laden met with the Iraqi Intelligence Service, the IIS for short, on multiple occasions. Both al Qaeda and the Hussein administration often sought the possibility of closer relations through various means.¹
- 2) One source stated bin Laden and al Qaeda received training in making bombs from Iraqi Intelligence.¹
- 3) There was talk by Iraqi Intelligence and the Hussein administration of harboring al Qaeda terrorists, and even bin Laden himself.¹
- 4) The Czech Republic counter intelligence reported that there was a possibility that an Iraqi intelligence official handed money over to one of the 9/11 hijackers, named Mohammad Atta.¹ While the 9/11 Commission doubted the meeting, they could not rule it out.
- 5) Ahmed Hikmat Shakir, was an Iraqi who worked at a foreign airport in Kuala Lumpur. The city, located in Malaysia in Southeast Asia, was the meeting place for some of the planning on the 9/11 plot. Shakir, who received his job through an Iraqi Embassy contact, not only escorted 9/11 hijackers through customs at the airport, but he even attended the meeting. Even more fishy is the fact that Iraq, not his employer, controlled Shakir's schedule.¹
- 6) A recently released 8 page fax memo from the Iraqi ambassador in Manila to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Baghdad, indicated the Iraqi regime provided funds to a terrorist group in the Philippines to purchase weapons. The kicker is that the group, Abu Sayyaf, was founded by Osama bin Laden's brother in law.²
- 7) 8,000 terrorists were trained by the Hussein regime at 3 training camps in Iraq. Many of these terrorists had close ties to al Qaeda.³
- 8) Blessed July. What is it you ask? A plot according to newly released documents, that called for the planned bombings and assassinations on London, Iran, and the Kurdish North.⁴ The planning was headed up by Uday Hussein. In fact the plot was well under way when Operation Iraqi Freedom occurred.²
- 9) While weapons of mass destruction were not found in bulk, the fact is that Saddam was planning to resume full scale weapons development after U.N. sanctions were lifted.⁵ The nuclear scientists were still in place, there was an offer for the uranium essential in creating a

nuclear weapon from the Congo, and much of the technology and tools needed were hidden but within reach.⁶

- 10) One Iraqi chemical weapons expert stated that after sanctions were over, it would have taken Iraq only a few days to develop mustard gas. Even more frightening was what former Iraqi Foreign Minister, Tariq Aziz made reference to. He stated Iraq could have had weapons of mass destruction capability within 2 years after sanctions were lifted.⁷
- 11) Iraq was secretly creating long range missiles with a range of 1,000 kilometers. Such a range would have easily hit Jerusalem and started a regional, if not world conflict. One such long range missile was even in the design stage.⁶
- 12) There is ample evidence that some of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction may have gone to Syria. One of the major players to make this claim was Saddam Hussein's #2 General in the Air Force, Georges Sada.⁸
- 13) Many on the left feel that Iraq was not an imminent threat to the United States. That was not the thoughts of Dr. Richard Spertzel, a member of the team inspecting some of Iraq's weapon's efforts. He told Fox News that Saddam was actively developing disguised aerosol weapons containing the nerve gas sarin that could have been used in assassinations or mass murders. He felt Saddam was going to put the sarin into perfume bottles that would have been placed on U.S. and European shelves. If released they could of killed thousands of Americans.⁹ For those who think Hussein would have not dared, then talk to the Iranians, Shiites, and Kurds, whose family members fell victim to the onslaught of biological and chemical weapons during the 80's and 90's.
- 14) There are several more items of interest that could have proved deadly if Saddam had stayed in power. From dual use substances that could be used to make civilian items or deadly chemicals like ricin,¹⁰ to the dual use biological weapons trailers.¹¹ Even Iraq's UAVs, (unmanned aerial vehicles), that could travel 500 kilometers, were a threat. Not only were they in direct violation of the United Nations sanctions, but if chemical or biological weapons were attached to them, the results would have been deadly.¹²

The Surgeon General's Warning

These 14 points show just how dangerous a world with Saddam Hussein in power would be. While many reading this chapter want to write off these claims as being doctored, tainted,

and spun to hit a certain audience, beware. Many of these 14 points cannot be denied. They are sure as death and taxes. Others are well researched, yet some of the pieces of the puzzle are yet to be found. This information is not meant to mislead or be misinterpreted. It is, however, the evidence that most of the 24 hour news outlets refuse to report. The information given looks to show just why the reasons for war still stand.

In the end only the reader can decide for themselves. You alone are the judge, jury, and executioner. Yet if one allows themselves the opportunity to look at the evidence given, they will at the very least see that the Hussein regime was a direct threat to the world. Did the end justify the means? You decide. Who knows, it might even change your outlook on if this war was worth fighting.

Black & White

When the 9/11 hijackers were looking at what specific date to attack America, they worked in code. For example, one of the terrorists, Mohammad Atta used two branches, a slash, and a lollipop to tell when the date of the hijackings might occur.¹³

Could you tell that two branches, a slash, and a lollipop on a computer marked a date to attack America? Do you think that one in the intelligence community would be able to read such a code, and actually get the date right every time? This is just one example on how difficult it can be to read the intelligence that terrorist networks and outlaw regimes use and are constantly trying to hide.

That brings us to Iraq. When stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction were not found, the liberals became unhinged. “Bush lied, and people died.” Yet not only did other national intelligence sources from countries like France, Russia, and Germany state Iraq had WMD capability, but so to did the Democrats. Along with that was the complexity of sorting through the intelligence,[.] much of which was not easy to decipher.

Take a quote from David Kay, who led the search for Weapons of Mass Destruction for most of the first year following Iraq’s liberation. “Iraq’s WMD programs spanned more than two decades, involved thousands of people, billions of dollars, and were shielded by elaborate security and deception.”¹²

Take that with the fact that often two Iraqis inside the Hussein organization would tell the Coalition two entirely different stories of the same event, and one can see how hard it becomes to