

2003 2003 IRAQ  
Toward Global Social Justice.

I exclaimed that an invasion of Iraq would be an illegal act under international law.  
There was dead silence

The American responded that: "Perhaps someone from Canada should address my comment."

No one did,

C(xvii)

I then proceeded to the hall where there was a poster display area. I found a conspicuous location and set up camp; trying to get signatures for my petition. The first one who came was supportive of the invasion, and we had a strenuous exchange about Iraq. Soon, one of the authorities from the conference told me that this was a private meeting. I replied, but the CFIA was a charitable institution so they should welcome different views. I then moved to the hallway between the two conferences: Military and Health getting no signatures and then getting numerous signatures.

Soon a man came along and said, "I know you:" You were the former leader of the Green Party of Canada. He soon revealed that he was working for the hotel and I had to leave and he escorted me out.

C(xvii)

I then went to Parliament hill - it was about 20 below. I tried to find a place to put my sign. There was a wooden sign in front - Visitors this way. I clipped my sign over it and got signatures. I stopped many politicians.

In 2008, I filed the following complaint to Revenue Canada about CDAI's charitable status and re-posted it with the question

See more the full complaint is included in the following article

[http://pejnews.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=9917:was-conference-of-defence-associations-charitable-status-ever-investigated&catid=75:cjustice-news&Itemid=2018MOVE](http://pejnews.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=9917:was-conference-of-defence-associations-charitable-status-ever-investigated&catid=75:cjustice-news&Itemid=2018MOVE) MOVE

**C\*(ixx)**

**SIGN-ON PETITION FOR AN EMERGENCY UNGA SESSION IN MARCH AT THE UN**

**This proposal for a UNGA resolution will be passed on to various delegations at the United Nations in New York from March 4-March 7 2003. Signatories of the proposed resolution are encouraged to lobby various state governments. [see enclosed draft resolution]**

**If you would like to endorse the proposal Please fill out the section at the end of the Proposal which states:**

**We support PROPOSAL FOR AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION EVOKING THE "UNITING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION" (UNGA RESOLUTION 377 v.; 7 October 1950).**

**Signatories: Name: Group if applicable. City/ Country and e-mail  
Please send copy of signature to [j.russow@shawlink.ca](mailto:j.russow@shawlink.ca)**

**C\*(xx)On March 2, I attended Canadian UNESCO AGM and worked on the following resolution:**

**March 1, 2003 I was standing in front of parliament with a large poster from 1939 with the message: Women do not give birth to kill sons of other mothers along with a petition against the invasion of Iraq**

**For further information, please contact: Joan Russow (PhD) 1 250 598-0071, [j.russow@shawlink.ca](mailto:j.russow@shawlink.ca)**

**C\* ( )2003 March 2nd UNESCO RESOLUTION ON INVASION OF IRAQ**

**Aware that 2001-2010 is the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World;**

**Concurring with the Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Koichiro Matsuura: "this Decade will provide a unique opportunity to translate solemn declarations and good intentions into reality";**

**Affirming that the relevance of the United Nations will reside in its ability to implement the provisions in the Charter of the United Nations and in the international instruments related to peace, social justice, human rights and the environment.**

**Recalling that the United Nations and UNESCO were founded to bring about a world at peace, and to prevent the scourge of war;**

**The 43rd Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO:**

- 1. Supports all efforts toward a peaceful resolution to the imminent and potentially explosive conflict;**
- 2. Calls upon the Canadian government to remain committed to a peace-based, multilateral process for resolving current and future conflicts, and provide leadership in building a culture of peace in the world;**
- 3. Invites the President of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO to convey this message to the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada, to the Director General of UNESCO and to the Secretary General of the United Nations.**

**François Crépeau  
Alex Michalos  
Joan Russow**

**March 2nd, 2003**

**Considérant que les années 2001-2010 constituent la Décennie internationale de la promotion d'une culture de la non-violence et de la paix au profit des enfants du monde ;**

**En accord avec le Directeur Général de l'UNESCO Monsieur Koichiro Matsuura « cette Décennie est l'occasion ou jamais de traduire les Déclarations solennelles et les bonnes intentions en réalité »;**

**Affirmant que la pertinence de l'Organisation des Nations Unies doit résider dans sa capacité à mettre en œuvre les dispositions de la Charte des Nations Unies et les instruments internationaux relatifs**

à la paix ,à la justice sociale ,aux droits humains et à l'environnement;

Rappelant que les Nations Unies et l'UNESCO ont été fondées pour bâtir un monde en paix et prévenir le spectre de la guerre,

La 43eme Assemblée Générale Annuelle de la Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO :

1. Appuie tous les efforts en faveur d'une résolution pacifique des conflits actuels et futurs ;
2. Demande au Gouvernement Canadien de maintenir son engagement envers un processus de règlement pacifique des conflits actuels et futurs et de tenir son rôle de défenseur d'une culture de la paix dans le monde;
3. Invite le président de la Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO à transmettre ce message au Premier Ministre et au gouvernement du Canada au Directeur Général de l'UNESCO et au Secrétaire Général des nations Unies.

François Crépeau  
Alex Michalos  
Joan Russow

ON March 2. I arrived i at the UN Commission on the Status of Women

March 2003

Languages 2003 March 3 Wednesday, i intervened at the NGO briefing, sitting in the Cuba delegation seat calling for an emergency protest prior to Blix' handing down report on March 7. I announced that anyone interested in participating should go to WILPF office to make posters. and plan the rally. About 20 women showed up . In all there were 27 languages spoken.

**C(xxi)**

(On March 3, I went to the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) morning NGO briefing and sat in the Cuban section. During the question period, I proposed that we have an emergency protest prior to Blix' handing down his report on March 7, in front of the UN on March 7- the day that Hans Blix was giving his IAEA Report and I proposed that anyone interested could go over to the WILPF office after the briefing. About 20 women showed up and we found at the meeting, that among the women present, we could speak 27

languages so we called the rally: Women Say No to War in 27 languages , then we drafted and circulated press releases.

The US invoked chapter 7 to support its claim that serious consequences in the 2002 security council resolutions 1441 could justify an invasion of Iraq. When Russia and France opposed the US position, Bush was furious and claimed the UNSC had become irrelevant.

C\*(xxii) on March 4, I went to the Russian press conference.

I had a chance to go to the Russian embassy for a press conference given by the Russian UN ambassador. Sergey Lavrov .- In the question period I asked him if he did not think that the UNSC was relevant because it did not support the US Intervention of IRAQ, and then asked if the US invaded Iraq, would he support the taking of the US to the International Court of Justice? He responded: that he did not think the US would invade Iraq . After the press conference , I went to a reception and asked him if he thought that “serious consequences” in the 2002 resolution legitimized the invasion of Iraq . He responded: that in 2002 when he did not veto the resolution that Bush assured him that “serious consequences” did not give UNSC support for an invasion of Iraq

C\*( xxiii)

#### **MARCH 5 MEETING WITH THE ASSISTANT CANADIAN AMBASSADOR**

The Canadian Voice if women for Peace had the opportunity of meeting with the Deputy Canadian ambassador who distributed to us the Canadian position in it we could see that Canada was supporting the US position about “serious consequences . we challenged the position.

A few days later we found out that Canada, to satisfy the concern of Great Britain to have a stronger endorsement of the invasion. Canada had drafted and circulated a new UNSC resolution related to delaying the invasion until there could be clear support for the invasion of CANADA

#### **&&CANADA THE US UNDERLING**

#### **&&OFF THE RECORD**

C\*(xxiv)After the meeting, at the UN I saw two reporters interviewing the Chilean Ambassador. I overheard the ambassador saying that Canada behind the scenes was working on a new resolution that would have a clear clause endorsing the invasion [something that

Great Britain had wished. I moved over to join the reporters and was told that this meeting was off the record

C\*xxv) Parliament, Chretien had declared that Canada would only support the invasion if there was an endorsement by the UNSC I do not think that Canadians knew how much Canada was lobbying to get a new UNSC resolution. I MENTIONED IT ON Vancouver COOP RADIO WHEN I was being interviewed in New York

#### **&&LEANING ON THE CHAIR OF THE UNSC**

C\* (xxvi)At one point I was going up the elevator when there was a comment about the US' LEANING ON Guinea which was currently the chair of the UNSC. I managed to slip out of the elevator with the UNSC reporters and wait there for a press conference for the media. I was talking with several reporters. I asked them why they don't ask the non-permanent members about US pressure on the non-permanent members? One of them said: "They have not said that there is pressure."

#### **C\*MARCH 7 AT THE UNSC PRESS GALLERY**

I was talking with several non-PERMANENT MEMBERS of states who revealed that it was being done .

C\*(xxvii) When the Pakistani ambassador came out to address the media, I asked him if he could comment on the way the US was intimidating non-permanent Council members. He diplomatically declined to respond. I had hoped that reporters would follow up on my question but what happened next was the media handler came over and asked to see my pass. When he saw my NGO pass he escorted me out. I don't know if a reporter had reported on me. Because if the handler knew all the reporters he would have asked me to leave earlier.

#### **&&UN MEDIA BEING CONSTRAINED**

C\*(xxviii) Later on there was a discussion of the role of the UN media in one of the conference rooms. During the question period, I raised the issue of the "UN media" not being willing to ask questions of the non -permanent members; in what way were they being pressured by the US?

C\*(xxix) PROPOSAL FOR AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION INVOKING THE UNITING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION

(UNGA RESOLUTION 377 v.; 7 October 1950).

**AFFIRMING** as in the Uniting for Peace Resolution that the first two stated purposes of the United Nations are the following:

(i) To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace, and

(2) To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace, reaffirming that it remains the primary duty of all Members of the United Nations, when involved in an international dispute, to seek settlement of such a dispute by peaceful means through the procedures laid down in Chapter VI of the Charter

**CONCURRING** with the Uniting for Peace Resolution, that failure of the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities on behalf of all the Member States, particularly those responsibilities referred to in the two preceding paragraphs, does not relieve Member States of their obligations or the United Nations of its responsibility under the Charter to maintain international peace and security,

**NOTING** further that although there was unanimity in the support by the Security Council for UN Security Council resolution 1441, on Iraq, (passed November 7, 2002), there was and continues to be an absence of unanimity related to what constitutes "a material breach".

**ACKNOWLEDGING** that “serious consequences” is not “code” for military invasion, and that under the Convention on the Law of Treaties, terms in international agreements must be understood in their ordinary language meaning;

**CONVINCED** that a second UN Security resolution declaring a perceived military breach and supporting a military invasion of Iraq, will jeopardize the work of the inspectors;

**DISMAYED** that two permanent members of the Security Council have without the consent of the Security Council or the General Assembly set up a no-fly zone in a region of Iraq; and that these two permanent members continue to aggressively provoke Iraq through their bombing in the no-fly zone, and through their building up of military offenses in the border states surrounding Iraq;

**CONCURRING** with the Declaration of the Right of Peoples to Peace that ensuring the exercise of the right of peoples to peace demands that the policies of States be directed towards the elimination of the threat of war, particularly nuclear war, the renunciation of the use of force in international relations and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations (3. Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace approved by General Assembly resolution 39/11 of 12 November 1984): and that the preservation of the right of peoples to peace and the promotion of its implementation constitute a fundamental obligation of each State (2. Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace approved by General Assembly resolution 39/11 of 12 November 1984);

**RECALLING** the dismay conveyed at the World Conference on Human Rights at massive violations of human rights especially in the form of genocide, ethnic cleansing” and systematic rape of women in war situations, creating mass exodus of refugees and displaced persons (s. 28 World Conference on Human Rights);.



**RECALLING** also the acknowledgement in Resolution 1325- that civilians, particularly women and children, account for the vast majority of those adversely affected by armed conflict, including as refugees and internally displaced persons and increasingly are targeted by combatants and armed elements, and recognizing the consequent impact this has on durable peace and reconciliation;

**RECALLING** also the recognition at the UN Conference on Women that the threat to peace resulting from continuing international tensions and violations of the United Nations Charter, ... as well as wars, armed conflicts, ... gross violations of human rights... are major obstacles to human progress- specifically to the advancement of women. (Para, Nairobi Forward looking strategies for the advancement of women, 1985);

**REAFFIRMING** the condemnation of the formulation, propounding, dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts intended to provide 'legitimacy' for the first use of nuclear weapons and in general to justify the 'admissibility' of unleashing nuclear war (2 Condemnation of Nuclear War General Assembly Resolution A/RES/38/75, 1983);

**ADDED** Convinced that life without war serves as the primary international prerequisite for the material well-being, development and progress of countries, and for the full implementation of the rights and fundamental human freedoms proclaimed by the United Nations (Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace approved by General Assembly resolution 39/11 of 12 November 1984);

**DISMAYED** that the World Health Organization estimates that 100,000 Iraqi civilians could be wounded and another 400,000 hit by disease after water, sewage, power and food facilities are bombed; and that 3.6 million Iraqi's will likely need "emergency shelter". Aware that at least 500,000 Iraqi children have died due to the sanctions that have deprived them of clean water, sanitation, and health care according to UNICEF;

**AWARE** that the military plans for an invasion of Iraq would likely result in the deaths of tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians; and that these plans would

**be in direct violation of the Geneva Convention which states that, "It is prohibited to attack, destroy, remove, or render useless objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population, such as foodstuffs, crops, livestock, drinking water installations and supplies, and irrigation works?" (Protocol 1, Article 54, paragraph 2);**

**DISMAYED also that those states promoting the military invasion of Iraq, are stating publicly that the UN will lose its relevance if it does not support the use of military force;**

**AFFIRMING that the relevance of the UN will be determined instead by its ability to implement the provisions in the UN Charter of the United Nations, and in the International agreements related to peace, social justice, human rights, and environmental protection;**

**AWARE that the March 1999 report of the UN Expert Panel on Disarmament concluded that "the bulk of Iraq's proscribed weapons programs has been eliminated" and that "...100% of verification may be an unattainable goal". They also noted that in the March report, it was stated that: "the country [Iraq] has experienced a shift from relative affluence to massive poverty...infant mortality rates in Iraq today are among the highest in the world...chronic malnutrition affects every fourth child... only 41% of the population have regular access to clean water...the gravity of the humanitarian situation of Iraqi people is indisputable and cannot be overstated." (Statement from the Canadian Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2000);**

**CONCERNED about the announced plans of the U.S. for what - in plain language - is nothing less than the threat of mass destruction by U.S. weapons, including plans to demolish critical infrastructure - such as electrical infrastructure - which would have profound impact, via the impact on water treatment facilities, on the health of the Iraqi people.**

**AWARE that many other states have weapons of mass destruction that do pose a threat to international peace and security;**

**DEEPLY CONCERNED** that in the past undue pressure and influence has been used to secure support in the UN Security Council, and **AWARE** that after recent reports to the UN Security Council, over 9 member states expressed opposition to military intervention;

**CONCURRING** with the Uniting for Peace resolution that failure of the Security Council

to discharge its responsibilities on behalf of all the member states, particularly

those responsibilities referred to in aforementioned paragraphs of the United Nations

Charter does not relieve Member States of their obligations or the United Nations of their responsibility under the Charter to maintain international peace and security,

**THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
THEREFORE**

**Will convene an emergency General Assembly session as provided for under the "Uniting for Peace resolution" to address the unprovoked aggression against Iraq, to oppose military intervention into Iraq, and to consider ending the sanctions**

**against Iraq; and that in accordance with the UN Charter, the General Assembly will support complete disarmament with UN inspectors being authorized to inspect and destroy weapons of mass destruction in the possession of all member states of the United Nations.**

**We support PROPOSAL FOR AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION EVOKING THE "UNITING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION" (UNGA RESOLUTION 377 v.; 7 October 1950).**

**Signatories: Name: Group if applicable. City/ Country and e-mail  
Please send copy of signature to [j.russow@shawlink.ca](mailto:j.russow@shawlink.ca) and**

***NAME  
SIGNATURE***

***ADDRESS***

Joan Russow PhD Canada Uniting for Peace  
Coalition [j.russow@shawlink.ca](mailto:j.russow@shawlink.ca)

### **&& CORALLED FOR SAFETY OUT OF SIGHT**

C\* (xxx)

**WE HAD POSTERS IN 27 LANGUAGES SAYING WOMEN SAY NO TO WAR**

March 8 I got up early ,and walked, with my poster [ women do not give birth to sons to kill sons of other mothers] , over to be in front of the UN for our protest. The guard, at the US embassy was very intimidating and told me that we must move away from in front of the embassy because it was not safe [because of the US?]. and ordered me to move over to another area and pointed to an area which was not visible from the UN. At the protest, I was interviewed by the German media. I took a video of the rally and passed it on to the Canadian Voice of Women for Peace. When I returned to the UN, I saw a CNN reporter and asked why he did not video our protest ; he responded; He did not expect any violence”.

### **C\*xxxii MARCH 8 CODE PINK RALLY**

On March 8, I went to a code pink rally- gave my poster to the president of United for Peace and Justice. I then interviewed protesters and said: “If I could send this on to Bush what would you say to him” See video

C\*(xxxii) I had to leave to catch a plane so I printed up 400 copies of the following piece and the Canadian Voice of Women for Peace undertook to distribute them:

### **&&CORRUPTION US STYLE: THE SILENT CURSE AT THE UN**

Although it is common knowledge at the UN that the US bribes, intimidates, threatens, cajoles coerces other states particularly the non-permanent member states of the UN Security Council , there is reluctance to refer to the US actions as corruption. The US has been ready to condemn other states as being corrupt but rarely is prepared to recognize the hypocrisy of its failing to designate its own actions as corrupt. When I raised the issue at a press scrum at the UN when I asked the Ambassador from Pakistan to comment on the fact that the US is cajoling, intimidating, and offering financial incentives to other members of the UN Security Council. I was approached by the media handler, and asked if I was with the media, and reprimanded by members of the media. I then have asked the

accredited media at the UN why they do not raise the issue of corruption, and have found that there is great reluctance to raising the issue. The answer probably lies in the fact admitted by some members of the media that raising such issues might jeopardize their accreditation as media.

### **f&&US CODE**

The US has established a code which has been scripted:

1. If the Security Council is not united the UN will become irrelevant (i.e. if the Security Council does not endorse the US proposal)
2. "Serious consequences" is UN code for Military invasion has been argued by Powell. (However, under the Convention on the Law of Treaties all terms in international documents must be interpreted in their ordinary language usage". Most other UN Security Council members did not understand "serious consequences" as being equivalent to military invasion
3. there is some progress with the inspections but not sufficient
4. Iraq must demonstrate full, unconditional, immediate and active cooperation ..
4. Inspection cannot go on forever; there must be deadline - currently proposed by the US/GB resolution as March 17
5. If Iraq has not complied with 4, then "all necessary means could be used to force them to disarm" or "remain seized of the matter"

At the UN, prior to the Blix and ElBaradei reports on March 7, buzzing around the UN was concern about how Guinea, as the new President of the Security Council had been "leaned" on "pressured" . Also if one compares the statement made by Angola after the first Blix report and the statement made yesterday one can see that even Angola which had spoken out so strongly about the devastation of war is now speaking in US code. When one asks around the UN about the change of heart of Angola, the answer inevitably the US negotiations around the oil industry. Similarly, Cameroon which previously had been opposed to war, appears to be evoking the US code.

In a proposal for impeachment in 1991, the corrupt actions by Bush the First at the UN Security Council were used as one of the grounds for impeachment. Currently there is another proposal to impeach Bush the Second. For all the reasons advocated in the current proposal, definitely corruption is an integral part of case against Bush the Second.

Joan Russow (PhD)

## **Global Compliance Research Project**

### **C\*(xxxiii)- A WILLING WARMONGER**

**Canada's so-called "compromise" resolution is nothing more than a delayed ultimatum for war. Canada continues to forget that the purpose of the Charter of the United Nations is to prevent the scourge of war.**

**It is reported that Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien, and Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Bill Graham are supposedly carrying out US dirty work by, in the case of the Prime Minister, lobbying Chile and Mexico, and in the case of Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister, trying to persuade France not to veto.**

**In this way, the Canadian government is condoning the questionable practices of the United States: intimidation, cajoling and "check book diplomacy".**

**Throughout the deliberations of the United Nations, the government of Canada has been deliberately deluding the Canadian public that the government would join the war if there is " UN support" or "international support".**

**The way to determine if there is UN or international support is to endorse the global call for an emergency session of the UN General Assembly through evoking the 1950 Uniting for Peace resolution. A request by seven members of the Security Council could bring about an emergency session of the UN General Assembly.**

**There is little doubt that a UN General Assembly would overwhelmingly support the continued inspections without an ultimatum for war. It is only through engaging in practices that under normal conditions would be indictable will the US be able to establish "the Coalition of the Willing" or as was coined by the NGO's at the UN: the "Coalition of the coerced".**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
1 250 598-0071**

Prior to the following statement by Francis Boyle, he had urged Iraq to go to the international Court of Justice A recommendation which I circulated every where:

**&& BEHIND THE SCENES**

Updated Tue, 11 Mar 2003 20:04:49

**UNITED NATIONS** - Canada's ambassador to the United Nations, Paul Heinbecker, said he is both disturbed and encouraged by Iraqi efforts to comply with a UN resolution to disarm.

**INDEPTH: Iraq: U.S. military buildup**

Although not a member of the Security Council, Canada has been working hard to help two opposing factions heal the divisions over taking action on Iraq.

**&& IRRELEVANT IF OPPOSING US INVASION**

Heinbecker warned the current battle within the Security Council threatens to make the UN irrelevant as a force for peace.

C\*( ) The following is a report from the CBC:

A haze of diplomatic uncertainty descended on the United Nations on Tuesday - uncertainty over whether the U.S., Britain and Spain are planning to bring forward a new, modified resolution on Iraq to the Security Council.

There's talk of a new deadline near the end of March or even later. There's talk as well of setting out some specific disarmament benchmarks for Iraq. But so far nothing has been confirmed.

The Security Council met in a special open session. Ambassadors from nations not on the Security Council asked to speak, and many, like Heinbecker, delivered strong messages.

The first country to speak in the open session was Iraq. Ambassador Mohammed al-Douriem said: "He'd come to respond to the "lies and falsehoods" of the U.S. and Britain. "No weapons of mass destruction have been found by the (UN weapons) inspectors," he said.

Iraq, he said, has made "the strategic decision to rid itself of its weapons of mass destruction."

**Iraq "reiterates its readiness to co-operate: "We will convincingly respond to anyone who has any doubts about Iraq's co-operation," the ambassador told the Council members.**

**The procession of ambassadors will continue through much of the day on Wednesday.**

**While that goes on, most of the members of the Security Council wait. It's not clear just how the U.S. and Britain might modify their draft resolution.**

**There are hints of new tests, or disarmament benchmarks for Iraq, combined with a later deadline.**

**The smaller nations on the Council have suggested a delay of 45 days, an idea quickly rejected by U.S. officials and Britain's UN ambassador, Jeremy Greenstock.**

**"We are busting a gut to see if we can get greater consensus in the Council," he said. "We are examining whether a list of tests of Iraqi compliance would be a useful thing for the council. It doesn't mean there are any conclusions."**

**It could be that the deadlock in the Security Council is at least beginning to loosen up. French officials are sending out feelers saying they're "open to dialogue." And Russia's UN ambassador, Sergei Lavrov, seemed to signal some subtle change as well, suggesting that what matters most is not the timeline, but how a decision for war is ultimately made.**

**"Any resolution which contains ultimatums and automatically for the use of force is not acceptable to us," said Lavrov.**

**It may yet prove to be that compromise isn't possible and that U.S. President George W. Bush will defy the UN and go to war anyway.**

**But there was a new and clear warning from the current president of the Security Council, Guinea's Mamadee Trowawee, who suggested that if war breaks out that way, then the UN may have to meet in an effort to stop it.**

**"The United Nations will have to take, maybe, the decision. I mean to call for a meeting. I don't know if it will be at the level of the General Assembly or the Security Council. But in that case something will have to be done."**



**The question of what the Security Council will be asked to do about Iraq is now shrouded in a thick fog of diplomatic uncertainty.**

**But in another twist, a spokesman for Pakistan's ruling party says Pakistan has decided to abstain on any vote authorizing war against Iraq.**

**An abstention by such a key U.S. ally in the "war against terrorism" means one less Security Council vote for Washington to count on.**

**"We do not want to see the destruction of the Iraqi people, the destruction of the country," said Prime Minister Zafarullah Khan Jamali.**

**Jamali pleaded for the Security Council to allow more time for UN weapons inspectors to do their job.**

**White House spokesman Ari Fleischer said however, that the new resolution would be put to a vote this week, although he did indicate a readiness to compromise.**

**But, Fleischer said, the proposal being floated to push back the March 17 deadline by a month, was "a non-starter."**

**"There is room for diplomacy here," he said. "Not much room and not much time."**

**C\***

**I was talking with the representatives of Guinea and Mexico in Canada today.**

**Both indicated that at this point that their countries were against the US/UK resolution. I missed a call from Chilean Embassy in Ottawa. I think that we should lobby the embassies located in various countries. I stressed that there was strong support for opposing the UK/US resolution, including the position of the Non-Aligned states, and that if a resolution opposing the war were put on the floor at an emergency session of the UNGA, it would definitely pass.**

**The reporting of the presentations by non-Security Council members was skewed in Canada and I presume it was the same in the US. In Canada, the CBC had Iraq, Kuwait, and Canada and CNN had Iraq and Kuwait and turned off the volume when the Ambassador from South Africa spoke.**

**Shaming the Media at the UN has to be done. Perhaps they are afraid that they will lose their "embedded" status.**

**C\*( ) I wrote a letter to the president of the General**

**Dear President of the UN General Assembly:**

**I urge you to heed the request of the majority of the members of the UN General Assembly to call an Emergency Session of the UNGA, and address the illegal action of the United States' military invasion of Iraq.**

**In November, after the UN Security Council Resolution 1441 was passed, I was concerned that the United States was claiming that it had now received the support from the United Nations, and from the International Community. Subsequently, I drafted a proposal for an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly invoking the 1950 Uniting for peace resolution. This resolution permits the requesting of an emergency session to be called within 24 hours in the event that the UN Security Council fails to perform its primary role under the Charter of the United Nations: to prevent the scourge the war.**

**As you know, a high percentage of the citizens of the world as well as a large majority of the members states of the United Nations are opposed to the US's military invasion of Iraq.**

**It is with great dismay, that it has been brought to my attention, that the US, in the last few weeks, has sent an intimidating letter to all the members of the UN General Assembly:demanding {that states] "... avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly."**

**The General Assembly should draft an emergency resolution calling for**

- \* the immediate cessation of all military intervention into Iraq, and for the immediate withdrawal of invading US and "coalition" troops ;**
- \* the continuation of the work of the inspectors in Iraq**

**Subsequently, the UN General Assembly, should meet and pass a resolution calling for:**

- the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction through the authorization of inspectors entering all states that have weapons of mass destruction
- the US and the UK to be compelled to appear before the international Court of Justice for violating the rule of international law
- the ratification of the International Criminal Court by all states, and for President George Bush, and President Tony Blair to be tried under the Court for war crimes.

The General Assembly, is the body that most accommodates the essence of sovereign equality under the Charter of the United Nations, and the voice of the UNGA must be strengthened as was agreed under the Millennium Declaration.

Yours very truly,

Joan Russow (PhD)  
1230 St . Patrick St.  
Victoria, B.C. V8S 4Y4

Member of the Uniting for Peace Coalition

to eliminate the weapons of mass destruction, including those weapons in the possession of memc

**SOMETIME BETWEEN MARCH 11 AND MARCH 19**

**FIND DATE**

The Chilean newspaper La Tercera reports that their embassy in Washington

Received a letter from the U.S., technically called a "non paper," that "demands" that they "focus on the real challenges that are to come and avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly. Such steps will not change the path that we are on, but will increase tensions, make divisions deeper and could provoke more damage to the UN and the Security Council."

This letter was sent to all members of the UN General Assembly.

**The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression of "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**The hypocrisy of the US -the world's largest producer of weapons of mass destruction, and of MUF-nuclear material unaccounted for-- has not escaped the international community of citizens and states. If the US were truly concerned about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction they would not have withdrawn from the CBT Convention, and they would call for inspectors to go into all countries, including their own, that have weapons of mass destruction to systematically rid the world of these weapons.**

**the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)**

**The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council, is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any**

**authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.**

**The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.**

**Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.**

**As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice, Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.**

**In addition, President George Bush should be brought**

**Yours very truly**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
1230 St. Patrick St.  
Victoria,  
1 250 598-0071**

**US IS AN INTERNATIONAL ROGUE STATE: HYPOCRITICAL STANCES. CORRUPTIVE PRACTICES, AND ILLEGAL ACTIONS,**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
Victoria, Canada**

**1 250 598-0071**

**US THWARTS ATTEMPT TO CALL AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION**

**For some time there has been a campaign to call for an emergency UN General Assembly session, invoking the 1950 uniting for peace resolution. The United States knows that not only is a large percentage of civil society opposing the invasion of Iraq, but also over 80% of the member states of the United Nations would oppose the military invasion of Iraq.**

**Yesterday, it was revealed in the newspaper La Tercera that the US had been attempting to prevent an emergency General Assembly session.**

**It is well documented that the US has continually shown disdain for the rule of International law-failing to sign and ratify international instruments, and showing for the jurisdiction of International Court of Justice, and more recently for the International Criminal Court.**

**US ENGAGED IN AN ILLEGAL ACT**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, the following purpose is clearly enunciated:  
to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and**

**to ensure by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, force is only authorized if sanctioned by the UN Security Council, or under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations which affirms: the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)**

**The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.**

**The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.**

**Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.**

**As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice, Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute**

**Victoria, Canada**

**1 250 598-0071**

**UNDOUBTEDLY BUSH SHOULD ALSO BE COMPELLED BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY. IF THE US CONTINUALLY REFUSES TO RATIFY THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT. HE SHOULD BE TRIED UNDER A INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL COMPARABLE TO THE ONE SET UP FOR Kosovo.**

**PROPOSAL FOR AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION EVOKING THE UNITING FOR PEACE<sup>24</sup>**

**2424242424-242424Error!. At the meeting there was a decision to set up the Women's Coalition of the Unwilling, and to approach other women in the community to participate.**

**At the meeting we initiated a list of actions that the Coalition for the Unwilling is unwilling to accept, condone etc.**

**The Coalition of the Unwilling is unwilling:**

**- to allow the US to undermine the United Nations, and to violate the rule of international law through engaging in an illegal act**



- to accept the failure of the US to ratify the International Criminal Court where the US president George Bush should be brought for War Crimes
- to condone the US intimidating, cajoling and offering cheque-book diplomacy to influence the will of other states
  
- to accept "pre-emptive or prevention strikes as policy, because it violates international law, including international human rights instruments
  
- to tolerate the obsequiousness of the media towards the governments, and the military industrial complex
- to tolerate the continued use of euphemisms to describe crimes against humanity: i.e. collateral damage; " operation Iraqi freedom " "ultimatum Iraq"
  
- to condone hypocrisy where the US which possesses the largest arsenal of weapons of mass destruction is not prepared to allow inspectors to enter the US facilities to ensure the full and complete elimination of the weapons of mass destruction in the United States.
  
- to allow the mining and export of uranium, and the sale of CANDU reactors which is closely linked to the development of weapons of mass destruction
  
- to condone the use of Depleted Uranium which has been described as a low level weapon of mass destruction
  
- to condone the existence of 1000 Canadian industries that are involved in the defence industries, and that export this technology to the United States and elsewhere
- to condone the exorbitant global 900 billion military budget that diverts funds from global social justice
- to support any measure to further military industrial
- to continue to have Canada export oil and natural gas, used in the production of weapons in the US, to the US
- to urge all citizens, unions, and institutions to withdraw funds from all companies that contribute to the military industrial complex
  
- to tolerate the classification of those opposing the US/UK military intervention as being "unpatriotic" or .."traitors"
  
- to have Canada associated with the so-called "Coalition of the Willing"

**- to have a delegation from the Canadian Senate go to the US to complain about Canada not being listed as part of the "Coalition of the Willing"**

**- to condone any Canadian Complicity in the attack on Iraq**  
**- to have Canadian vessels remain in the Arabian Sea**

**- to have children used for political purposes [children hailing the arrival of the Americans]**

**- to tolerate the violence of technological disastrous warfare- - the technological massacre of civilians**

**- to support " rehabilitation of Iraq being used as a justification of an intervention**

**- to support sons of mothers to kill sons of other mothers [reversing the message on my poster; "Mothers do not give birth to kill sons of other Mothers."**

**- to condone the environmental devastation of war**

**- to tolerate racial profiling, engaging in an attack that could be construed as having racial and religious elements**

**The Coalition of the Unwilling supports Canada not participating in the so-called Coalition of the Willing**

**Dear President of the UN General Assembly:**

**I urge you to heed the request of the majority of the members of the UN General Assembly to call an Emergency Session of the UNGA, and address the illegal action of the United States' military invasion of Iraq.**

**In November, after the UN Security Council Resolution 1441 was passed, I was concerned that the United States was claiming that it had now received the support from the United Nations, and from the International Community. Subsequently, I drafted a proposal for an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly invoking the 1950 Uniting for peace resolution. This resolution permits the requesting of an emergency session to be called within 24 hours in the event that the UN Security Council fails to perform its primary role under the Charter of the United Nations: to prevent the scourge the war.**

**As you know, a high percentage of the citizens of the world as well as a large majority of the members states of the United Nations are opposed to the US's military invasion of Iraq.**

**It is with great dismay, that it has been brought to my attention, that the US, in the last few weeks, has sent an intimidating letter to all the members of the UN General Assembly, demanding {that states] ".avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly".**

**The General Assembly should draft an emergency resolution calling for**

- \* the immediate cessation of all military intervention into Iraq, and for the immediate withdrawal of invading US and "coalition" troops ;**
- \* the continuation of the work of the inspectors in Iraq**

**Subsequently, the UN General Assembly, should meet pass a resolution calling for**

- the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction through the authorization of inspectors entering all states that have weapons of mass destruction**
- the US and the UK to be compelled to appear before the international Court of Justice for violating the rule of international law**
- the ratification of the International Criminal Court by all states, and for President George Bush, and President Tony Blair to be tried under the Court for war crimes.**

**The General Assembly, is the body that most accommodates the essence of sovereign equality under the Charter of the United Nations, and the voice of the UNGA must be strengthened as was agreed under the Millennium Declaration.**

**Yours very truly,**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
1230 St . Patrick St.  
Victoria, B.C. V8S 4Y4**

**to eliminate the weapons of mass destruction, including those weapons in the possession of**

**The Chilean newspaper La Tercera reports that their embassy in Washington**

Received a letter from the U.S., technically called a "non paper," that "demands" that they "focus on the real challenges that are to come and avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly. Such steps will not change the path that we are on, but will increase tensions, make divisions deeper and could provoke more damage to the UN and the Security Council."

This letter was sent to all members of the UN General Assembly.

The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.

The hypocrisy of the US -the world's largest producer of weapons of mass destruction, and of MUF-nuclear material unaccounted for-- has not escaped the international community of citizens and states. If the US were truly concerned about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction they would not have withdrawn from the CBT Convention, and they would call for inspectors to go into all countries, including their own, that have weapons of mass destruction to systematically rid the world of these weapons.

the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)

The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes

**on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.**

**The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.**

**Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.**

**As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice,**

**Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in**

**violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.**

**In addition, President George Bush should be brought**

**Yours very truly**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
1230 St. Patrick St.**

### **US THWARTS ATTEMPT TO CALL AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION**

**For some time there has been a campaign to call for an emergency UN General Assembly session, invoking the 1950 uniting for peace resolution. The United States knows that not only is a large percentage of civil society opposing the invasion of Iraq, but also over 80% of the member states of the United Nations would oppose the military invasion of Iraq.**

**Yesterday, it was revealed in the newspaper La Tercera that the US had been attempting to prevent an emergency General Assembly session.**

**It is well documented that the US has continually shown disdain for the rule of International law-failing to sign and ratify international instruments, and showing disdain for the jurisdiction of International Court of Justice, and more recently for the International Criminal Court.**

### **US ENGAGED IN AN ILLEGAL ACT**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, the following purpose is clearly enunciated:**

**to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and**

**to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure by the acceptance of principles and the institution of**

**methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, force is only authorized if sanctioned by the UN Security Council, or under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations which affirms:**

**the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)**

**The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.**

**The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.**

Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.

As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice,

Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.

Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute

Victoria, Canada

1 250 598-0071

**UNDOUBTEDLY BUSH SHOULD ALSO BE COMPELLED BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY. IF THE US CONTINUALLY REFUSES TO RATIFY THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT. HE SHOULD BE TRIED UNDER A INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL COMPARABLE TO THE ONE SET UP FOR KOSOVO.**

### **&&US INTIMIDATION**

At one point we were optimistic that there would be an emergency meeting of the UNGA where the uniting for peace would be invoked. But it was not to happen.

Chile went public and revealed that the US HAD Sent an intimidating letter to all members of the UNGA 'URGING' THEM NOT TO SUPPORT AN EMERGENCY MEETING OF THE UNGA



**The Chilean newspaper La Tercera reports that their embassy in President Washington Received a letter from the U.S., technically called a "non paper," that "demands" that they "focus on the real challenges that are to come and avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly. Such steps will not change the path that we are on, but will increase tensions, make divisions deeper and could provoke more damage to the UN and the Security Council."**

**\***

## **&&ILLEGAL INVASION**

**C\*By Francis A. Boyle**

**On 19 March 2003 President Bush Jr. commenced his criminal war against Iraq by ordering a so-called decapitation strike against the President of Iraq in violation of a 48-hour ultimatum he had given publicly to the Iraqi President and his sons to leave the country. This duplicitous behavior violated the customary international laws of war set forth in the 1907 Hague Convention on the Opening of Hostilities to which the United States is still a contracting party, as evidenced by paragraphs 20, 21, 22, and 23 of U.S. Army Field Manual 27-10 (1956). Furthermore, President Bush Jr.'s attempt to assassinate the President of Iraq was an international crime in its own right. Of course the Bush Jr. administration's war of aggression against Iraq constituted a Crime against Peace as defined by the Nuremberg Charter (1945), the Nuremberg Judgment (1946), and the Nuremberg Principles (1950) as well as by paragraph 498 of U.S. Army Field Manual 27-10 (1956).**



### **Shock and awe 2019**

Next came the Pentagon's military strategy of inflicting "shock and awe" upon the city of Baghdad.

### **C\* ( )MARCH 20 VOW FILM**

2003 March 20 produced a film Voices with women from Iraq, Egypt, Afghanistan, Colombia, US, South Asia , Canada

### **C\*( )MARCH 22 letter to president OF THE UNGA**

---

Victoria, Canada

1 250 598-0071

Subsequent attempt to end the invasion This Campaign was sent around the world and the signatures presented to the UN'

**C\*( )**

**A CAMPAIGN CALLING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS TO SUPPORT IRAQ IN DETERMINING ITS OWN FUTURE**

**We Call for an Immediate Cease Fire, Withdrawal of the Troops Occupying Iraq, UN Leadership in Ending the Humanitarian Disaster, and an End to Pre-emptive Attacks**

**As a large percentage of civil society, as well as a majority of the member states of the United Nations, have opposed the military invasion of Iraq and recognize this as a clear violation of the UN Charter and of International Law and, furthermore, that the US and UK troops are, therefore, an occupying force –**

**We, the undersigned, request that UN peacekeepers and/or a truly international force, under the command of the UN, be immediately sent in to replace the occupying forces in Iraq with a mandate to restore peace and order, provide humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq, and to oversee the process of rebuilding and reparation.**

**We further state that American corporations (or any corporation from the UK or any of the allied countries) must not be allowed to profit from either reconstruction or from the sales or production of oil. All profits from such activities should go directly back to Iraq to provide for the country's reconstruction and the people's well being. It is vital that the United Nations play the lead role in overseeing such matters.**

**We further state that the Iraqi people are entitled to reparations for the devastation of their peoples, country and heritage.**

**In addition, the United Nations through its various organs and institutions, including the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court should take all measures necessary to maintain security and peace in the world and prevent the scourge of war - fundamental objective of the Charter of the United Nations**

**Finally, the United Nations, not the U.S. (or UK or any of the allied countries), should assist Iraq in creating a new, representative and indigenous government.**

**In light of the above we raise the following concerns that:**

**a.. The situation in Iraq is a humanitarian disaster that demands an immediate remedy**

**b.. The Security Council has not fulfilled its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.**

**c.. The UN Security Council has failed to comply with its own resolution 1325 which affirms the Importance of involving women in the prevention, management and resolution of conflict and peace processes**

**d.. No state may be allowed to violate the principle of equality before the law with impunity. The policy and/or implementation of pre-emptive strike, by any member state of the United Nations, is illegal and in violation of the rule of International Law equally applicable to each member state, the violation of which incurs legal remedy**

**e.. The use of weapons of mass destruction - such as weapons with depleted uranium casing, cluster bombs, which cannot avoid civilian targets, are indiscriminate and excessively injurious including long-term debilitating effects - reasonably fall under "Prohibitive Weapons" as per the 1980 Convention On Conventional Weapons.**

**f.. Civilians, including humanitarian workers, journalists and local residents were deliberate targets of war**

**g.. The illegal occupying forces continue to violate their obligations under the Geneva Conventions**

**h.. Invaders--most particularly those engaged in further illegal acts--must not by law be permitted to govern and the UN must step in immediately to**

**assist in the transfer of governance authority to the Iraqi people**

**i.. The invaders be required in a timely manner to pay for reparations to be administered by the UN system and NGO network. A number of significant international human rights treaties create a general duty to make appropriate reparations for violations of human rights. These include the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment**

**j.. The devastation caused to the natural and cultural heritage of Iraq is in violation of the spirit and the letter of international conventions such as the World Heritage Convention of 1972, ratified by 170 countries; the 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Properties in the Event of Armed Conflict (the Hague Convention), now ratified by 103 countries; and the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970),**

ratified by 97 countries. k.. In many cases the corporations that are profiteers often continue to profit from the spoils of war, and this must not be allowed, it must be prohibited.

l.. That there has been a failure, which must not continue, to act on the important commitment made at the UN Conference on Women (1995) and the Habitat II Conference (1996) "to ensure that corporations, including transnational corporations, comply with international law, including international environmental law.

m.. The practice at the United Nations of intimidation, and "check book diplomacy" exercised by the United States - financial coercion that most often results in member states being "persuaded" to endorse actions that contravene the Charter of the United Nations, continues to be practiced and condoned.

n.. Although the member states of the United Nations have, in certain instances, undertaken adherence to principles through conventions, treaties, and covenants, through Conference action plans, and through General Assembly Resolutions related to peace, human rights, social justice and the environment, these principles have not been sufficiently adhered to.

o.. Member states of the UN General Assembly have been deterred, largely through the vigorous efforts of the United States, from exercising their fundamental duties under the Charter the United Nations and under the rule of International Law.

**THUS, we urge the Security Council to meet immediately, call for a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops and to carry out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security (Article 24 of the UN Charter)**

**If the Security Council fails once again to stop the aggression and to take the lead in establishing peace and security, then we urge all member states of the United Nations, with the vigorous support from all members of global civil society, to request an emergency session of the UN General Assembly,**

**invoking the Uniting for Peace Resolution, or other means available under the authority of the UN, to call for the following:**

- 1.. Immediate end of the current invasion and occupation of Iraq.**
- 2.. For the US, UK and allied countries supporting and involved directly**

and indirectly in this attack on Iraq, to be required to immediately and adequately fund UN and International aid agencies in order to address the humanitarian disaster in Iraq.

3.. For the United Nations, not the U.S. or any member/representative of the coalition of allied countries, to assist Iraq in the creation of a new, representative and indigenous government. All Laws governing the political economy of Iraq should be rightfully developed by the appropriate authorities selected by the Iraqi people and consultants of their own Choosing. The UN's central role must involve real decision-making power; it must not be a "fig leaf" designed to provide political cover for unilateral U.S. action. The UN must remain at the center of all moves to create an interim administration, recruit Iraqis to participate, set the dates for conferences and elections, etc. If UN authority is compromised, or if the UN is brought into the process only to provide legitimacy to continuing U.S. (or UK or allied countries) control, then the UN should not take it on at all. Jay Garner's authority should be turned over immediately and fully to a United Nations special representative.

4.. Contracts for the re-building of Iraq should be opened to local and regional enterprises inviting collaboration with international companies of the Iraqis own choosing in an open bidding process. No element whatsoever of 'victor takes the spoils' secret contracting to USA, UK corporations should be allowed.

5.. UN inspectors, under the jurisdiction of the UN, should return to Iraq to carry out any legitimate need to eliminate weapons of mass destruction.

6.. UN peacekeeping forces and human rights monitors should have immediate jurisdiction in Iraq, replacing any US (or UK and allied countries) forces or personnel.

7. Immediate involvement of UNESCO in collaboration with non-commercial NGOs for the full restoration to Iraq of its entire cultural heritage. All objects from the vandalized museums and libraries of Iraq must be declared stolen property to be required by law returned to the people of Iraq. All nations must be called upon to sign an agreement to declare criminal any trade in the art and objects of Iraqi

heritage and agree to make every effort to restore to Iraq the objects of her magnificent history.

We will hold the United States, the United Kingdom, the consortium of allied countries and their officials accountable for their involvement and claims that this war is about democratization and not about empire, oil, and the expansion of U.S. power.

We hold the mainstream media responsible for complicity in its support of the U.S. led invasion of Iraq.

### Contact

Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Project  
COUNTRY Victoria, Canada

toward global social justice.

I exclaimed that an invasion of Iraq would be an illegal act under international law.

There was dead silence

the American responded: Perhaps someone from Canada should address my comment.”

No one did

C(xvii) I then proceeded to the hall where there was a poster display area. I found a conspicuous location and set up camp, trying to get signatures for my petition, The first one who came was supportive of the invasion , and we had a strenuous exchange about Iraq. Soon, one of the authorities from the conference told me that this was a private meeting- I said but the CFIA was a charitable institution so they should welcome different views. I then moved to the hallway in between the two conferences; the military and the health. I went from military to health - getting no signatures and getting numerous signatures.

Soon this man came along and said I know you:” You were the former leader of the Green Party of Canada. He soon revealed that he was working for the hotel and I had to leave and he escorted me out.

C(xvii) I then went to Parliament hill -it was about 20 below. I tried to find a place to put my sign. There was a wooden sign in front -

Visitors this way. I clipped my sign over the and got signatures. I stopped many politicians

In 2008, I filed the following complaint to revenue Canada about CDAl's charitable status and re-posted it with the question

See more the full complaint is included in the following article

[http://pejnews.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=9917:was-conference-of-defence-associations-charitable-status-ever-investigated&catid=75:cjustice-news&Itemid=2018MOVE](http://pejnews.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=9917:was-conference-of-defence-associations-charitable-status-ever-investigated&catid=75:cjustice-news&Itemid=2018MOVE) MOVE

**C\*(ixx) SIGN-ON PETITION FOR AN EMERGENCY UNGA SESSION IN MARCH AT THE UN**

This proposal for a UNGA resolution will be passed on to various delegations at the United Nations in New York from March 4-March 7 2003. Signatories of the proposed resolution are encouraged to lobby various state governments. [see enclosed draft resolution]

If you would like to endorse the proposal Please fill out the section at the end of the Proposal which states:

**We support PROPOSAL FOR AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION EVOKING THE "UNITING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION" (UNGA RESOLUTION 377 v.; 7 October 1950).**

Signatories: Name: Group if applicable. City/ Country and e-mail  
Please send copy of signature to [j.russow@shawlink.ca](mailto:j.russow@shawlink.ca)

**C\*(xx)On March 2, I attended Canadian UNESCO AGM and worked on the following resolution:**

**March 1, 2003 I was standing in front of parliament with a large poster from 1939 with the message: Women do not give birth to kill sons of other mothers along with a petition against the invasion of Iraq**

For further information, please contact: Joan Russow (PhD) 1 250 598-0071, [j.russow@shawlink.ca](mailto:j.russow@shawlink.ca)



**C\* ( )2003 March 2nd UNESCO RESOLUTION ON INVASION OF IRAQ**

**Aware that 2001-2010 is the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World;**

**Concurring with the Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Koichiro Matsuura: "this Decade will provide a unique opportunity to translate solemn declarations and good intentions into reality";**

**Affirming that the relevance of the United Nations will reside in its ability to implement the provisions in the Charter of the United Nations and in the international instruments related to peace, social justice, human rights and the environment.**

**Recalling that the United Nations and UNESCO were founded to bring about a world at peace, and to prevent the scourge of war;**

**The 43rd Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO:**

- 1. Supports all efforts toward a peaceful resolution to the imminent and potentially explosive conflict;**
- 2. Calls upon the Canadian government to remain committed to a peace-based, multilateral process for resolving current and future conflicts, and provide leadership in building a culture of peace in the world;**
- 3. Invites the President of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO to convey this message to the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada, to the Director General of UNESCO and to the Secretary General of the United Nations.**

**François Crépeau  
Alex Michalos  
Joan Russow**

**March 2nd, 2003**

**Considérant que les années 2001-2010 constituent la Décennie internationale de la promotion d'une culture de la non-violence et de la paix au profit des enfants du monde ;**

**En accord avec le Directeur Général de l'UNESCO Monsieur Koichiro Matsuura « cette Décennie est l'occasion ou jamais de traduire les Déclarations solennelles et les bonnes intentions en réalité »;**

**Affirmant que la pertinence de l'Organisation des Nations Unies doit résider dans sa capacité à mettre en œuvre les dispositions de la Charte des Nations Unies et les instruments internationaux relatifs à la paix, à la justice sociale, aux droits humains et à l'environnement;**

**Rappelant que les Nations Unies et l'UNESCO ont été fondées pour bâtir un monde en paix et prévenir le spectre de la guerre,**

**La 43ème Assemblée Générale Annuelle de la Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO :**

- 1. Appuie tous les efforts en faveur d'une résolution pacifique des conflits actuels et futurs ;**
- 2. Demande au Gouvernement Canadien de maintenir son engagement envers un processus de règlement pacifique des conflits actuels et futurs et de tenir son rôle de défenseur d'une culture de la paix dans le monde;**
- 3. Invite le président de la Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO à transmettre ce message au Premier Ministre et au gouvernement du Canada au Directeur Général de l'UNESCO et au Secrétaire Général des Nations Unies.**

**François Crépeau  
Alex Michalos  
Joan Russow**

**ON March 2. I arrived i at the UN Commission on the Status of Women**

**March 2003  
Languages 2003 March 3 Wednesday, i intervened at the NGO briefing, sitting in the Cuba delegation seat calling for an emergency protest prior to Blix' handing down report on March 7. I announced that anyone interested in participating should go to WILPF office to make posters. and plan the rally. About 20 women showed up . In all there were 27 languages spoken.**

**C(xxi)** (On March 3, I went to Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) morning NGO briefing and sat in the Cuban section, during the question period, I proposed that we have an emergency protest prior to Blix' handing down his report on March 7. in front of the UN on March 7- the day that Hans Blix was giving his IAEA Report and I proposed that anyone interested could go over to the WILPF office after the briefing. About 20 women showed up and we found at the meeting that among the women present we could speak 27 languages so we called the rally: women say no to war in 27 languages, then we drafted and circulated press releases.

The US invoked chapter 7 to support its claim that serious consequences in the 2002 security council resolutions 1441 could justify an invasion of Iraq. when Russia and France opposed the US position Bush was furious and claimed the UNSC had become irrelevant.

**C\*(xxii)** on March 4 I went to the Russian press conference

I had a chance to go to the Russian embassy for a press conference given by the Russian UN ambassador. Sergey Lavrov. In the question period I asked him. If he did not think that the UNSC was relevant because it did not support the US Intervention of IRAQ, and then asked if the US invaded Iraq would he support the taking of the US to the International Court of Justice. he responded: that he did not think the US would invade Iraq. After the press conference, I went to a reception and asked him if he thought that "serious consequences" in the 2002 resolution legitimized the invasion of Iraq. He responded: that in 2002 when he did not veto the resolution that Bush assured him that "serious consequences" did not give UNSC support for an invasion of Iraq

**C\*( xxiii) MARCH 5 MEETING WITH THE ASSISTANT CANADIAN AMBASSADOR**

The Canadian Voice if women for Peace had the opportunity of meeting with the Deputy Canadian ambassador who distributed to us the Canadian position in it we could see that Canada was supporting the US position about "serious consequences. we challenged the position.

A few days later we found out that Canada, to satisfy the concern of Great Britain to have a stronger endorsement of the invasion. Canada had drafted and circulated a new UNSC resolution related to delaying the invasion until there could be clear support for the invasion CANADA

## **&&CANADA THE US UNDERLING**

### **&&OFF THE RECORD**

C\*(xxiv)After the meeting, at the UN I saw two reporters interviewing the Chilian Ambassador I overheard the ambassador saying that Canada behind the scenes was working on a new resolution that would have a clear clause endorsing the invasion [something that that Great Britain had wished. I moved over to join the reporters and was told that this meeting was off the record

C\*xxv) Parliament, Chretien had declared that Canada would only support the invasion if there was an endorsement by the UNSC I do not think that Canadians knew how much Canada was lobbying to get a new UNSC resolution. I MENTIONED IT ON Vancouver COOP RADIO WHEN I was being interviewed in New York

### **&&LEANING ON THE CHAIR OF THE UNSC**

C\* (xxvi)At one point I was going up the elevator when there was a comment about the US' LEANING ON Guinea which was currently the chair of the UNSC, I managed to slip off the elevator with the UNSC reporters and wait there for a press conference for the media I was talking with several reporters the I asked several reporters why they don't ask the non-permanent members about US pressure on the non-permanent members. One of them said:"They have not said that there is pressure

### **C\*MARCH 7 AT THE UNSC PRESS GALLERY**

I was talking with several non-PERMANENT MEMBERS states who revealed that it was being done .

C\*(xxvii) When the Pakistani ambassador came out to address the media

I asked him if he could comment on the way the US was intimidating non-permanent Council members. He diplomatically declined to respond . I had hoped that reporters would follow up on my question, but what happened next was the media handler came over and asked to see my pass. When he saw my NGO pass he escorted me out. I don't know if a reporter had reported on me. Because if the handler knew all the reporters he would have asked me to leave earlier.

### **&&UN MEDIA BEING CONSTRAINED**

C\*(xxviii) Later on there was a discussion of the role of the UN media in one of the conference rooms During the question period, I raised the issue of the UN media" not being willing to ask questions of the

**non -permanent members in what way, were they being pressured by the US.**

**C\*(xxix) PROPOSAL FOR AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION IVOKINGTHE UNITING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION (UNGA RESOLUTION 377 v.; 7 October 1950).**

**AFFIRMING as in the Uniting for Peace Resolution that the first two stated Purposes of the United Nations are the following:**

**(i) To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity .with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace, and**

**(2) To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self- determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace, reaffirming that it remains the primary duty of all Members of the United Nations, when involved in an international dispute, to seek settlement of such a dispute by peaceful means through the procedures laid down in Chapter VI of the Charter**

**CONCURRING with the Uniting for Peace Resolution, that failure of the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities on behalf of all the Member States, particularly those responsibilities referred to in the two preceding paragraphs, does not relieve Member States of their obligations or the United Nations of its responsibility under the Charter to maintain international peace and security,**

**NOTING further that although there was unanimity in the support by the Security Council for UN Security Council resolution 1441, on Iraq, passed November 7, 2002, there was and continues to be an absence of unanimity related to what constitutes “a material breach”;**

**ACKNOWLEDGING that “serious consequences” is not “code” for military invasion, and that under the Convention on the Law of Treaties, terms in international agreements must be understood in their ordinary language meaning;**

**CONVINCED** that a second UN Security resolution declaring a perceived military breach and supporting a military invasion of Iraq, will jeopardize the work of the inspectors;

**DISMAYED** that two permanent members of the Security Council have without the consent of the Security Council or the General Assembly set up a no-fly zone in a region of Iraq; and that these two permanent members continue to aggressively provoke Iraq through their bombing in the no-fly zone, and through their building up of military offenses in the border states surrounding Iraq;

**CONCURRING** with the Declaration of the Right of Peoples to Peace that ensuring the exercise of the right of peoples to peace demands that the policies of States be directed towards the elimination of the threat of war, particularly nuclear war, the renunciation of the use of force in international relations and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations (3. Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace approved by General Assembly resolution 39/11 of 12 November 1984): and that the preservation of the right of peoples to peace and the promotion of its implementation constitute a fundamental obligation of each State (2. Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace approved by General Assembly resolution 39/11 of 12 November 1984);

**RECALLING** the dismay conveyed at the World Conference on Human Rights at massive violations of human rights especially in the form of genocide, ethnic cleansing” and systematic rape of women in war situations, creating mass exodus of refugees and displaced persons (s. 28 World Conference on Human Rights);.

**RECALLING** also the acknowledgement in Resolution 1325 that civilians, particularly women and children, account for the vast majority of those adversely affected by armed conflict, including as refugees and internally displaced persons and increasingly are targeted by combatants and armed elements, and recognizing the consequent impact this has on durable peace and reconciliation;

**RECALLING** also the recognition at the UN Conference on Women that the threat to peace resulting from continuing international tensions and violations of the United Nations Charter, ... as well as wars, armed conflicts, ... gross violations of human rights... are

major obstacles to human progress, specifically to the advancement of women. (Para, Nairobi Forward looking strategies for the advancement of women, 1985);

**REAFFIRMING** the condemnation of the formulation, propounding, dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts intended to provide 'legitimacy' for the first use of nuclear weapons and in general to justify the 'admissibility' of unleashing nuclear war (2 Condemnation of Nuclear War General Assembly Resolution A/RES/38/75, 1983);

**ADDED** Convinced that life without war serves as the primary international prerequisite for the material well-being, development and progress of countries, and for the full implementation of the rights and fundamental human freedoms proclaimed by the United Nations (Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace approved by General Assembly resolution 39/11 of 12 November 1984);

**DISMAYED** that the World Health Organization estimates that 100,000 Iraqi civilians could be wounded and another 400,000 hit by disease after water, sewage, power and food facilities are bombed; and that 3.6 million Iraqi's will likely need "emergency shelter". Aware that at least 500,000 Iraqi children have died due to the sanctions that have deprived them of clean water, sanitation, and health care according to UNICEF;

**AWARE** that the military plans for an invasion of Iraq would likely result in the deaths of tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians; and that these plans would be in direct violation of the Geneva Convention which states that, "It is prohibited to attack, destroy, remove, or render useless objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population, such as foodstuffs, crops, livestock, drinking water installations and supplies, and irrigation works?" (Protocol 1, Article 54, paragraph 2);

**DISMAYED** also that those states promoting the military invasion of Iraq, are stating publicly that the UN will lose its relevance if it does not support the use of military force;

**AFFIRMING** that the relevance of the UN will be determined instead by its ability to implement the provisions in the UN Charter of the United Nations, and in the International agreements related to peace, social justice, human rights, and environmental protection;

**AWARE** that the March 1999 report of the UN Expert Panel on Disarmament concluded that "the bulk of Iraq's proscribed weapons programs has been eliminated" and that "...100% of verification may be an unattainable goal". They also noted that in the March report it was stated that: "the country [Iraq] has experienced a shift from relative affluence to massive poverty...infant mortality rates in Iraq today are among the highest in the world...chronic malnutrition affects every fourth child... only 41% of the population have regular access to clean water...the gravity of the humanitarian situation of Iraqi people is indisputable and cannot be overstated." (Statement from the Canadian Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2000);

**CONCERNED** about the announced plans of the U.S. for what - in plain language - is nothing less than the threat of mass destruction by U.S. weapons, including plans to demolish critical infrastructure - such as electrical infrastructure - which would have profound impact, via the impact on water treatment facilities, on the health of the Iraqi people.

**AWARE** that many other states have weapons of mass destruction that do pose a threat to international peace and security;

**DEEPLY CONCERNED** that in the past undue pressure and influence has been used to secure support in the UN Security Council, and **AWARE** that after recent reports to the UN Security Council, over 9 member states expressed opposition to military intervention;

**CONCURRING** with the Uniting for Peace resolution that failure of the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities on behalf of all the member states, particularly those responsibilities referred to in aforementioned paragraphs of the United Nations Charter does not relieve Member States of their obligations or the United Nations of their responsibility under the Charter to maintain international peace and security,





### **C\*xxxii MARCH 8 CODE PINK RALLY**

On March 8, I went to code pink rally- gave my poster to the president of United for Peace. and Justice. I then interviewed protesters and said: "If I could send this on to Bush what would you say to him" See video

C\*(xxxii) I had to leave to catch a plane so I printed up 400 copies of the following piece and the Canadian Voice of Women for Peace undertook to distribute them:

### **&&CORRUPTION US STYLE: THE SILENT CURSE AT THE UN**

Although it is common knowledge at the UN that the US bribes, intimidates, threatens, cajoles, coerces other states particularly the non-permanent member states of the UN Security Council, there is reluctance to refer to the US actions as corruption. The US has been ready to condemn other states as being corrupt but rarely is prepared to recognize the hypocrisy of its failing to designate its own actions as corrupt. When I raised the issue at a press scrum at the UN when I asked the Ambassador from Pakistan to comment on the fact that the US is cajoling, intimidating, and offering financial incentives to other members of the UN Security Council. I was approached by the media handler, and asked if I was with the media, and reprimanded by members of the media. I then have asked the accredited media at the UN why they do not raise the issue of corruption, and have found that there is great reluctance to raising the issue. The answer probably lies in the fact admitted by some members of the media that raising such issues might jeopardize their accreditation as media.

### **f&&US CODE**

The US has established a code which has been scripted:

1. If the Security Council is not united the UN will become irrelevant (i.e. if the Security Council does not endorse the US proposal)
2. "Serious consequences" is UN code for Military invasion has been argued by Powell. (However, under the Convention on the Law of Treaties all terms in international documents must be interpreted in their ordinary language usage". Most other UN Security Council members did not understand "serious consequences" as being equivalent to military invasion)
3. there is some progress with the inspections but not sufficient
4. Iraq must demonstrate full, unconditional, immediate and active cooperation ..

- 4. Inspection cannot go on for every there must be deadline - currently proposed by the US/GB resolution as March 17**
- 5. If Iraq has not complied with 4, then "all necessary means could be used to force them to disarm" or "remain seized of the matter"**

**At the UN, prior to the Blix and ElBaradei reports on March 7, buzzing around the UN was concern about how Guinea, as the new President of the Security Council had been "leaned" on "pressured" . Also if one compares the statement made by Angola after the first Blix report and the statement made yesterday one can see that even Angola which had spoken out so strongly about the devastation of war is now speaking in US code. When one asks around the UN about the change of heart of Angola, the answer inevitably the US negotiations around the oil industry. Similarly, Cameroon which previously had been opposed to war, appears to be evoking the US code.**

**In a proposal for impeachment in 1991, the corrupt actions by Bush the First at the UN Security Council were used as one of the grounds for impeachment. Currently there is another proposal to impeach Bush the Second. For all the reasons advocated in the current proposal, definitely corruption is an integral part of case against Bush the Second.**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Project**

#### **C\*(xxxiii)- A WILLING WARMONGER**

**Canada's so-called "compromise" resolution is nothing more than a delayed ultimatum for war. Canada continues to forget that the purpose of the Charter of the United Nations is to prevent the scourge of war.**

**It is reported that Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien, and Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Bill Graham are supposedly carrying out US dirty work by, in the case of the Prime Minister, lobbying Chile and Mexico, and in the case of Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister trying to persuade France not to veto.**

**In this way, the Canadian government is condoning the questionable practices of the United States: intimidation, cajoling and "check book diplomacy".**

Throughout the deliberations of the United Nations, the government of Canada has been deliberately deluding the Canadian public that the government would join the war if there is " UN support" or "international support".

The way to determine if there is UN or international support is to endorse the global call for an emergency session of the UN General Assembly through evoking the 1950 Uniting for Peace resolution. A request by seven members of the Security Council could bring about an emergency session of the UN General Assembly.

There is little doubt that a UN General Assembly would overwhelmingly support the continued inspections without an ultimatum for war. It is only through engaging in practices that under normal conditions would be indictable will the US be able to establish "the Coalition of the Willing" or as was coined by the NGO's at the UN: the "Coalition of the coerced".

Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
1 250 598-0071

Prior to the following statement by Francis Boyle, he had urged Iraq to go to the international Court of Justice A recommendation which I circulated every where:

**&& BEHIND THE SCENES**

Updated Tue, 11 Mar 2003 20:04:49

UNITED NATIONS - Canada's ambassador to the United Nations, Paul Heinbecker, said he is both disturbed and encouraged by Iraqi efforts to comply with a UN resolution to disarm.

**INDEPTH: Iraq: U.S. military buildup**

Although not a member of the Security Council, Canada has been working hard to help two opposing factions heal the divisions over taking action on Iraq.

**&& IRREVEVANT IF OPPOSING US INVASION**

Heinbecker warned the current battle within the Security Council threatens to make the UN irrelevant as a force for peace.

C\*( ) The following is a report from the CBC”

**A haze of diplomatic uncertainty descended on the United Nations on Tuesday - uncertainty over whether the U.S., Britain and Spain are planning to bring forward a new, modified resolution on Iraq to the Security Council.**

**There's talk of a new deadline near the end of March or even later. There's talk as well of setting out some specific disarmament benchmarks for Iraq. But so far nothing has been confirmed.**

**The Security Council met in a special open session. Ambassadors from nations not on the Security Council asked to speak, and many, like Heinbecker, delivered strong messages.**

**The first country to speak in the open session was Iraq. Ambassador Mohammed al-Douriem said: "He'd come to respond to the "lies and falsehoods" of the U.S. and Britain. "No weapons of mass destruction have been found by the (UN weapons) inspectors," he said.**

**Iraq, he said, has made "the strategic decision to rid itself of its weapons of mass destruction."**

**Iraq "reiterates its readiness to co-operate: "We will convincingly respond to anyone who has any doubts about Iraq's co-operation," the ambassador told the Council members.**

**The procession of ambassadors will continue through much of the day on Wednesday.**

**While that goes on most of the members of the Security Council wait. It's not clear just how the U.S. and Britain might modify their draft resolution.**

**There are hints of new tests, or disarmament benchmarks for Iraq, combined with a later deadline.**

**The smaller nations on the Council have suggested a delay of 45 days, an idea quickly rejected by U.S. officials and Britain's UN ambassador, Jeremy Greenstock.**

**"We are busting a gut to see if we can get greater consensus in the Council," he said. "We are examining whether a list of tests of Iraqi compliance would be a useful thing for the council. It doesn't mean there are any conclusions."**

**It could be that the deadlock in the Security Council is at least beginning to loosen up. French officials are sending out feelers saying they're "open to dialogue." And Russia's UN ambassador, Sergei Lavrov, seemed to signal some subtle change as well, suggesting that what matters most is not the timeline, but how a decision for war is ultimately made.**

**"Any resolution which contains ultimatums and automatically for the use of force is not acceptable to us," said Lavrov.**

**It may yet prove to be that compromise isn't possible and that U.S. President George W. Bush will defy the UN and go to war anyway.**

**But there was a new and clear warning from the current president of the Security Council, Guinea's Mamadee Trowawee, who suggested that if war breaks out that way, then the UN may have to meet in an effort to stop it.**

**"The United Nations will have to take, maybe, the decision. I mean to call for a meeting. I don't know if it will be at the level of the General Assembly or the Security Council. But in that case something will have to be done."**

**The question of what the Security Council will be asked to do about Iraq is now shrouded in a thick fog of diplomatic uncertainty.**

**But in another twist, a spokesman for Pakistan's ruling party says Pakistan has decided to abstain on any vote authorizing war against Iraq.**

**An abstention by such a key U.S. ally in the "war against terrorism" means one less Security Council vote for Washington to count on.**

**"We do not want to see the destruction of the Iraqi people, the destruction of the country," said Prime Minister Zafarullah Khan Jamali.**

**Jamali pleaded for the Security Council to allow more time for UN weapons inspectors to do their job.**

**White House spokesman Ari Fleischer said however, that the new resolution would be put to a vote this week, although he did indicate a readiness to compromise.**

**But, Fleischer said, the proposal being floated to push back the March 17 deadline by a month was "a non-starter."**

**"There is room for diplomacy here," he said. "Not much room and not much time."**

**C\*I was talking with the representatives of Guinea and Mexico in Canada today.**

**Both indicated that at this point that their countries were against the US/UK resolution. I missed a call from Chilean Embassy in Ottawa. I think that we should lobby the embassies located in various countries. I stressed that there was strong support for opposing the UK/US resolution, including the position of the Non-Aligned states, and that if a resolution opposing the war were put on the floor at an emergency session of the UNGA, it would definitely pass.**

**The reporting of the presentations by non-Security Council members was skewed in Canada and I presume it was the same in the US. In Canada, the CBC had Iraq, Kuwait, and Canada and CNN had Iraq and Kuwait and turned off the volume when the Ambassador from South Africa spoke.**

**Shaming the Media at the UN has to be done. Perhaps they are afraid that they will lose their "embedded" status.**

**C\*( ) I wrote a letter to the president of the General**

**Dear President of the UN General Assembly:**

**"urge you to heed the request of the majority of the members of the UN General Assembly to call an Emergency Session of the UNGA, and address the illegal action of the United States' military invasion of Iraq.**

**In November, after the UN Security Council Resolution 1441 was passed, I was concerned that the United States was claiming that it had now received the support from the United Nations, and from the International Community. Subsequently, I drafted a proposal for an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly invoking the 1950 Uniting for peace resolution. This resolution permits the requesting of an emergency session to be called within 24 hours in the event that the UN Security Council fails to perform its primary role under the Charter of the United Nations: to prevent the scourge the war.**

**As you know, a high percentage of the citizens of the world as well as a large majority of the members states of the United Nations are opposed to the US's military invasion of Iraq.**

**It is with great dismay, that it has been brought to my attention, that the US, in the last few weeks, has sent an intimidating letter to all the members of the UN General Assembly:demanded {that states] "avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly."**

**The General Assembly should draft an emergency resolution calling for**

- \* the immediate cessation of all military intervention into Iraq, and for the immediate withdrawal of invading US and "coalition" troops ;**
- \* the continuation of the work of the inspectors in Iraq**

**Subsequently, the UN General Assembly, should meet pass a resolution calling for**

- the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction through the authorization of inspectors entering all states that have weapons of mass destruction**
- the US and the UK to be compelled to appear before the international Court of Justice for violating the rule of international law**
- the ratification of the International Criminal Court by all states, and for President George Bush, and President Tony Blair to be tried under the Court for war crimes.**

**The General Assembly, is the body that most accommodates the essence of sovereign equality under the Charter of the United Nations, and the voice of the UNGA must be strengthened as was agreed under the Millennium Declaration.**

**Yours very truly,**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
1230 St . Patrick St.  
Victoria, B.C. V8S 4Y4**

**Member of the Uniting for Peace c  
Coalition**



to eliminate the weapons of mass destruction, including those weapons in the possession of memc

**SOMETIME BETWEEN MARCH 11 AND MARCH 19**

### **FIND DATE**

The Chilean newspaper La Tercera reports that their embassy in Washington Received a letter from the U.S., technically called a "non paper," that "demands" that they "focus on the real challenges that are to come and avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly. Such steps will not change the path that we are on, but will increase tensions, make divisions deeper and could provoke more damage to the UN and the Security Council."

This letter was sent to all members of the UN General Assembly.

The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary

The hypocrisy of the US -the world's largest producer of weapons of mass destruction, and of MUF-nuclear material unaccounted for-- has not escaped the international community of citizens and states. If the US were truly concerned about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction they would not have withdrawn from the CBT Convention, and they would call for inspectors to go into all countries, including their own, that have weapons of mass destruction to systematically rid the world of these weapons.

**the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)**

**The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.**

**The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.**

**Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.**

**As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed**

**to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice, Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.**

**In addition, President George Bush should be brought**

**Yours very truly**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
1230 St. Patrick St.  
Victoria,  
1 250 598-0071**

**US IS AN INTERNATIONAL ROGUE STATE: HYPOCRITICAL STANCES. CORRUPTIVE PRACTICES, AND ILLEGAL ACTIONS,**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
Victoria, Canada**

**1 250 598-0071**

**US THWARTS ATTEMPT TO CALL AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION**

**For some time there has been a campaign to call for an emergency UN General Assembly session, invoking the 1950 uniting for peace resolution. The United States knows that not only is a large percentage of civil society opposing the invasion of Iraq, but also over 80% of the member states of the United Nations would oppose the military invasion of Iraq.**

**Yesterday, it was revealed in the newspaper La Tercera that the US had been attempting to prevent an emergency General Assembly session.**

**It is well documented that the US has continually shown disdain for the rule of International law-failing to sign and ratify international instruments, and showing for the jurisdiction of International Court of Justice, and more recently for the International Criminal Court.**

### **US ENGAGED IN AN ILLEGAL ACT**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, the following purpose is clearly enunciated:**

**to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and**

**to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, force is only authorized if sanctioned by the UN Security Council, or under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations which affirms:**

**the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)**

**The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed**

that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.

In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.

The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.

Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.

As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice, Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.

Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute

Victoria, Canada

1 250 598-0071

**UNDOUBTEDLY BUSH SHOULD ALSO BE COMPELLED BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT FOR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY. IF THE US CONTINUALLY REFUSES TO RATIFY THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT. HE SHOULD BE TRIED UNDER A INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL COMPARABLE TO THE ONE SET UP FOR Kosovo.**

**PROPOSAL FOR AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION EVOKING THE UNITING FOR PEACE**

**6262626262-626262Error!. At the meeting there was a decision to set up the Women's Coalition of the Unwilling, and to approach other women in the community to participate.**

**At the meeting we initiated a list of actions that the Coalition for the Unwilling is unwilling to accept, condone etc.**

**The Coalition of the Unwilling is unwilling:**

- to allow the US to undermine the United Nations, and to violate the rule of international law through engaging in an illegal act**
- to accept the failure of the US to ratify the International Criminal Court where the US president George Bush should be brought for War Crimes**
- to condone the US intimidating, cajoling and offering cheque-book diplomacy to influence the will of other states**
  
- to accept "pre-emptive or prevention strikes as policy, because it violates international law, including international human rights instruments**
  
- to tolerate the obsequiousness of the media towards the governments, and the military industrial complex**
- to tolerate the continued use of euphemisms to describe crimes against humanity: i.e. collateral damage; " operation Iraqi freedom " "ultimatum Iraq"**
  
- to condone hypocrisy where the US which possesses the largest arsenal of weapons of mass destruction is not prepared to allow inspectors to enter the US facilities to ensure the full and complete elimination of the weapons of mass destruction in the United States.**

- to allow the mining and export of uranium, and the sale of CANDU reactors which is closely linked to the development of weapons of mass destruction
- to condone the use of Depleted Uranium which has been described as a low level weapon of mass destruction
- to condone the existence of 1000 Canadian industries that are involved in the defence industries, and that export this technology to the United States and elsewhere
- to condone the exorbitant global 900 billion military budget that diverts funds from global social justice
- to support any measure to further military industrial
- to continue to have Canada export oil and natural gas, used in the production of weapons in the US, to the US
- to urge all citizens, unions, and institutions to withdraw funds from all companies that contribute to the military industrial complex
- to tolerate the classification of those opposing the US/UK military intervention as being "unpatriotic" or .."traitors"
- to have Canada associated with the so-called "Coalition of the Willing"
- to have a delegation from the Canadian Senate go to the US to complain about Canada not being listed as part of the "Coalition of the Willing"
- to condone any Canadian Complicity in the attack on Iraq
- to have Canadian vessels remain in the Arabian Sea
- to have children used for political purposes [children hailing the arrival of the Americans]
- to tolerate the violence of technological disastrous warfare- - the technological massacre of civilians
- to support " rehabilitation of Iraq being used as a justification of an intervention
- to support sons of mothers to kill sons of other mothers [reversing the message on my poster; "Mothers do not give birth to kill sons of other Mothers."
- to condone the environmental devastation of war
- to tolerate racial profiling, engaging in an attack that could be construed as having racial and religious elements

**The Coalition of the Unwilling supports Canada not participating in the so-called Coalition of the Willing**

**Dear President of the UN General Assembly:**

**I urge you to heed the request of the majority of the members of the UN General Assembly to call an Emergency Session of the UNGA, and address the illegal action of the United States' military invasion of Iraq.**

**In November, after the UN Security Council Resolution 1441 was passed, I was concerned that the United States was claiming that it had now received the support from the United Nations, and from the International Community. Subsequently, I drafted a proposal for an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly invoking the 1950 Uniting for peace resolution. This resolution permits the requesting of an emergency session to be called within 24 hours in the event that the UN Security Council fails to perform its primary role under the Charter of the United Nations: to prevent the scourge the war.**

**As you know, a high percentage of the citizens of the world as well as a large majority of the members states of the United Nations are opposed to the US's military invasion of Iraq.**

**It is with great dismay, that it has been brought to my attention, that the US, in the last few weeks, has sent an intimidating letter to all the members of the UN General Assembly, demanding {that states} ".avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly".**

**The General Assembly should draft an emergency resolution calling for**

- \* the immediate cessation of all military intervention into Iraq, and for the immediate withdrawal of invading US and "coalition" troops ;**
- \* the continuation of the work of the inspectors in Iraq**

**Subsequently, the UN General Assembly, should meet pass a resolution calling for**

- the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction through the authorization of inspectors entering all states that have weapons of mass destruction**



- the US and the UK to be compelled to appear before the international Court of Justice for violating the rule of international law
- the ratification of the International Criminal Court by all states, and for President George Bush, and President Tony Blair to be tried under the Court for war crimes.

The General Assembly, is the body that most accommodates the essence of sovereign equality under the Charter of the United Nations, and the voice of the UNGA must be strengthened as was agreed under the Millennium Declaration.

Yours very truly,

Joan Russow (PhD)  
1230 St . Patrick St.  
Victoria, B.C. V8S 4Y4

to eliminate the weapons of mass destruction, including those weapons in the possession of

The Chilean newspaper La Tercera reports that their embassy in Washington Received a letter from the U.S., technically called a "non paper," that "demands" that they "focus on the real challenges that are to come and avoid provocative steps within the Security Council such as condemning resolutions or calls for an emergency session of the General Assembly. Such steps will not change the path that we are on, but will increase tensions, make divisions deeper and could provoke more damage to the UN and the Security Council."

This letter was sent to all members of the UN General Assembly.

The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious

consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary

The hypocrisy of the US -the world's largest producer of weapons of mass destruction, and of MUF-nuclear material unaccounted for-- has not escaped the international community of citizens and states. If the US were truly concerned about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction they would not have withdrawn from the CBT Convention, and they would call for inspectors to go into all countries, including their own, that have weapons of mass destruction to systematically rid the world of these weapons.

the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)

The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear

**understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.**

**The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.**

**Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.**

**As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice, Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.**

**In addition, President George Bush should be brought**

**Yours very truly**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute  
1230 St. Patrick St.**

## **US THWARTS ATTEMPT TO CALL AN EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION**

**For some time there has been a campaign to call for an emergency UN General Assembly session, invoking the 1950 uniting for peace resolution. The United States knows that not only is a large percentage of civil society opposing the invasion of Iraq, but also over 80% of the member states of the United Nations would oppose the military invasion of Iraq.**

**Yesterday, it was revealed in the newspaper La Tercera that the US had been attempting to prevent an emergency General Assembly session.**

**It is well documented that the US has continually shown disdain for the rule of International law-failing to sign and ratify international instruments, and showing disdain for the jurisdiction of International Court of Justice, and more recently for the International Criminal Court.**

## **US ENGAGED IN AN ILLEGAL ACT**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, the following purpose is clearly enunciated:**

**to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and**

**.to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and**

**to ensure by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and**

**Under the Charter of the United Nations, force is only authorized if sanctioned by the UN Security Council, or under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations which affirms:**

**the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security (Article 51)**

**The United States , after failing to obtain the sufficient number of votes on the UN Security Council , is claiming that the US had received support for the use of force under the UN Security Council Resolution 1441. In an early draft, many members of the UN Security Council rejected the expression "all necessary means" which would have included the use of force. In UNSC resolution 1441, there was a provision for "serious consequences" to be in place in the event that Iraq had been in material breach of the resolution. Colin Powell has claimed that "serious consequences" is UN code for the use of force. There was a clear understanding, even formally expressed by Russia, France and China, that "serious consequences" did not authorize the automatic use of force and that before any authorization of force would be sanctioned, a further UN Security Council resolution would be necessary.**

**In addition, under the Convention of the Law of Treaties, terms in international instruments must be interpreted in their ordinary language meaning; in no way in ordinary language would serious consequences, even in the context of the UN Security Council resolution, be equated automatically with the use of force. One serious consequence could have been to take the issue to the International Court of Justice to enable the judges to carefully assess the legitimacy of the documentation presented. As has been reported recently, not only has there been misrepresentation of documents from US British intelligence, but also there have been forged documents on the purchase of uranium.**

**The US has misused used Article 51 before and redefined what constituted self defence under Article 51. Again, the interpretation of this Article and its applicability would be best assessed by the International Court of Justice.**

**Several specialists in International Law have requested the US to go to the International Court of Justice to seek an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of force in Iraq.**

**As usual, the US is willing to condemn others as rogue states defying the rule of international law, but the US fails to seek the advice from the International Court of Justice which is a specialized**

**organ under the United Nations, and the US has over the years failed to accept both the jurisdiction and the decisions of the International Court of Justice,**

**Iraq should appear before the International Court of Justice and ask for an emergency decision to prevent the imminent war on Iraq, and if the US invades Iraq, the US should be compelled to appear before the International Court of Justice for engaging in an illegal war in violation of the rule of international law, and the Charter of the United Nations.**

**Joan Russow (PhD)  
Global Compliance Research Institute**

**Victoria, Canada**

**1 250 598-0071**