An Overview of The Case Against The Defendant(s)

Anthony Charles Lynton Blair

"To sin by silence when we should protest makes cowards out of men."

Ella Wheeler Wilcox

This document constitutes but a small portion of the evidence we have concerning the above named individual. We furnish this information in order to allow you to sign the warrant with a clear conscience knowing that you cannot be accused of negligence, bias or lack of diligence. The following information is almost enough to allow the case against the below named individual to proceed in and of itself and so if you are convinced that there exists a "reasonable case" against the accused after so reading our submission, then please sign the warrant(s). We further believe that it is your national, legal, moral ethical, humane, spiritual and constitutional duty to accede to this formal request as we seek to put in place constitutional/legal remedies that have, to date, been allowed to sli.p by those Masonic, Teutonic Zionist treacherous black-hatted serpents that set out to deceive mankind and turn brother against brother for their own sport, amusement and benefit.

"**Regardless of the war, the administration, or the various sophistries for expending human lives as a matter of government policy, profiteering from it universally offends all citizens, whether they are Republicans, Democrats, Independents, other parties or no shows."**

Charles Lewis, founder of the Centre for Pubic Integrity

We will try and state our case as simply as possible, bearing in mind that due to the nature of the charges and the content of this document, I have not had the luxury of having another soul proof read, offer advice as to content, positioning or length of prose, nor make any other suggestions. We ask you simply to approach with an open and enquiring mind and we assure you that everything that you think you know about the world in which you live is soon to change. This initiative is called for, this we know. Many members of the electorate would view it as long overdue, it is therefore our gift to the world and it can be yours too! We hope that you will commit to the cause. Join with us. We are also aware that there are as many possibilities of escape as there are holes in a Swiss cheese for you to wriggle down, prevaricate upon, or offer as a reason "not to "do". You can delay and seek other opinions also. That is not what we want. We desire no twists of semantics or plays of sophistry; we want no deceitful dance or claim of "non-justiciability". Our so called "guardians of public morals," people such as **George Bush** (41 and 44), **Tony Blair** and **Lord Goldsmith** and **Alberto Gonzales** as well as **Gordon Brown**, have committed about every crime that we have a law for. We trust that you will do the right thing in helping us to bring known terrorists and master criminals to justice. Just that!

In many cases, too, they have committed crimes for which there are NO laws. The crimes are so far-reaching that no legislature has ever thought it possible that such a state of affairs could arise. For example, with a written constitution in the United States, who would have thought that a group of political hyenas would take over the White House via electronic voter fraud, and then seek to perpetrate crimes of state sponsored terrorism against its own populations in an effort to dismantle and dissemble the American Constitution in order to control the "useless eaters". Laws for it or against it? – they're not even on the Statute Book!

However, it is a common law principle and an absolute cornerstone of any judicial system that no matter what the offence, no matter how contrived or left-field, no matter that it's not been thought of before or that there exists no constitutional protection or that an implied repeal of an existing statute may be offered as protection, THERE CAN BE NO TRANSGRESSION WHICH DOES NOT HAVE A LEGAL REMEDY BEFORE THE COURTS. If no law exists then we will make the law in court. That's true common law and will not tolerate "reasons of national interest" or "State Security" to be used as the neo-con mantra in order to provide the next hot rock for them to slither under in order to allow them to poison society all the more next time. No to that! It's not in keeping with the times and neither will we allow the highly paid and corrupt minds of the legal profession or the judiciary derail us from our assured goal! This time is our time. This time is now!

THE CASE FOR THE PROSECUTION

PRINCIPAL CHARGES against PRINCIPAL PLAYERS

Contravention of;
1. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997- Articles 2,4,5,6
2. Terrorism Act 2000
3. The Rome Statute of The International Criminal Court 1998 – War of aggression, genocide.
4. The 1984 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel and Inhuman Punishment -torture
5. The Geneva Conventions – Treatment of POW's.
6. The UN International Declaration of Human Rights – Violations regarding UK Citizens.
7. The Atlantic Charter – Violating principles of peaceful co-existence and tolerance.
8. Domestic Criminal Law – Committal of almost every crime for which we have a law.

Article 6(1) 1984 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment states: "*Upon being satisfied, after an examination of information available to it, that the circumstances so warrant, any State party in whose territory a person alleged to have committed any offence referred to in article 4 is present, shall take him into custody or take other legal measures to ensure his presence…."*

Article 6(2) *"Such a State shall immediately make a preliminary inquiry into the facts"*.

And

Article 7 of the **International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997**

1. Upon receiving information that a person who has committed or who is alleged to have committed an offence as set forth in article 2 may be present in its territory, the State Party concerned shall take such measures as may be necessary under its domestic law to investigate the facts contained in the information.

2. Upon being satisfied that the circumstances so warrant, the State Party in whose territory the offender or alleged offender is present shall take the appropriate measures under its domestic law so as to ensure that person's presence for the purpose of prosecution or extradition.

Article 17

Issues of admissibility

1. Having regard to paragraph 10 of the Preamble and article 1, the Court shall determine that a case is inadmissible where:

(a) The case is being investigated or prosecuted by a State which has jurisdiction over it, unless the State is **unwilling** or unable genuinely to carry out the investigation or prosecution;

(b) The case has been investigated by a State which has jurisdiction over it and the State has decided not to prosecute the person concerned, unless the decision resulted from the unwillingness or inability of the State genuinely to prosecute;

(c) The person concerned has already been tried for conduct which is the subject of the complaint, and a trial by the Court is not permitted under article 20, paragraph 3;

(d) The case is not of sufficient gravity to justify further action by the Court.

2. In order to determine **unwillingness** in a particular case, the Court shall consider, having regard to the principles of due process recognized by international law, whether one or more of the following exist, as applicable:

(*a) The proceedings were or are being undertaken or the national decision was made for the purpose of shielding the person concerned from criminal responsibility for crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court referred to in article 5;*

(b) There has been an unjustified delay in the proceedings which in the circumstances is inconsistent with an intent to bring the person concerned to justice;

(c) The proceedings were not or are not being conducted independently or impartially, and they were or are being conducted in a manner which, in the circumstances, is inconsistent with an intent to bring the person concerned to justice.

3. In order to determine inability in a particular case, the Court shall consider whether, due to a total or substantial collapse or unavailability of its national judicial system, the State is unable to obtain the accused or the necessary evidence and testimony or otherwise unable to carry out its proceedings.

The first question to you is as follows:

If they were Jews and not Arabs being detained in Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib and Bhagram gulags, would the world's reaction have been as mute?

You will have seen the pictures of the detention facilities, you know that we went to war against Iraq, you know there was no second resolution, you know that there is public outcry still against the perpetrators, you know that the Bush Administration is trying the same trick on Iran as it did in Iraq: someone has got to get off his spotty arse and shout "Enough"! Consider this the shout.

Please also bear in mind that we now seek to polarise this county, this country and this planet. This process, which we now initiate gives every one, yet again, the chance to choose upon which side of the fence they wish to sit. Either, the side of greed, self-interest, corruption, deceit, treachery, thievery and lyingly corrupt capitalist control or marching forward in a spirit of tolerance, love, brotherhood and genuine and sincere respect for our planet and our fellow men. Now everyone has the choice – if they are not with us, then they are by default, against us and must side with the controlling political elite as suspecting or unsuspecting pawns in the game. No one can claim NON-INFORMED CONSENT. They have it before their very eyes and no dis-association will be tolerated.

We assume that you know no less but then no more than the "averagely interested" citizen of the UK in the matters we wish to cover and so we take the time to brief you on the following evidence.The facts of this act of aggression and therefore the broad strokes of our case are known generally to most of the peoples of the Western democracies and so we will not labour the point unduly. It shows "*beyond reasonable doubt*" that the accused is complicit in the charges as set out and has actively and in full awareness of the possible outcomes, aligned himself with the powers of fascism; of power, greed and darkness which the secret brotherhoods, that have brought about the downfall of every civilisation from Atlantis to Rome have engineered. Which have with their "octopus like tentacles" choked the very life spirit out of man and subjected him to a slave's existence, him becoming no more than a menial servant for those that would restrict, control and dominate others.

WHAT IS THE FUNCTION OF POLITICS AND THEREFORE THE POLITICIAN?

They function on offering themselves out to the public as being those, through better experience, greater wisdom or bravery, to be better suited to lead and show others a better way to life happiness and security. But this is not the case. They can never survive by the telling of the truth for their game is to keep power and so the truth to one as acceptable, is not so to the other. Therein lieth the dilemma. In trying to balance their act they end up lying to everyone and can only ever have their own interests at heart. And to keep in power they must pander to the controlling elite, those that have the wealth or money – the banker families of this world. Wars need paying for, political parties need paying for, the military and the transport needs paying for – political parties who become governments need money. From where do they receive it?

These unscrupulous hyenas and polecat politicos, they send our children off to war yet sleep safely in their beds at night under the duvet of protection bought for them on the battlefields of the next Somme. They are the most vile, decrepit, deceitful scavengers that roam the earth and their shame is non existent and they lie with a verve that would bend iron bars. When found out they point at and blame all but themselves and then shamelessly snake off to await their next opportunity at the trough.

IT ENDS AS IT BEGINS – WITH OUTRAGE

The full facts of the lead up to war with Iraq are far too lengthy to address here but we will cover some ground in order that it cannot be said that you have signed these warrants with complete disregard as to the guilt or innocence of the parties or that you were negligent as to the facts.

In January 2002, extremely disturbing pictures made their way onto our television screens and the front pages of newspapers around the world. They showed groups of bound and shackled men, dressed in orange jumpsuits, on their knees, heads bowed, under armed guard, in narrow enclosures behind barbed wire. Others showed men, also in orange jumpsuits in the hold of an aircraft bound and hooded or wearing blacked goggles. These detainees were being held in a US Military detention centre Camp Delta, in Guantanamo Bay on the island of Cuba. They were said to be members of the Taliban or of a group called Al-Qaeda. Within a few days Vice President Dick Cheney was explaining to the world that these men were the "*worst of a very bad lot*" devoted to "*killing millions of Americans*". What he should have said was that it was he and his regime which were the worst of a very bad lot. Classical miss-direction and the big-lie tactic.

These individuals were held at Guantanamo because it was deemed to be outside the sovereign territory of the USA and the Administration believed that this geographic fact would remove all legal protections – both of American Constitutional law and international law. The bad people were put in a legal black-hole. They would have no right to access any court or tribunal. They could be held indefinitely on the whim of the President, without charge. They would be interrogated tortured and faced truncated military proceedings before tribunals which could apply the death penalty and did! And they would have no rights under The Atlantic Charter for which Roosevelt and Churchill had championed on August 13th 1941, or under the Geneva Conventions of 1949, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the 1984 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Amongst the original Guantanamo detainees were nine British nationals. Hence as they were citizens of the United Kingdom they have rights "ab initio" under UK domestic common law and statute (Habeas Corpus).

SOME INTERNATIONAL LAW

The rules of international law which are applicable to the Guantanamo detainees are set out in two separate but related groups of treaties, (see appendices attached). Both have near universal support and go back a long way in time and the USA played a central role in promulgating them. They include "in-transgressible norms" of international law, rules which cannot be abrogated under ANY CIRCUMSTANCES WHATSOEVER. The **1899 Hague Convention** requires that combatants and certain other individuals who were prisoners of war have to be treated humanely. The 1947 Nuremberg Military Tribunal confirmed that captivity during war is neither "revenge nor punishment" but solely protective custody the only purpose of which is to prevent the person from further participation. In 1949 a diplomatic conference in Geneva adopted four new conventions including **Geneva Convention 3.**

Article 3 known as **Common Article 3** (because it is common to all three conventions) states that, prisoners are to be treated humanely; there is a prohibition on the passing of sentences and/or the carrying out of executions without previous judgement pronounced by a regularly constituted court affording ALL the judicial guarantees which are recognised as indispensable by civilised peoples".

Article 5 further states if a combatant's status is uncertain then:
"Should any doubt arise as to whether persons, having committed a belligerent act and having fallen into the hands of the enemy, belong to any of the categories enumerated in Article 4 (see attachment), such persons shall enjoy the protection of the present Convention until such time as their status has been determined by a competent tribunal."
This obligation lies at the heart of the matter concerning the detainees.

In the aftermath of the Vietnam War a protocol to the Geneva Convention was adopted known as **Geneva Protocol 1 of 1977.** It recognised that there would be some conflicts where the combatant would not distinguish himself from the civilian population, as the rules required. Did that person cease to have any legal protections? No. **Protocol 1** shows that there is a very simple premise running throughout the global brotherhood of international law and no person can ever fall outside the scope of the **"minimum legal protections**".

THERE CAN BE NO LEGAL BLACK HOLES.
This is underscored by **Article 75 of 1977 Protocol 1 of the Geneva Convention** and is a "catch-all" article which is totally unambiguous. It prohibits violence, including torture of all kinds and threats of torture and outrages of personal dignity including humiliating or degrading treatment and any form of indecent assault, the presumption of innocence, until proved guilty, and the right against self-incrimination and the right to examine witnesses. These are amongst its basic guarantees.

These rules of international law were in no way controversial until the stealing of the 2000 election in the USA by the "Bush Neo-con New World Order " "Team B" protagonists who have decided to lead a crusade against all that humanity stands for.

The **United States** is also party to both the **1907 Hague Convention 4** and the **1949 Geneva Convention 3**, it has signed but not ratified **Art 75 of Protocol** 1 but it is broadly recognised that **Article 75** is applicable to ALL states and to ALL persons.
{Even the **US Army's Operational Law Handbook** recognises the applicability of **Article 75.** See JA 422 sections 18-20 cited in A. Roberts, "*Counter-Terrorism, Armed Force and the Laws of War Survival",* vol.44 no.1 Spring 2002, pp.7-32, note 46 and accompanying text.}

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was finalised in **1966** in some way due to the hand of **LBJ** being forced by the race riots in the USA. It entered into force in 1976 but the USA didn't become a party until 1992. On issues concerning detainees the Covenant generally follows the approach taken by the Universal Declaration although greater detail is provided. **Article 2 (1)** commits each party to respect and to ensure that, "*all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction, have the rights recognised in the present Covenant without distinction of any kind"*.

The Human Rights Committee of the United Nations has confirmed that the Covenant applies not just to acts taking place on a states territory. The Covenants & obligations apply to Guantanamo Bay in Cuba because "it" is under the:-
EXCLUSIVE CONTROL AND JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES. President Bush and his cronies can no more argue the contrary than they would choose to argue that their Embassies and military bases around the world are not sovereign territory and not subject to US law, or that once their fleet is onto the High Seas they are no longer under Federal Jurisdiction.(See the, **Vienna Convention on Consular Relations 1963**, done at Vienna on the 24 April 1963 which entered into force on 19 March 1967).

The US Deputy Assistant Attorney and torturer architect, Assistant Attorney General **John Choon Yoo** said in May 2002, "*What the administration is trying to do is to create a new legal regime,*" quoted in the Sydney Morning Herald, 17 May 2002, (see also ex.parte **Abbassi).** Those appointed to create this new legal regime were political appointees and they sided with those who appointed them. They were to give the illusion of legality to a totally trumped up and illegally manufactured war on terror, state sponsored terrorism being their own weapon to control and subjugate all those who stood for the right to self-determination. We've always had Nazis in the White House the only difference is that now they're a little more emboldened.

In setting up Camp Delta, in Cuba, the Bush Administration was acutely aware of America's obligations under international law. That's why it put the camp there in the first place. They specifically relied on a ruling in the **US Supreme Court in 1950, Johnson v. Eisentrage**r. In this case, 21 Germans captured in China, were detained on a base in Germany, not being able to invoke a writ of habeas corpus, amongst other things, the Court stating that, "*being non-nationals they lacked the capacity and standing to invoke the process of the Federal courts"*. This seemed to provide the key for Bush's legal team. There was no delay in criticism from many quarters but on the whole it went un-noticed by the mindless majority caught up in the sabre-rattling propaganda, controlled by the political machine. Very early on the Red Cross went public, challenging the concept of unlawful combatants as non existent under international law. "*You can look through the Geneva Conventions and you will not find it.*" Kim Gordon Bates, Daily Telegraph, 17, Jan 2002.
For the Bush Administration the guilt of the detainees was not in question within a month of Camp Delta being opened for business the US Attorney General **John Ashcroft** had no qualms about the risks of prejudicing future trials as he was describing the prisoners as uniquely dangerous individuals and terrorists who had been participants in a "*war crime setting*" responsible for "*killing innocent women and child*ren." FT 21 Jan 2002.

911 - THE LEAD UP TO REGIME CHANGE - COWBOYS IN THE WHITEHOUSE

The day after 911 George W. Bush stated: "*I don't care what the international lawyers say; we are going to kick some ass*". Richard Clarke. *Against All Enemies (Free Press, 2004) p24.*

Bush had issued **Executive Order of 13th November 2001,** which established military commissions to try non-Americans who were suspected of violating the rules governing the conduct of warfare. It took nearly three years for the first hearings to be held in August 2004. The order gave the CIA and its National Security Agency foot-soldiers the authority to detain persons OUTSIDE or within the USA. The panels to adjudicate were to be military in nature and answerable only to him (Bush). They are conducted in secret and the prosecution may rely on secret evidence and witnesses. The accused has no right to cross examine and cannot choose their own counsel. Communication between the defendant and his advisers is restricted. Lord Steyn, the British Law Lord described them as, "*Kangaroo Courts*". He's right.

Then on the 5th April 2002 President George W. Bush, the 44th President of the United States of America, declared in a television interview that, "*Saddam needs to go*." He did not specify where he needed to go only that he did.*(See New York Times 6th April 2002 Section A. page 9).*

QUIZ TIME.
Question: Why did Saddam Hussein invade Kuwait in 1990.
Answer: For oil.
Question: Why did Bush invade Iraq in 2003? Answer:
Answer: For oil.
Question: Who installed Saddam Hussein into Iraq in the first place?
Answer: The CIA and The US government and British Intelligence.
Question: Who was supplying him arms in the 1990's?
Answer: Matrix-Churchill via the Department of Trade and the British government under orders from Margaret Thatcher,(Pinochet admirer and Kissinger adorer)

As the troops prepared to cross into Iraq even sensible people like Anne-Marie Slaughter, Dean of Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton and President of the American Society of International Law wrote in the New York Times that the war would be, "**Illegal but legitimate.**" (NYT 18 March 2003 Section A p.33). A year later she had the decency to publicly rescind her former stance by stating that the, "***invasion was both illegal and illegitimate***".

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

The hope of limiting force in international conflicts had its first real post World War outing in San Francisco in 1945. Much activity could be seen following the cessation of hostilities in 1945. **The Genocide Convention** was adopted on 12 August 1949 and the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** was adopted on 9 December 1948. In April 1945 fifty countries met to negotiate a **Charter for The United Nations**, this Charter was signed on 26th June 1945 and came into force four months later in October 1945. Part of the Charter of The United Nations, adopted in June of that year, showed Britain and the US joined with forty five other countries to outlaw the use of force, except under the most limited of conditions. **Article 2(4)** of the UN Charter declares that "*All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations".*

There are only two exceptions. **Article 51**: "Self defence" but arguably not "anticipatory self-defence". The second exception is authorised under **Chapter 7 of the UN Charter**. Apart from economic and other non-military measures as outlined in **Article 41**, **Article 42** allows the Security Council to *"take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security"*. For nearly 50 years Cold War rivalries prevented the Council from ever exercising its powers. With the collapse of the Soviet Bloc in 1989 a re-invigorated (somewhat) Security Council emerged. The first time it reacted was to the events surrounding the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. **Resolution 678** authorised member states to, *"use all necessary means*" to uphold and implement previous Security Council resolutions to restore peace and security in the area.

The Security Council had acted decisively after Iraq had invaded Kuwait on 2 August 1990. **Resolution 660** called upon Iraq to*, "withdraw immediately*". On the 29th November, the Security Council adopted **Resolution 678**. This authorised member states to, "use all

necessary means to uphold and implement **Resolution 660** and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area". "All necessary means", is the well understood formulation authorising force if necessary. There was no withdrawal.

Thus the first Gulf War began on 17th January 1991 duly authorised by the Security Council. It ended on the 28th February 1991 when Iraq capitulated. On 3 April 1991 the Security Council adopted the **Resolution 687** for the ceasefire and it imposed new obligations on Iraq to disarm and to destroy all chemical & biological weapons of mass destruction.

On 5th April 2002 Bush declared in a television interview that *"Saddam needs to go".* By this time though via a leaked memo we know that **Tony Blair** was secretly already committed to going to war alongside George W. Bush regardless of whether or not a second UN Resolution was forthcoming. He had independently concluded that nothing was to stand in his way. **Tony Blair** had privately signalled his commitment to regime change very early on: on 18 March 2002 Sir David Manning, Blair's foreign policy adviser had written to Condolezza Rice that "*you would not budge in your support for regime change"*. Gaby Hinsliff: "*Blair in firing line on Iraq leak". Observer 19 September 2004.*

Why Blair welded himself to George Bush's hip remains a mystery to most commentators, but weld himself he did and the true reason he did so will be revealed at his trial but for now we see that at a key meeting which took place on 23rd July, 2002 at which various ministers including the Attorney General were present, they were reminded that the Prime Minister had told President Bush that the UK would support military action to bring about regime change (illegal!) so long as a coalition had been created, the Israel-Palestine crisis was no issue and UN weapons inspectors had been given a further opportunity to eliminate Iraq's (fictitious) **W.M.D.**. At that meeting Sir Richard Dearlove, the former Chief of MI6, told the meeting that,
"the intelligence and the facts were being fixed around the policy". Memo from Mathew Rycroft to David Manning (23 July 2002) was published in the Sunday Times 1 May 2005 at p.7.

This memo is referred to as **The Downing Street Memo** in the USA by those who seek to establish that President Bush sought to deceive the American public. Blair was acutely aware of the legal position and sought a further resolution. The noose was tightening. Working with Colin Powell he managed to produce the **Resolution Number 1441** in November 2002 which is of central importance to the legality of the war.

RESOLUTION1441 /IRAQ 2

Resolution 1441 was instigated primarily on the chicanery and goading and un-diplomatic pressure of the Bush administration. It was built upon a tissue of lies as we will later show in court. It maintained that Iraq has "been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including **Resolution 687** (1991)", and that it had failed to co-operate with UN inspectors and the International Atomic Agency (IAEA). This was another lie. From November 2002 to March 2003 the UN and the IAEA resumed inspections. Despite the inspectors failure to find ANY **W.M.D.,** the US and coincidentally Britain, [now suddenly a worlds expert in the location of **W.M.D.**, {What did Dr. David Kelly die for?}], claimed that their own intelligence disclosed the fact that Iraq had failed to disarm and was in violation of its Security Council obligations. Lie, after lie, after lie they told to the British and American public and the world. How do we know for certain! Well, none were ever found and none ever will be! Why? Because none were ever there! Of 145 requests made by **Hans Blix** and his team, constantly overshadowed and pressurised by "Hawks" from the Bush Administration, Iraq had acceded immediately to every single one bar five. Of these 5 delays (of up to 5 hours for consultation) all were deemed by the Bush administration to be "*material breaches*". To give an example of the morality and desperation of the perpetrators in the White House:- one request was to examine files and take them away from a Baath Party Regional HQ, delay - 4 hours. On another occasion there was a refusal to allow American IAEA "representatives" (read C.I.A. agents) to fly to Baghdad to interview all the science students at the Baghdad Science Faculty. The regime said it would be happy for them to interview named graduates or Ph.D. students but it didn't see the point in allowing ALL students, regardless of faculty, interviewed: this was listed as a "Material Breach".

1441 gave Iraq one last chance before the report from **Hans Blix** and Mohammed **El Baradei** was to be sent to the UN. Upon receipt the UN would reconvene to:

"…consider the situation and the need for full compliance with all the relevant Council resolutions" .The resolution did NOT authorise states "to use all necessary means" to implement its requirements.

The USA, Spain and Britain now began to fabricate evidence against Saddam Hussein and relied upon the darker break-away factions within the CIA and British Intelligence to begin to de-stabilise their former golden-boy, who was, after all, their previous administrations' installed stooge. Why? Well….

SCUM DOWN – TO CONSPIRACY?

On the 24th February 2003, after a meeting in the Azores, the three countries, Spain, Britain and the USA, tabled a draft Security Council resolution. The draft stated that Iraq's declaration pursuant to resolution 1441 (2002) contained "*false statements and omissions*" and concluded that Iraq had failed to take the final opportunity afforded to it in **Resolution 1441**". It had little support. France, Germany and Russia tabled a motion the same day that "the conditions for using force against Iraq are not fulfilled". Mexico, Chile, Guinea, Cameroon Angola and Pakistan were being targeted as six key swing votes. Clare Short (then British Minister for International Development) described the pressure that was brought to bear on these states, including the inducements in the form of development assistance (bribes to you and me). Diplomats from these countries complained later that they had had their rooms and phone calls bugged.

The ex Prime Minister was trained as a barrister. He is sensitised to legal arguments and was surrounded by lawyers. He and the British government were active campaigners for a second resolution up until the last days before the war. Why did Blair need that second resolution from the UN? He could not claim that Saddam was an imminent threat and so "self-defence " was not a plausible argument (MTV March 2003) but this was despite the claim made in the British government's dossier of September 2002 that the Iraqi military are " able to deploy [chemical and biological] weapons within 45 minutes of a decision to do so". (Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Assessment of The British Government". Sept 2002 p.17: at *http://www.number-10.gov.uk/files/pdf/iraqdossier.pdf*
[David Kelly, you may recall was found dead after revealing that the "facts concerning **W.M.D.** had been sexed up."]

Saddam was installed by the British and US secret services in the first place and was a vital asset. Matrix Churchill was a trial case against the Department of Trade where it was shown to have authorised the export of embargoed machinery, while Thatcher was our corrupt governess. Saddam was especially welcomed at the time when he was an American and British ally fighting a war against the regime of the Ayatollahs in Iran and when he was receiving Rumsfeld as an "esteemed visitor" – why, there was certainly no outcry then for his suppressed subjects and certainly there was no "humanitarian crisis" to justify war in 2003. Blair had to find another legal argument and he and Bush were now going for the ploy, "the lie", and that lie was to be that the Security Council had "*somehow already authorized the use of force*". This is the age old "revivalist doctrine", which had been foreseen even as the original **Resolution 660** was being drafted in 1990!

This line had been foreseen by many expert legal minds and several had written to the then Prime Minister (**Tony Blair**) expressing the fact that this argument was without merit. Philippe Sands Q.C. in his well researched book, "**Lawless World"** (ISBN: 978-0-14-101799-0) also shows that this letter was published in The Guardian newspaper on the 7 March 2003 the same, the very same day, that Goldsmith delivered his SECRET legal opinion to the cabinet. Also Sands and his team mentioned in passing, the fact that a legal war is not necessarily, *"a just, prudent or humanitarian war".*

The bottom line is that the war was illegal and illegal at every turn and they knew it BUT WERE GOING TO GO AHEAD "no matter what" for a plot or conspiracy had been entered into. The "no matter what" for Blair at the moment is a half a million pounds a year salary with one of the key profit-mongering companies of this world, the Jewish bank of J.P.Morgan Cazenove, as well as a similar pay-off from the Rothschild owned, Zurich Insurance of Switzerland, as well as lucrative pay-offs from other "interested parties" coupled to automatic speaking rights in the USA at millions per annum plus the lure of European President on offer.

THE TORTURERS AGENDA - WHAT WAS THEIR MASTER PLAN?

"International law? I better call my lawyer. […] I don't know what you're talking about by international law." George W. Bush 11 December 2003

In the run up to the invasion of Iraq on the 19 March 2003, **President Bush** made clear to **Tony Blair** his view that Iraq should be seen as a first step. The two leaders spoke on the 30 January 2003. According to a note of that conversation taken by one of Blair's foreign policy advisers, Bush said that he "*wanted to go beyond Iraq in dealing with **W.M.D.** proliferation, mentioning in particular Saudi Arabia, Iran, North Korea and Pakistan*". Global rules; global schmules! Look at the constant CIA provoked challenges against Iran. Look at the dictatorship in Pakistan and the recent covert black-ops assassination by CIA and rogue elements within British intelligence of Benazir Bhutto, and Pakistani Diktator Musharref having the gaul to accuse Britain of not having an anti-terrorist policy (why do you think he's calling in Scotland yard to investigate her death?…give us a break!!). Look at the continuous Mossad back up, anywhere, anytime for the USA or British Intel agencies. (What happened to Ariel Sharron by the way, is he still in his January 2006 coma?)

What was the mind set behind Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Detention Facility under the Bush Blair regime? As Blair was fully aware of (1) the existence of these facilities and (2) that they would be used before, during and after the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, this makes him an *"accessory before the fac*t" and acting joint principal in war crimes and torture and so under international law he might as well have been there putting the dog-collars on the prisoners himself or urinating upon them. IT MAKES NOT ONE JOT OF difference that he was several thousand miles away negotiating his next "15 times earnings mortgage" for his Belgravia property. Also the doctrine of collective ministerial responsibility within the Cabinet ensures also that ministerially, governmentally, legally and constitutionally AND MORALLY, the Cabinet, (then and now) must carry the can, COLLECTIVELY! This is constitutional law and is as it should be. If you attempt the seat of "power" then hot or cold that seat is yours until someone throws you off it. These illegal regimes, both in Downing Street and the Pentagon are soon to be nothing more than bad memories.

PHOTOS + THE PINOCHET CASE 1998

When the now notorious photographs of Abu Ghraib, with there relevant testimonies, hit the world head-lines we did not know at that point that lawyers in the United States Department of Justice and elsewhere in the Administration had provided detailed legal advice to the US government and by association therefore joint principal to the British P.M., on the international torture rules. These documents, argued by these political appointees of the Bush Administration, that in short the international rules didn't apply to detainees, were irrelevant and unenforceable. This document and these warrants, which we are now asking you to sign, is our gift to the international community and all victims of such atrocities showing that the rules do apply and apply to EVERYONE.

The advice given, ignored the very plain language of the **1984 Convention Against Torture (CAT '84)** as well as other treaties and rules. The advice ignored the definition of torture and the prohibition against torture under any circumstances. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you is a most fitting maxim here. Torture and other cruel and inhuman treatment has been internationally outlawed since the Second World War.

The 1984 Convention Against Torture (CAT '84) takes these general obligations and codifies them into more specific rules. It prohibits torture and "*other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*". See Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984) **Article 16**. It criminalises torture and seeks to end impunity for any torturer by denying him all possible refuge. The House of Lords ruled that Senator (for life) **Augusto Pinochet's** claim to immunity could NOT withstand the 1984 Convention. Margaret Thatcher, a personal friend of the torturer and "dis-appearer of thousands" thought otherwise, personally going to Heathrow and apologising on behalf of the nation as to how he'd been treated! Nice.(** See Kissinger note infra).

The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights stated even that, "*No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*". By the way, it allows for NO EXCEPTIONS. Similar language can be found in **The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Article 7**) and **The American Convention on Human Rights**

(**Article 5**(2)). Both are binding on the USA. **The 1949 Geneva Convention 3** prohibits physical or mental torture and any other form of coercion against a prisoner of war (**Article 17**):-

"*No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to any unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind.*

It designates such acts as *"grave breaches"* of the Convention (Article 130).

Geneva Convention 4 prohibits an occupying power from torturing any protected person (Article 32) as well as all other "measures of brutality" **(Article 283).**

The 1977 Geneva Protocol 1 – the relevant provision of which reflects customary law - prohibits "*torture of all kinds"* and any other outrages on personal dignity, against any person under any circumstances. Is that clear enough for you!

****({NB**. Kissinger was also one of the principle architects of Pinochet's barbarous regime Operation Condor and he is also on the list of criminals for whom warrants are being prepared for arrest under CAT 84 as well as The Rome Statute of The ICC. Henry Kissinger has been one of the more powerful critics of the House of Lords' judgement in the Pinochet case, a fact that may not be entirely unconnected with his own alleged involvement with Pinochet's coup and Operation Condor. He has written that the House of Lords could have decided that a Chilean court, or an international criminal tribunal specifically established for crimes committed in Chile, was the appropriate forum for proceedings, not the courts of England or Spain. Please note the following therefore, this is what the criminal elite fear the most and it is that monster which they themselves created can turn around and bite them. To date though it's just not happened because, simply put, no one has dared to call the inert monster up from its semi-drugged state of slumber and point it in the direction it should be facing: so here goes, that which they dread.

*"The unprecedented and sweeping interpretation of international law in Ex parte Pinochet would arm any magistrate, anywhere in the world, with the unilateral power to invoke a supranational conception of justice; to substitute his own judgement for the reconciliation procedures of even incontestably democratic societies where the alleged violations of human rights occurred; and to subject the accused to the criminal procedures of the magistrate's country, with whose legal system the defendant may be unfamiliar (read unable to buy his way out!) and which forces him to bring evidence and witnesses from long distance*s."} Henry Kissinger, Does America Need A Foreign Policy? (Simon & Schuster, 2001. p.277).

Mr Kissinger would seemingly have good reason to be concerned. In a recently released transcript of a telephone conversation, five days after Pinochet's coup, he told President Nixon that, "*we helped them*". See National Security Archive, Telecon: 9/16/73 (Home) 1150}

What we should bare in mind is that what Henry Kissinger really objects to – although he cannot quite bring himself to say it in so many words – is the loss of sovereign and executive power, and its subjection to the limits of the rule of law by an independent judiciary. His complaint is that HE does not want to loose control! His complaint is that ultimately foreign policy cannot be constrained by rules of international law**.})**

THE 1984 CONVENTION IS CATEGORICAL:

THERE WILL BE NO CIRCUMSTANCE – EVEN A "WAR ON TERRORISM" – IN WHICH TORTURE IS PERMITTED:

"*No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification for torture."*
Article 2(2), Convention Against Torture 1984.

Similarly **The Rome Statute of The International Criminal Court 1998** (See Appendix) treats torture and other inhumane acts (like the invasion and systemic genocide of a sovereign nation of people like (say) er.. Iraq, as war crimes and crimes against humanity. These are sentiments

of the Rome Statute and neither the USA nor Britain has ever objected to them though, it is worth noting that when the UN vote was taken on the 1998 **Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court** only three countries voted against it, and they were:- the USA, China and Israel! Can you see any human rights abuses or connectivity amongst these three? And furthermore, just so that you are under no doubt whatsoever as to the culpability of this government, (the present and past P.M that is), then:

"any person who threatens torture or who is complicit or participates in torture is also to be treated as a criminal." No ambiguity here!

And even the **1997 International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings** even reiterates that "*fair treatment*" is to be given to everyone and guarantees the "*applicable provisions of international law, including the international law of human rights";* **Article 14**.

Ponder these words too! In 1999, the Israeli Supreme Court gave a landmark ruling that prohibited the Israeli Security Forces (MOSSAD) from using physical abuse of suspected terrorists during "in-terror-gation".

"*This is the destiny of democracy"*, wrote Chief Justice Barak, "*as not all means are acceptable to it and not all practices employed by its enemies are open before it."* His words resound today*. "Although a democracy must fight with one hand tied behind its back, it nonetheless has the upper hand. Preserving the Rule of Law and recognition of an individual's liberty constitutes an important component in its understanding of security. At the end of the day, they strengthen its spirit and its strength and allow it to overcome its difficulties."*

The court noted the absolute prohibition on torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment in international law: there were no exceptions and "there is no room for balancing". **See - Supreme Court of Israel** , judgement concerning the legality of the General Security Service's interrogation methods, 6 September 1999, reproduced in **International legal Materials, vol.38; (1999) 1471**

AMERICA HAS LOST ITS WAY – WELL AND TRULY

The USA has changed dramatically for the worse since World War Two, arguably from the 6th August 1945 when under the auspices of bringing freedom, they psychologically, physiologically, mentally, morally, intellectually and spiritually crippled the world by dropping the bomb on Hiroshima, and then just for fun dropping another 3 days later on Nagasaki. The reason ? Well, the technology which the Manhattan Project scientists had been **given –**

(by the way signed off from the President by Prescott Sheldon Bush, yup a grand daddy to the present encumbent, whom as a managing partner of Brown Brothers Harriman, this company having spent millions of dollars for LBJ's 1948 Senate race, sat on several corporate boards, including the following:- Vanadium Corporation of America. This company was headed by Charles M. Schwab and Jacob Leonard Replogle. In August 1942, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers established the Manhattan Engineer District (MED), also known as the Manhattan Project, to develop atomic weapons and to procure the raw materials, principally uranium, necessary for their production. The MED contracted the Vanadium Corporation of America and the U.S. Vanadium Corporation (owned by Union Carbide) to procure and process uranium bearing ore.)

- **had to be** tested and was part of "the deal". And just as a drug dealer, negotiating the quality of the "heroin" he proposes to buy must test the quality and competency, then to be sure, the US covert and interior government had to be certain that that which they were paying for worked, hence one bomb of uranium and one of plutonium. Prescott was later arraigned by J. Edgar Hoover and had his bank, The Union Bank and Harriman Brothers shut down for un-American activities…."and they were, those activities?" I hear you ask, well, secretly funding the Nazi party in Germany of course. Since then the "Neo-Conservatives", or closet Nazis have been running the US Presidential campaign from both sides (oppo-sames) and non more furthered the war cause and Reds under the Bed threat, bogey-man nightmare than Lyndon Baines Johnson funded illegally by Brown Brothers and Root. From this time, the infamously stolen 1948 Texas election for the Senate, the honesty and partial integrity of why the USA came into being was well and truly rotting in it's grave. The military-industrial-pharmaceutical-war at any cost government was in place and was in place courtesy of British Intelligence – Christian Zionists, like Chamberlain and Lord Balfour, who gave Palestine, to the Israelis under

the orders of Walter Rothschild. But that's another story for another day…….back to Nazi torture and police state, totalitarian regimes.
Guantanamo's Camp Delta was established for one reason only: as a place to gather information beyond the constraints of international law. What the US Supreme Court has not yet done to date (March 2008) but may now well do with your help, is decide whether the interrogation regime at Guantanamo was consistent with American law and America's international obligations. The covert operations division of the C.I.A. is involved with these practices and we know exactly from where the executive orders and permissions to proceed have emanated.

The US ARMY FIELD MANUAL (FM) at 34-52 by the summer of 2002 was not providing the results expected. The statement on torture in these sections says*:*

"The use of force, mental torture, threats, insults or exposure to unpleasant and inhumane treatment of any kind is PROHIBITED BY LAW and is neither authorised nor condoned by the US Government. Experience indicates that the use of force is not necessary to gain the co-operation of sources for interrogation. Therefore, the use of force is a poor technique, as it yields unreliable results, may damage subsequent collection efforts, and can induce the source to say whatever he thinks the interrogator wants to hear. However, the use of force is not to be confused with psychological ploys, verbal trickery or other non-violent and non-coercive ruses used by the interrogator in questioning hesitant or un-cooperative sources. […] Additionally, the inability to carry out a threat of violence or force renders an interrogator ineffective should the source challenge the threat. Consequently, from both legal and moral viewpoints, the restrictions established by INTERNATIONAL LAW, agreements and customs render threats of force, violence and deprivation useless as interrogation techniques."
No ambiguity there, either Mr Blair.

The Pentagon, (or should we say the Inverted Pentagon), called for: "*additional interrogation techniques"*. See US Dept. of Defence News Release Number 596-04, 22 June 2004.
These techniques were to be applied to those alleged to have close connections with al-Qaeda leadership and planning figures, including "financiers, bodyguards, recruiters and operators". A US Army lawyer Lieutenant Colonel **Diane Beaver** (unfortunate name! Ed.) was asked to advise on the legal position and in the face of all this she wrote that, "*More aggressive interrogation techniques than the ones referred to in the US Army FM may be required in order to obtain information from detainees that are resisting interrogation efforts and are suspected to have significant information essential to national security"*. According to her memo America's international obligations are irrelevant and interrogation techniques – including forceful means and restraints on torture – are governed exclusively by US law. *Joint Task Force 170-SJA, Memorandum to Commander, Joint Task Force 170, 11 October 2002.*

Meanwhile, over at the US Department of Justice her civilian colleagues had not been treading water either. On 1 August 2002 just a few months before Lt. Col. Beaver produced her advice, the now much discredited, now left office and now plea-bargained by Patrick Fitzgerald, **Alberto Gonzales,** Counsel to Bush, received two memos. One from **John Yoo**, a Deputy Assistant Attorney General (*produced by R. Greenberg and J.Dratel in The Torture Papers: The Road to Abu Ghraib (Cambridge University Press 2005*), the second, a longer one, from **Jay Bybee** an Assistant Attorney General and presumably **Yoo**'s boss. **Yoo** was being questioned as to whether torturers could be hauled up before the ICC or violate the CAT '84. He stated that as the USA is not party to the Rome statute, "*We cannot be bound by the provisions of the ICC treaty nor can US nationals be subject to ICC prosecution".* [So, there you have it then – Geneva Convention, Statute of Rome, Convention Against Torture all go to hell in a hand-basket. But every WTO agreement enforced for financial infringement at a pace that would make your eye's water. Hmmm!]

His first point is correct. The US is not a party to **The Rome Statute** but what he forgets and so is left hanging in the wind upon, is the following oversight which he makes.
IT IS INDIVIDUALS AND NOT STATES WHO ARE THE DEFENDANTS BEFORE THE COURT.
If any CIA operative or member of British Intelligence commits torture, rising to the level of a war crime or a crime against humanity, on the territory of a state which is party to the Statute, then he can be prosecuted at the ICC. The Rome Statute is perfectly clear on that point. It can and will also be argued in court, irrelevant of ratification or signature, that the UN Conventions give global "minimum protections" to all humanity below which no one can fall.

On **CAT 84, Yoo** drops the ball again. The Convention(s) set(s) a lower standard to define the act of "torture" than US law. But **Yoo** says that if an act was not to be defined as torture under US law, then it could not be torture under the Convention. His argument is hopeless as it is one of the most basic rules of international law that in the event of conflict between an international rule and a domestic rule then the international rule will prevail. Once that rule is overridden, as **Yoo** proposes then there is NO international law left. Why bother negotiating a treaty on torture in the first place. More seriously though, **Yoo** has misunderstood, perhaps deliberately what the US did in ratifying the Convention. It did not enter a "reservation redefining torture and setting the bar at a higher level; it entered an "understanding" and no amount of wilful misreading by apolitically appointed Justice Department can change that.

The second memo received by **Gonzales** was slightly longer and came from **Jay Bybee**. It addressed the standards of conduct required by CAT '84 as implemented by US federal law. Administration officials have confirmed that the **Bybee** memo "helped provide an after –the-fact legal basis for harsher procedures used by the CIA on high level leaders (so called) of al-Qaeda". Just in case you are vacillating at this point in any way, would you like to know what their "newer interpretation" is? Well, according to our friends in the White House, those swivel – chair knights of the pen and senders of children to war, then: **Bybee** dispenses with all established canons of treaty interpretation and concludes that torture covers only the most extreme acts, those limited to severe pain which is difficult for the victim to endure.

"*Where the pain is physical,"* he writes, "*it must be of an intensity akin to that which accompanies serious physical injury such as death or organ failure."* Well that's nice to know: anything less, he implies, will not be torture and will be permissible." Oh, and as for mental? Well, this, "*requires a level of suffering not just at the moment of infliction but also requires lasting psychological harm such as seen in mental disorders like post-traumatic stress disorder".* See ""Memorandum from Alberto Gonzales, Counsel to the President, 1 August 2002, US Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel, p.46"; see also http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp_srv/nation/documents/dojinterrogationmemo20020801/.pdf

And it gets worse, much, much worse! According to **Bybee**, the US Congress could no more interfere with the President's conduct of the interrogation of enemy combatants than it can dictate strategic or tactical decisions on the battlefield. **Bybee** basically argues that as no part of **CAT '84** has been incorporated into federal law it just is not applicable. This therefore steps to assuming that the US Congress must therefore have intended to permit the "*necessity or war time defence"* for torture. Can anyone other than me see where this all might lead if it is not stopped with a brake of bronze? And furthermore, forget ye not, that this bunch are presently "negotiating" with the UK police, the Home Secretary Gordon Brown and the Windsors for "permission" to access our personal, private and sovereign data bases in order presumably to protect us from" **W.M.D.**'S". Which ones? Well, non-findable ones, of course!

So the global war on terrorism was therefore used as a confection to distract the true intentions of these rabid scaremongers – and it was used to justify "*additional interrogation techniques".* Has anyone heard of this kind of thing before, like around 1939 to 1945 in a country called Germany where the Storm Abteilung later re-named the SS (Security Statspolitzei) were not averse to a little bit of "additional interrogation technique" and what came out of that at Nuremberg, "*But Vee Ver only obeying orderz*!"

SORDID DETAIL
Said techniques were divided into three categories and Mr. **Tony Blair** was fully aware and was briefed by George Bush as to, "*How far we'll go to eliminate the threat*".

Category 1:-included two techniques: yelling and deception

Category 2:- required additional permission and included the use of stress positions such as standing or kneeling cross legged with someone standing on ones legs, for periods of up to four hours; the use of falsified documents ; isolation for up to thirty days; deprivation of light and auditory stimuli; hooding during questioning and transportation; 28 hour interrogations; removal of comfort items; removal of clothing; forced grooming; and the use of detainee specific phobias like dogs, snakes scorpions, rats and viruses to induce stress.

Category 3: - for "exceptionally resistant detainees" – this allowed for the detainees to be convinced that death was imminent or that severely painful consequences were imminent for

the person and/or his family; exposure to cold or hot weather or water; the use of wet towels and the use of dripping water to induce the "misperception" of suffocation or drowning; and so on.
On December 2, 2002, **Donald Rumsfeld** personally approved Categories 2 and 3 in a hand written memo he states that; *"I stand for 8-10 hours a day. Why is standing limited to 4 hours?"*

CRUEL MEN
The mind-set in the White House, and in this country too, and at the highest level, has now become most dangerous to the freedoms and liberties of its very own citizenry. The laws are being trampled underfoot by an elitist controlling class within our "democracy" however it is nothing more than a "faux-democratic" dictatorship. The MPs become delegates and are forced and coerced in order to pick up their fat pay checks into voting i.e. giving the peoples' names to that which would never be condoned in a thousand millennia in a true democracy. Whenever would the people vote for taxes (and now with over 150 stealth taxes already introduced since 1997 by Gordon Brown and with more to come) so ardent that they would break your very back to even calculate them let alone pay? When would they vote to pay to have to commute for jobs then get penalised at every point along the road they commute to them? Licensed here, controlled there; our borders indiscriminately opened to all and sundry. Our hospitals overwhelmed with causalities borne of drug overdose and 24 hour boozing and all brought to your very door by … yep, you have it, our Parliamentarians.

By January (mid) 2003, the torturer architect **Donald Rumsfeld**, directed the Pentagon's General Counsel to establish a Working Group on the interrogation of detainees held by US armed forces. It was headed by **Mary Walker**, the US Air Force's General Counsel and included top civilian and uniformed lawyers from each military branch and consulted with the Justice Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Defence Intelligence Agency and other Intel. Agencies. This group reported on 4 April 2003 and recommended 35 interrogation techniques to be used on "unlawful combatants" outside the USA. A military lawyer who assisted in preparing the report said that the political appointees heading the Working Group wanted to assign to the President of the United States virtually unlimited authority on matters of torture. *See Jess Bravin, "Security or Legal Factors Could Trump Restrictions, Memo to Rumsfeld Argued", Wall St Journal 7 June 2004 section A @ p.1*

Military lawyers were uncomfortable with the approach and concentrated in reining in the more extreme methods rather than challenge the President's constitutional powers.Of these techniques even Rumsfeld rejected eleven of them (God only knows why) but those relating to anxiety and aversion therapy he approved and it is "no coincidence" that those very techniques were the ones we vividly saw on the news and front pages of the worlds' press showing chained people lying upon bare concrete floors with dogs barking nearby. Removal of clothing and hooding were common place and many of these techniques are used by the British Special Forces, namely 22 SAS at Bradbury Lines, Hereford, on Officers Selection Week and on the E&E Exercises in order to disorient and break detainees' resolve.

Senators of the United States when they found out or rather were "made to find out", about what THEY'D SANCTIONED, interviewed Rumsfeld's deputy, (a kindly fellow, now with a top job as Chairman of the World Bank as a reward for a job well done as a torture architect and debilitator of global freedom), **Paul Wolfowitz**. When hauled up before the hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, (Federal News Service , 13 May 2004) he offered the following:-

SENATOR REED: *Mr. Secretary, do you think crouching naked for 45 minutes is humane?*
WOLFOWITZ: Not naked, absolutely not.
SENATOR REED: *So if he is dressed up that is fine? […] Sensory deprivation, which would be a bag over your head for 72 hours. Do you think that is humane?*
WOLFOWITZ: Let me come back to what you said, the work of this government…..
SENATOR REED: *No, no. Answer the question, Mr Secretary. Is that humane?*
WOLFOWITZ: I don't know whether it means a bag over your head for 72 hours, Senator, I don't know.
SENATOR REED: *Mr. Secretary, you're dissembling, non-responsive. Anybody, would say putting a bag over someone's head for 72 hours, which is….*
WOLFOWITZ: It strikes me as not humane, Senator.
SENATOR REED: *Thank you very much Mr. Secretary.*

No Thanks, We're British –British Citizens Tortured - Right of Remedy = Article 4 CAT '84
Tarek Dergoul, a British detainee at Guantanamo, has stated under oath, that he was,
"*poked, kicked, punched, shaved, exposed to intense heat and cold, deprived of sleep, and kept chained in painful positions"* .He claims he was threatened with return to an Arab country(refouler) where he was told he would be subjected to full-blown torture, contrary to **Article 3 of the 1998 Convention Against Torture.** Please bear in mind that these are just some of the 11 techniques recommended by the Pentagon's Working Report of April 2003, but not "*officially approved*" by Rumsfeld. And we have a unique and special working relationship with this regime….are we mad??? Questions need to be answered and I know the people wish to hear them.

In March 2004, five of the British detainees were released. **The Tipton Three**, Shafiq Rasul, Ruhal Ahmed and Asif Iqbal – claimed that their "in-terror-gation" had begun immediately upon arrival at Guantanamo and that the British Secret Service, MI5, had participated. Well before the British detainees went public with their allegations the British government had been forced to justify its approach to the legality of the Guantanamo detainees, **Jack Straw** claimed one thing but Defence Secretary, **Geoff Hoon**, took a different approach. Responding to complaints that British nationals had been removed from Afghanistan, hooded and manacled together and then flown for twenty four hours in that condition he responded assertively:

"*there is no doubting the legality in the way these combatants have been imprisoned. There is no doubting the legality of the right of the US….to remove them for trial*." Fin. Times 15th Jan 2002.Hmmm!

Louise Christian, a campaigning human rights lawyer, took the **Ferroz Abbassi** case maintaining that he was being detained against his "fundamental human rights" and secondly that the British government had a duty to protect those rights. At first instance the government got the case thrown out but fast tracking to the Court of Appeal in July 2002, in the presence of **Lord Phillips the Master of The Rolls**, the previous defence of "forbidden domain and non-justiciability" was rejected. In one of the most forensically superb pieces of advocacy seen Nicholas Blake QC destroyed that view: *"it's [a]n old view, which takes no account of modern developments in international law and human rights".*

The Court of Appeal invoked the principle of habeas corpus – imprisonment being unlawful unless it can be justified. The Court relied on the famous dissenting words of Lord Atkins in a House of Lords judgement given the Second World War:

"*Amid the clash of arms the laws are not silent. They may be changed, but they speak the same language in war as in peace*". {**Liversidge v Anderson**, (1942) AC 206 at 244.}

Prior to their release, the USA was insisting that they be tried upon their return, thus hampering the "independence" (so called) of the Crown Prosecution Service but as per **Lord Brennan QC,** a former Chairman of The English Bar, "*it would be next to impossible to produce a case against the detainees". FT 24th Nov 2003.*

What had the British government been doing while all this was going on? Well, for a start it had been defending its own anti-terrorist practices before the English courts, including the indefinite detention of a number of non-nationals, alleged to have links with Al Qaeda. For months the US had been consulting with the British government on how to make the Guantanamo trials work well. The British government has CONFIRMED that evidence obtained through torture at Guantanamo (or elsewhere) would be admissible in proceedings before the Special Immigration Appeals Commission (SIAC) See Hansard HL 2060, colWA71 (28 April 2004)

On 28th June 2004 the US Supreme Court handed down its landmark ruling in **Rasul et al. v. Bush**. By 6:3 the Court decided that the US federal courts DID have jurisdiction to determine the legality of the executive's potentially indefinite detention of individuals held in Cuba, who claimed to be wholly innocent of any wrongdoing. **Justice Kennedy** stated,
"*What matters is the unchallenged and indefinite control that the United States has long exercised over Guantanamo Bay*". **Justice Scalia** also in a scathing dissent stated
"…. *a foolish place to have housed alien wartime detainees*".

As **Lord Steyn** also described it: *"a monstrous failure of justice".*

We also had pictures from Abu Ghraib, Saddam Hussein's former punishment centre adopted "lock, stock and barrel" and turned into a US POW camp. Amazing, and how convenient! Just look at all these tools and instruments of torture we can use Sir!" Pictures were taken probably to underline either the arrogance and stupidity or the sub-concious desire of the perpetrators to atone for that which they were encouraged to do. The most notorious included a picture of a hooded detainee standing on a box with what appeared to be electrode wires attached to his fingers and his genitalia. Another showed Private First Class, Lyndie England, holding a leash tied to the neck of a man naked and lying on a floor… and many, many more.

YOU CANNOT GO AFTER PEOPLE WHO OBEYED ORDERS AND NOT GO AFTER THE PEOPLE WHO ISSUED THOSE ORDERS.

Sacrificial Minnows Caught up in Spider's webs

The spin doctors would try and convince you otherwise. SPIN = Satanic Polycentric Integrated Network of boxes within boxes, mesh upon mesh, with no one seemingly having given the order but the order being carried through. No one actually saying, "*Take the head shot*", no one actually saying, "*Kill the President now*!" No one actually (in govt/military power) pulling the trigger himself, but someone giving an instruction, responsible for standing down the security for Kennedy, standing it down, for placing the motor cavalcade on Deeley Plaza, for stepping down all personal security and outriders on the limo, for having all crowds withdrawn from Deeley Plaza, for sending those that might disobey orders to "stand down positions" in Alaska 24 hours before the Dallas visit of the President, and having the US cabinet out of the country on the day, and having half a battalion of troops airborne on their way back from Germany, and having the entire Washington DC phone and telegraph network out for an hour from around the time of the first shot, just in case. That's how it happens! No one was there, no body saw anything and no one pulled the trigger – but the President died and Lyndon Baines Johnson was the one, "qui bono". 1964 he campaigned not to up the stakes or increase involvement in Vietnam by sending more quote, "*young American boys to do what young Asian boys should be doing*", but words come cheap: following his successful Coup d'etat there were only 68,000 advisers, ground personnel and others in South Vietnam. By the time the electorate kicked that polecat out of the White House in 1968, that "war no more" ticket he'd waved was in shreds with over 568,000 personnel in Vietnam; 56,000 American soldiers dead and 288,000 seriously wounded. Casualties of the Vietnamese? … Who cares!

This mindset still subsists in the White House and 10 Downing Street. Bush's father, Herbert Walker Bush was in Deeley Plaza on the day of Kennedy's death, 22 November 1963. Prescott Bush (Bush 41's father) was called a NAZI by Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, and had his bank closed down for "un American activities." Bush 41, later to become head of the CIA, even phoned the Dallas police department after the Kennedy shooting to report "suspicious activity". However, he now claims it must have been another George Bush. Ex head of the CIA, ex Vice President, ex President now father of a "stolen election twice" serving alcoholic and cocaine addict, George junior. What do you doubt these people capable of? It's a family thing.

NEXT COFFIN NAIL.

Spring 2004, a Red Cross report condemning the treatment of Iraqi prisoners was leaked. This described violations of the Geneva Conventions which had been documented or observed while the International Committee of the Red Cross (IRC) had been visiting Iraqi prisoners of war, civilian internees and other persons protected by the Geneva Conventions between March and November 2003. The leaked extracts described brutality causing death or serious injury, physical or psychological coercion during interrogation, prolonged solitary confinement in cells devoid of light and excessive and disproportionate use of force. See "Violations Were Tantamount To Torture" The Guardian, 8 May 2004 P4.

Our over-riding question to crystallize the argument in this section might therefore be, "*Would we tolerate such systematic abuse of US or British prisoners of war under any circumstances*? If the answer is, "No", then the subject is closed and I need not continue. But maybe, you require more.

CHANGING THE GLOBAL RULES – THE RIGHT TO TYRANNISE

In its effort to change the rules the Clinton – Bush Dynasties have gone to great lengths to appear fair, with their tailored suits and $100 haircuts, with ex Rhodes Scholars in the White

House and Ex Presidents sons too, life on the Hill was just truly villainously easy. But America never acted on its own in this Satanic dance. It was always, always partnered by its STILL colonial ruler, Great Britain. To many minds it is a complete enigma as to why 9/11 brought Bush and Blair together as if Siamese twins; some have called it, "*the greatest enigma of 20th Century politics*" but it is obvious as long as you look for the obvious. If it looks like a duck, if it walks like a duck and if it quacks, then you know what? It's probably a duck! The special arrangement is a controlling trans-global brotherhood with agendas and issues. Don't doubt it, these guys are not as stupid as they would have you believe. They're already up at 5am, showered, suited and booted and thinking of their next position, while the average Joe is awake only to take the previous night's booze induced piss!

Blair stated consistently before the invasion that;
"we (Britain) would only act within the limits of international law," so great was the debate that the Attorney General had to make a late public statement in Parliament just three days before the invasion unequivocally justifying its legality without a further Security Council resolution. **UK Chief of the Defence Staff Admiral Sir Michael Boyce** wanted a clear and un-equivocal opinion before committing troops. See The Times, 1st March, 2004, p.4 & Daily Telegraph p.9.

The Butler Inquiry (or should we say Cover-Up) published, July 2004, provided many troubling insights into the time-table and manner in which the Attorney General **Lord Goldsmith** had advised. In September 2004 even the usually circumspect UN Secretary General, **Kofi Annan** took the unusual step of publicly stating that the Iraq war was illegal. And in November 2004, **Sir Stephen Wall** a senior foreign policy adviser at 10 Downing Street during the war, broke ranks with his former boss acknowledging that, "*we allowed our judgement of the dire consequences of inaction to over-ride our judgement of the even more dire consequences of parting from the rule of law*." Those consequences are here and they are NOW set before you requesting your courage to bring these known terrorists and criminals to account for what they have done and are still attempting to do.

WHO BOUGHT BLAIR –THE ISRAELIS, THE BUSHES or BOTH?

Blair's support for that faked, trumped up war defies all rationalisation by the common man. Remember **Blair** gave the support of diplomacy, of integrity of British-ness and fair play to the shaky Bush regime. He, **Blair** provided the oxygen for that horrendous regime to get away with what it did and still does. In the name of the Parliament, The Lords, The Monarchy, the people and the pints of British beer and cricket pitches of this nation he gave our vote to illegal war, acts of aggression and illegal regime change and torture and he did so, as we will prove, in a private capacity. He (Blair) gave credibility to **Guantanamo**, he gave credibility to the thin tune of death's melody that the **Bush** Administration droned out to the world, and gave up, with a willingness that could bend iron bars, the right of our own citizens, (that's me and thee) citizens of the Sovereign State of Great Britain to be tried at home: he allowed them, UK citizens, (the Nat. West Three) to be deported under an Unilateral Extradition Treaty zipped through Parliament faster than you can say Blair. Bear in mind too, that Britain under Blair following the events of 9/11was the ONLY MEMBER OF THE FORTY FIVE MEMBER COUNCIL OF EUROPE TO PASS ITS OWN ANTI-TERROR LEGISLATION requiring it to derogate from the European Convention on Human Rights to authorise indefinite detention without charge or trial of non-nationals who could not be deported.

The lunacy was partly checked in some small measure by the Law Lords in 2004 as we will now report, but we haven't even began to tackle the implications of the **Civil Contingencies Act 2005**, pushed through via the, "*nice old blind man routine*" using Herr Blunkett as the patsy: - with the "Blind Blunkett leading the blind to greater perdition on the road to insanity and prison planet earth," (though he was soon ejected after he'd served his purpose) where is it heading?

In December 2004, the judges in the House of Lords ruled (thankfully) by an overwhelming majority, that the law – part 4 of **The Anti Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001** was discriminatory and in violation of Britain's international legal obligations. The Law Lords were devastating in their critique of the government's actions. "*The real threat to the life of the nation"*, wrote **Lord Hoffman**, "*comes not from terrorism but from laws such as these".* **Lord Scott** described the law's power to allow indefinite imprisonment on the basis of a denunciation on grounds that are not disclosed, and made by a person whose identity cannot be disclosed as "*the stuff of nightmares*". *See A and others v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, X and another v. Secretary of State for the Home Department , Appellate Committee of the House of Lords , 16 December 2004, at paras 97 and 155.*

That was in 2004. With Blair out of the way now and the most in-effectual bean-counter this country has possibly ever seen in a seat of power now at the helm, have his handlers backed off the gas? Not at all. See The Guardian. Tuesday 15th January 2008 at p7, col1;

"Media challenge security claim for secrecy in murder trial ". Media organisations […] yesterday challenged a demand, unprecedented in modern times, that witnesses at a forthcoming murder trial should be heard in secret for "national security" reasons. "A secret trial would breach the common law principle of open justice and the principle of the freedom of the press enshrined in the European Human Rights Convention" said Gavin Millar Q.C.
The government wants to try Wang Yam, 45, a financial trader from Hampstead, North London, to be held behind closed doors for what Mark Ellison, counsel for the prosecution described as "reasons of national security".

My eye. We should be a fair and totally open society, with the guiding principle being fewer secrets not more and more. After all, what is a secret and why would you want to keep it? The reason that one keeps secrets is because you think they give you more power, or the edge over someone else or that they could harm or jeopardize you if someone else knew of them. If we are looking for spiritual role models then, Ghandi, the Dalai Llama, Mother Theresa, Buddha or Jesus should be chosen. I can't see the likes of them having too many secrets to hide, but our soon to become Gestapo State would have a Gauleiter in every block of flats and cul-de-sac and informants on every block. In the USA, should anyone be in doubt as to who actually won the Second World War, I know the official story says that the Facists lost but…, the FBI are even running initiatives for school-children to snoop on and "grass up" their parents .. they (FBI) say that it is the childrens' responsibility as "good citizens" to expose drug use, alcohol abuse or violence or theft, or hiding money from the tax man. 1984 was already here in 1964 it's just taken till now for people to realise the fact.

Even in the run up to war with Iraq, which the British people and the world citizenry thought might be avoidable with a bit of protest, we see that all along Blair and Bush had already agreed it would, Blair even hinted and expressed a willingness to override the UN Charter, suggesting that he might ignore any unreasonable French veto for the removal of **Saddam** from Iraq by force. (Also please remember that under international law Britain and America created the Permanent Member status of the United Nations and the veto system. It is theirs to live with!) On the legality of the war, he and his Attorney General (Blair appointed forget not) dismissed the views of Foreign Office legal advisers – and almost all international lawyers in Britain – that the use of force was not authorised by the Security Council. The Attorney General accorded to the Prime Minister the unilateral right to decide whether or not Iraq was in breach of **Resolution 1441**, exactly as **John Choon Yoo** had done for Bush, *coincidentally* in the USA. In taking that decision the Prime Minister did not even receive the benefit of up-to-date advice from the Joint Intelligence Committee. *See The Report of* ***The Butler Review*** *(Stationery Office, 14 July 2004*).

At roughly this time Britain entered into an agreement with the US acceding to a request NOT to transfer Americans to the International Criminal Court. Whatever could they have been thinking of? This support by the Blair government of this illicit war against Iraq and Afghanistan and deplorable illegal regime in Washington, has brought us no good at all and in the eyes of the world, implicated every voting man and woman on this isle. What have been the benefits of this lunacy? Have we benefited? We have not and we're seemingly systematically selling our very souls to no-bidder but these dastardly White House and Capitol Hill desperados and n'er-do-wells. There is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that the citizens of the United Kingdom have benefited in any way whatsoever for "*supping with the devil",* or are more secure or better protected than before. And that's as it should it be for no good can possibly result from a pact such as was made by these several criminals. Their, Bush/Blair, overriding trump card seems to be the most brutal and perhaps must be, as criminals can always identify with each other as "birds of a feather", that card being:- Power trumps all else and "reason and truth" is subject in the domain of the person with the biggest club. This transatlantic problem is not a Bush or Blair problem per say. It is a power problem.

BACK TO AMERICA
A few days after her appointment to succeed Colin Powell, **Condoleezza Rice** the new national Security Adviser, was addressing a group of people in the Dean Acheson Auditorium. These were State Department official and so well primed to subtle messages as far as a "new broom"

might provide, so to speak. In her position of National Security Adviser she would have had to advise George W. on Guantanamo, Iraq, Afghanistan and a range of foreign policy issues. Does anyone believe that such appointees are selected for the job because they exhibit strong leadership and strong opinions that differ in the slightest detail from their bosses? Does anyone believe that they are there to make the job harder or more awkward for the incumbent boss? Remember, that the hand that gives is always above the hand that receives. She told her audience that, "*We respect international obligations and treaty obligations and international law*" and she reiterates "*We're going to* continue *to make that very clear to the world*". There's the problem "continue". What does that mean?

In the run up to the stolen second term of office when **Bush** was debating with **John Kerry** (his distant cousin by the way, in case you may be thinking that any one can get to the run in) he frequently lambasted the UN and also renewed his attacks on the International Criminal Court (ICC) and international laws, as well as various European Countries. In his first debate, Bush told his audience that the ICC was constraining and illegitimate, "a body based in The Hague where unaccountable judges and prosecutors can pull our troops or diplomats up for trial". See the first Bush-Kerry debate, dated the 30th September 2004 at http://www.debates.org/pages/trans2004a.html

With the second debate the tone was just the same, "*You don't want to b e joining the ICC just because it's popular in certain capitals in Europe*." There was a sense of foreboding in the air as he "won" his second term thanks to the electronic vote rigger par excellence the, "Diebold Computer Voter Registration System" (Die bold being an old Knights Templar battle cry and used in initiations of the Skull & Bones Society at Yale, said system recently being handed over to help **Hilary Clinton** cheat her way via the New Hampshire Primary v. **Barrak Obama –** it's a dynasty thing 'cos they know no more Bush family members can sneak in).

America under the Bush regime had become synomomous with lawlessness. If you think about it logically that's how it had to be as the entire political framework is built upon a lie. And that lie is that politicians know what's better for you than you know yourself and are interested in helping you. So they spoon down your throat what they want you to believe and what's best for them and that invariably means that which enriches them the quickest and the most efficiently. It's the ultimate other-side of the rich/poor coin, you cannot have one without the other. Capitalism only works for the capitalist and just as to cool within a fridge you must generate heat then the un-acceptable face of capitalist wealth is sheer, abject poverty, you cannot have one without the other, two sides of the same coin. They know that and so set out with the justifiable rationale that if they don't get "it" or "take it" then someone else will, so the degree of criminality simply becomes a scale of relativity and the higher up the scale they go the better the pickings. How many retired Cabinet Ministers or PM's from memory were poor? Most make their money after leaving office as a thank you for a favour well done. Lawlessness is theft. Lawlessness is deceit. Lawlessness is not owning up when you're caught. Lawlessness is saying that the laws don't apply to you. Lawlessness is saying, "*We're different*!" Lawlessness is saying we have the right to, or we have the power to, or we can get away with it. Lawlessness IS terrorism. The established political elite and their families are these very things. Point to any of them and say this is not so!! I dare you!

In order for one to recognise what terrorism is in the realm of the absolute you have to be "it" before you can do it or recognise it, and that which you condemn will you become. In order for them to recognise terrorists they have to know terrorism. A complete contrast would be a spiritual nation state such as old pre 1959 Tibet. No terrorism, and if you tried to explain the fact as to why anyone would wish to harm their people by covert acts or barbarism they would proclaim, "*Why would anyone wish to do that to us?"* You see it all follows the chain of Cause & Effect and we are all responsible for what we bring to our own back-yards. If we are too lazy to wake up to the fact that we can better govern ourselves than others can, then we'll keep going around and around in ever decreasing circles, chasing our tails and disappearing up our own arses; allowing career weaklings, aristocratic inbreds, scoundrels, pathetic white-handed accountants and banker type, silver tongued, elitist family, degenerate service to self vermin, govern or better mis-govern us, always taking the shortest and easiest way to the end of their appointed term at the trough, all paid for with our tax dollars and the common mans' misery and always the lesser portion for the working man, who in truth, is too pre-occupied with the baubles dangled in front of his eyes to watch the road. It's all wired up, fibre optically sent at the speed of light and peoples' desire is stoked up to a point that it could melt diamonds: every kid is told "it's special" and it's, "*God's little creature*", when in fact their mediocrity is paralysing. But it's all

connected up to the techno. super information highway and cut loose. It's a runaway train man and it's heading for the buffers at Grand Central. But whilst this is going on who's keeping their eyes on the planet? Who's protecting the future, where even now the bees' honey tastes of mercury? Welcome to Hell. We did it!!

BURNING BUSH - I SEND YOU OUT AS SHEEP AMONGST THE WOLVES

After the "surprise" victory of George W. Bush in the 2004 election against his distant cousin, John Kerry, it was soon business as usual in the White House but more worryingly so. Powell left on moral grounds and the token black was swapped for another token black, and she was going to change things, right? No, just do as she was told if she wanted to keep the job. **Paul Wolfowitz** was picked to be President of the World Bank, a position which cannot be occupied without the consent of the Rothschild family, and **Alberto Gonzales** (now departed from the White House, following a plea bargain deal with **Department of Justice Special Counsel Patrick Fitzgerald,** presently, by the way, awaiting these signed warrants for the US Special Prosecutor's desk in Washington), was up graded from White House General Counsel (Bush's legal adviser) to US Attorney General (America's legal adviser). The news that **John Bolton** would not be Secretary of State Rice's deputy at the State Department brought relief in many quarters – until it was declared he would go even higher, as the US's Permanent Representative to the UN (giving him a seat at Bush's cabinet table).

Wolfowitz's World Bank nomination caused shivers around the world for he was afterall the principle architect of the war on terror or better stated as their war of terror, so damaging to long established international rules. Bankers and politicians are all the same: welded at the hip and totally symbiotic in their inter-relationship. Politicians seek power and money gives it to them. Bankers have money but want more and politicians give it to them.

John Bolton's appointment to the UN is diabolical from a non-US observers point of view. One of the functions of the US representative to the UN is to promote, *"respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law*". Yet **Bolton** is well known for his detestation of international rules. He described the time in 2002 when he signed the letter renouncing the US signature of the ICC statute as, "*the happiest moment in my government service*". As US Senator Christopher Dodd put it, Bolton's nomination would, *"send a dreadful, dreadful signal about our credibility to the world*". Douglas Jehl, "Democrats Force Senate to Delay a Vote on Bolton", New York Times, 27 May 2005.

The appointment of **Alberto Gonzales** was equally surprising for someone who once famously advised Bush that "*the Geneva Convention does not apply to al Qaeda or the Taliba*n". In launching Amnesty International's Annual Report in 2005 on the state of human rights around the world, the executive director of Amnesty International USA included Gonzales on its list of "high level torture architects" and called for him to be the subject of a full and impartial investigation. His name as you will see is on the list and is, upon your signature, being placed under arrest for contravening various human rights laws as well as acts of aggression. See statement of Dr. William F. Schultz, executive director Amnesty International USA, 25 May 2005, available at http://www.amnestyusa.org/annualreport/statement.html

Though these matters were aired at length at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings for his appointment he nevertheless got through. Just as with the **Dr. David Kelly's** murder and the Hutton Inquiry, as was the case with Yates and the Cash for Honours scandal, as was the casr with the Butler Inquiry, nothing gets done because those who have made and are making the decisions on high are doing just that.. making the decisions on high. The committees are guided or convinced as to what they should do by being exposed to that worn out tune or mantra of the day *"national interest*" which should read "Nazional Interest". The CPS don't prosecute; the file gets buried and the absolute ineffectual hamstringing of the common man rips out his gut. Again and again it is left to slide; half measures all the time. No culpability and no one accepting responsibility unless the cheating wretch is actually caught with the corpse around his shoulders! How could it ever have got this bad. Laziness and its first cousin cowardice my friend, that's how.

SPEEDY GONZALES – SPEEDILY GONE. APPOINTING A TORTURER

The Senate Judiciary hearings for Alberto Gonzales focussed on the fact that he was the principle architect for the post 9/11 legal framework much of which is set on our domestic UK table too. Gonzales told senators that "*contrary to reports, I consider the Geneva Conventions neither obsolete nor quaint"*. This is most strange since those reports were based not on an unattributable news reports but on his words, as expressed in a memorandum to President

Bush dated 25 January, 2002. He was questioned at length on his views on the 1 August, 2002 memo written by Jay **Bybee** at his request. This was the memo, you will recall that concluded that the US President had the authority as "Commander in Chief" to override domestic and international laws prohibiting torture and the ability to immunize from prosecution anyone who committed torture under his approval. This 2002 memo was not withdrawn until June 2004, after the **Abu Ghraib** scandal emerged. It then took six months to prepare a replacement memorandum, made public on the 30th December 2004, coincidentally (no doubt) just a few days before Gonzales's appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee. It specifically rejects the earlier memorandum prepared on Gonzales's watch – and seeks now to give effect to the United States' international obligations. However throughout all the questioning he refused to repudiate the first memos conclusions. He said he refused to answer hypothetical questions saying that, *"the President has said we are not going to engage in torture under any circumstance so the question is hypothetical."*

Despite the alarming signs, there have been a few hints that the USA Justice Department has painted itself into a corner and now has abandoned some of its hostility towards the ICC. John **Yoo**'s error ridden memo of the 1 August 2002, to **Alberto Gonzales** concluded that US nationals could not be subject to the jurisdiction of the ICC. The point was restated in the September 2002 National Security Strategy. Yet on 31 March 2005, the Administration agreed (by not vetoing the Security Council Resolution 1593) that the situation in Dafur should be referred to the ICC prosecutor, the first ever such referral. Asked to explain why it was that citizens of Sudan, which is *not a party to the Rome Statute*, should be nevertheless be subject to the jurisdiction of the ICC, Condoleezza Rice seemed a little off balance, then reiterated that "*we do believe that as matter of principle it is important to uphold the principle that non parties to a treaty are indeed non-parties to a treaty,*" then added: "*Sudan is an extraordinary circumstance".* See US Department of State, Office of the Spokesman, I April (Fools Day) 2005, remarks of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, available at http://usinfo.state.gov/af/Archive/2005/Apr/01-371658.htm

Ambassador Anne Patterson, the acting US representative to the UN provided some further insight, *"While the better mechanism would have been a hybrid tribunal in Africa, it is important that the international community speaks with one voice in order to help promote effective accountability*". Thank you, that logic will do nicely fto help validate our point of view that this application for warrants of arrest for the named individuals is totally in keeping with "domestic and internationally expected norms" and is morally and ethically required in order to show those who would exercise power over the masses that they are accountable and always will be, even to the end of time. "Pinochet like" escape on medical grounds and with the help of Lord Falconer, will not be allowed and these individuals will be held responsible for their acts no matter where they attempt to snake off to. Nevertheless, the campaign against the ICC has continued and on 3 May, 2005 the Bush Administration signed its 100th CAT 84 **Article 98** agreement, with Angola. This article basically attempts to ensure that a country will not offer up to the ICC a US national caught on its soil, for example in a diverted plane flight or in a transit lounge somewhere in the world. The lengths that this Administration has gone to in an attempt to protect itself does nothing but point to its guilt and culpability and shows that all along the *mens rea* of organised criminality was there.

The Land of the Free, the Land of The Brave! What a joke, Prison Planet HQ more like.
Some little known facts about the nation of the free.
The US is a nation of killers. They elect people to kill for them and they kill each other. Thousands each year are gunned down with the most liberal gun laws outside of a banana republic. On 1 March 2005, in a landmark judgement in **Roper v. Simmons**, the Supreme Court ruled by a narrow majority (5:4) that the Eight Amendment of the US Constitution (which prohibits the infliction of "cruel and unusual punishments") forbids the imposition of the death penalty on juvenile offenders who were under the age of 18 years when they committed the offence. In reaching that conclusion the majority opinion of **Justice Anthony Kennedy** ruled that the opinion of the world community was relevant in confirming a consensus view that the death penalty was a disproportionate punishment for such offenders and that the US stood alone, "*in a world that has turned its face against the juvenile death penalty*". This opinion was reflected in **Article 37** of the **United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child**, which EXPRESSLY prohibits capital punishment for crimes committed by juveniles under eighteen (and which has been ratified by every country in the world with the exception of wait for it …..the United States and Somalia!!).Hmmm what can you say, what can you say?

The dissenting bench Chief Justice William Rehnquist and Justice Clarence Thomas, and Justice Antonin Scalia, savages the majority for giving into the views of "*the so called international community"*. He argues against the fact that America's laws should need to conform in any way to those of the rest of the world. Scalia says that this assumption should be *"rejected out of hand*". Not at all comforting to know that such creatures are sitting in the highest court of the most powerful dictatorship on earth.

As of today, February/March 2008 the Pentagon's Working Group Report on Detainee Interrogations of March 2003 which adopted large parts of the approach taken by the Jay **Bybee** memorandum, appears to remain in effect. To date there have been no full investigations on either side of the Atlantic of any of those which Amnesty International has characterised as "*high level torture architects"*. These names include: President George W. Bush; also ex Head of the CIA, ex President and ex Vice President, his father George H.W. Bush; Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld; Attorney (ex sorry!) Alberto Gonzales, William Haynes (the former Defence Department General Counsel) and Douglas Feith (Under Secretary of Defence Policy). Amnesty International has also called upon State Bar Authorities to investigate Administration lawyers alleged to have been involved in the preparation of this and other memoranda.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL BLASTS USA

Indeed Amnesty International's 2005 Report on Human Rights alleges that the US is running a "new gulag" of prisons around the world and this seemed to hit a sore spot with the Bush family: it prompted a response from the President so banal that it is worth setting out in full.

"" I'm aware of the Amnesty International Report and it's absurd. It's an absurd allegation. The United States is a country that is – promotes freedom around the world. When there's accusations made about certain actions by our people, they're fully investigated in a transparent way. It's just an absurd allegation. In terms of the detainees, we've had thousands of people detained. We've investigated every single complaint against the detainees. It seemed like to me they based some of their decisions on the word of – and the allegations – by people who were held in detention, people who hate America, people that had been trained in some instances to disassemble – that means not tell the truth. And so it was an absurd report. It just is"". Presidents Press Conference, Rose Garden 31 May 2005,
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/05/20050531.html>

Some parting words from Donald Rumsfeld before he left office, shortly before Rice spoke at The American Society of International Law, in his document for the National Defence Strategy of the United States, March 2005, p.5 available at:
http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/nds-usa_mar2005.htm
we saw little reference to allowing for greater co-operation with the international community but instead more bullying, threats and intimidation:-
"*Our strength as a nation state will continue to be challenged by those who employ a strategy of the weak using international fora, judicial processes and terrorism".*

So there you have it: for us or against us. Al-Qaeda and the international lawyers and ME, joined at the hip!!

THE UNITED KINGDOM'S SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE USA

THE LEGAL ADVICE FROM LORD GOLDSMITH TO THE COUNTRY VIA THE COMMONS - THE CUP PROFFERED FROM WHICH THEY ALL DRANK.

Democracy is supposed to reflect the emergence of a universal expectation that those who seek a validation of their empowerment – the governors – should govern with the CONSENT of the governed. This is what is called constitutionally, "Informed consent" and its nemesis is "non-informed consent". Once the latter takes a hold you have dictatorship. Not even elected dictatorship. **Question**: how many people voted for **Tony Blair** in the last general election? **Answer:** only his constituents in Sedgefield! Of the Parliament of 650 or so MPs returned, we in effect had 650 separate elections to government, and with the lowest turnout in the last

100years. His party was elected by only 12% of the population of approximately 64 million and we call that democracy? Democracy - it's as dead as disco!

A BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF RESOLUTIONS - 660, 678, 687 and 1441. (*See Appendix)
The AG's reliance on **Resolution 678** is flawed.(See Attorney General's Advice of 7 March 2003 to the PM and Written Answer to Parliamentary Question, 17 march 2003 attached). This resolution was only intended to get Iraqi forces out of Kuwait in the first Gulf War, 1990. It informed Iraq to comply with **Resolution 660** which demanded that Iraq "withdraw unconditionally and immediately" from its positions in Kuwait. There was nothing in **Resolution 660** or ANY OTHER RESOLUTION concerning regime change or the overthrow of Saddam's government. **Sir Crispin Tickle** was one of the main drafters of resolution 678 and he clearly understood that this resolution had no purpose other than to remove Saddam from Kuwait. Similarly in his 1995 memoirs Colin Powell is similarly explicit: The UN resolution made clear that the mission was only to free Kuwait*: "the UN had given us our marching orders and the President intended to stay with them."* **Colin Powell:** *A Soldier's Way (Arrow Books, 1995 P490).*

His British counterpart **Sir Peter de la Billiere** agrees:
"We did not have a mandate to invade Iraq or to take the country over". Gen Sir Peter de La Billiere: *Storm Command (Harper Collins 1995 p304 cited by Lord Alexander of The Weedon in "Iraq: Pax Americana and the Law", Tom Sargant memorial annual lecture 14 October 2003*.

The same point was made by others who were in "power" at the time, **John Majo**r (a.k.a. John Major-Ball prior to his name change) was PM at the time of **Resolution 678 and 687**. His view for what it's worth:

"Our mandate from the United Nations was to expel the Iraqis from Kuwait, and not to bring down the Iraqi regime {…} We had gone to war to uphold international law. To go further than our mandate would have been, arguably, to break international law." No ambiguity there!
(See cited by Lord Alexander of Weedon op.cit).

If United Nation resolutions 660 and 678 did not provide any basis for overthrowing Saddam Hussein in 1991, then how could they have done so in 2003?

A RIGHT TO USE FORCE WHICH DID NOT EXIST IN 1991 CANNOT "REVIVE" IN 2003 ipso facto the war was illegal, it was and is still criminal: ipso facto the perpetrators are criminals: ipso facto they need to be brought to account by way of full public "non-whitewashed" trial. Moreover, there is nothing in **Resolution 687** which allows one or more members of the Security Council – or the British (then) Prime Minister – to decide what further steps are needed. Does this make sense or am I the only one getting it? Decision making collectively is the heart of the UN – It is the raison d'etre and the entire basis of international law. It's flawed but it is still the law, and the law is the law except, perhaps, "*quand les mouches sont grandes".*

As a mental construct even if **Resolutions 678** and **687** could be construed to authorise a right to use force to overthrow Saddam – which they did not – on what basis could such a right be said "to revive?"
Resolution 1441 has an operative paragraph 4 which provides that:
"*false statements or omissions in declarations submitted by Iraq pursuant to this resolution and failure by Iraq at any time to comply with and co-operate fully in the implementation of, this resolution shall constitute a further material breach of Iraq's obligations and will be reported to the council for assessment in accordance with paragraphs 11 and 12 below.*"

Any argument that by **Resolution 1441** the Security Council was reviving the authority to use force contained in resolution 678 is defeated by the wording of paragraph 4 in **Resolution 1441**. All the world apart from the "Bush - Blair Satanic Axis of Evil" understood that it would be for the council to decide what to do if Iraq failed to comply – when **Resolution 1441** was being drafted those drafters were <u>fully aware</u> of the "revival argument". Against this background it is very difficult to understand what the Attorney General was up to unless it was what he was obviously up to, namely …….

The UK Permanent Representative **Sir Jeremy Greenstock** was even clearer:-
"We heard loud and clear during the negotiations the concerns about "automaticity" and "hidden triggers" …. There is no "automaticity" in this Resolution. If there is a further Iraqi breach of the

disarmament obligations (i.e. now amounting to a volte face of the British American Imperialist foreign policy whilst arming him (Saddam) in the 1980's) the matter will return to the Council for discussion as required in Operational Paragraph 12. We would expect the Security Council then to meet its responsibilities". No ambiguity there.

Let's wrap this section up by allowing the last words to go to the **United States Permanent Representative** to the United Nations **John Negroponte** who said in his Explanation of The Vote, that: *"resolution 1441 contains no "hidden triggers" and no "automaticity" with the use of force" See* <.http://un.org/webcast/usa110802.htm>

WHO GOT AT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL?
The Attorney General's claim to "automatic revival" has been described as "risible" by **Lord Alexander of Weedon**. We concur. Our question to you is "Which circumstances could have prevailed upon the Attorney General for him to lend Britain's name to such a weak and dismal argument?

In January 2003 the Foreign Office legal advisers told the Attorney General of their view and asked for his. There is nothing to indicate that he did not share the unequivocal views of the legal advisers at the Foreign Office in London. **Robin Cook** resigned from the Cabinet shortly before the war in "honourable protest" because he noted the alarm when Blair stated in the Cabinet meeting on 11 April 2002 that "*the time to debate the legal basis for our action should be when we take that action*". Robin Cook: The Point of Departure (Pocket Books 2004) at p135.

The Attorney General's formal written advice to the P.M. is set out in a minute dated 7th March 2003. By then the troops had been deployed "illegally". This document was sent only to Blair.
For two years the British Labour Government refused even to acknowledge the existence of detailed legal advice. The Government published the full advice on 28th April 20005. The advice is equivocal and recognises that if ever the argument were to come before a court of law it might well be unsuccessful. So concerned was the Government about the possibility of such a case that it took steps to put together a legal team to prepare for possible litigation. Hmmm! How convenient for us that God's delays are not God's denials.

Lord Goldsmith's advice of the 7th March 2003 WAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR EITHER FOR SIR MICHAEL BOYCE, THE CHIEF of THE DEFENCE STAFF or his legal advisers.
He wanted to be sure that military chiefs and their soldiers would not be "*put through the mill*" at the International Criminal Court.

"*I asked for unequivocal advice that what we were proposing to do was lawful. Keeping it as simple as that did not allow for equivocations, and what I eventually got was what I required... something in writing that was very short indeed. Two or three lines saying our proposed actions were lawful under national* and international law". Observer, 7th March 2004 p.1.
On both accounts they were wrong, they lied.

The full advice which the Attorney General gave, to the then incumbent Prime Minister, was only made known to the public after much stone-walling and water treading following leaked extracts being published by The Guardian newspaper. The full advice, initially refuted as ever existing, was shown to the world in April 2005 two years after the war. The Prime Minister had earlier said the following: *"If it is being said that the legal opinion of the Attorney General was different from the Attorney General's statement to the House, that is patently absurd."*
Tony Blair, 9 March 2005.

So is he stating that both opinion and "advice" are the same thing and/or that legal opinion and "advice" is the same thing? Is a legal opinion the same as legal advice? What was the Attorney General "paid" by the taxpayers of this country to do: to give advice and/or opinion?

Seats were lost in the 2005 General Election due to the fact that the government had failed to come to grips with the obvious fact that the electorate wanted – but did not get – a proper explanation as to the circumstances in which the Attorney General's private , written legal advice had changed into a rather different public "view" in the course of just 10 days, and it may be added within that 10 day gestation period the Attorney General had possibly taken a visit to the USA to meet with the Bush Administration's legal advisers. The events that led to the

publication of the legal advice are somewhat complex and convoluted and do point to a smoking gun. We will not go into detail now but suffice it to say that advice came out.

The Attorney General admitted to the **Butler Enquiry** that he met with **Lord Falconer,** the Lord Chancellor, and **Baroness Morgan** on **13 March 2003**, at 10 Downing Street. He was asked by Lord Butler whether or not there was a transcript of that meeting: - *"I can't say…I don't know what minutes Number 10 may have of it. They shortly, of course, set out my view in the PQ which was published on the following Monday. That set out what my view was of course."*

NOW HERE COMES A KEY POINT. THE TRANSCRIPT WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, BUT WAS NOT CORRECTED. PUBLICATION THEN CAUSED HIM TO REVIEW THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE TAPE RECORDINGS AND A CORRECTED VERSION WAS THEN MADE AVAILABLE. The change was subtle but "gun-smokingly" significant:

"They shortly, of course, set out my view…" became *"Very shortly, of course, I then set out my view in the PQ which was published on the following Monday*." Statement by Lord Goldsmith, 25 February 2005.

Lord Butler (hired hand called into to fudge the findings) confirmed that the change accurately reflected the tape (although he had NOT listened to it but relied on the Inquiry's secretary who had) but, surprise, surprise the government REFUSED to make the tape available. (Er, is there anyone smelling something here…? Ed.)

And while we're on the subject, so to speak, we can mention the fact that **Lord Falconer** in 2003 was in the Cabinet of Mr. Blair as the Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs. It is he who appointed Lord Hutton to look into the death of Dr. David Kelly. Now Hutton is a legendary pair of "safe-hands" for the government. Lord Hutton was one of four Law Lords to reject David Shayler's application to use a 'public interest' defense as defined in section 1 of the Official Secrets Act at his trial.

Lord Hutton also came to public attention in 1999 during the extradition proceedings of former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet. Pinochet had been arrested in London on torture allegations by request of a Spanish judge. Five Law Lords, the UK's highest court, decided by a 3-2 majority that Pinochet was to be extradited to Spain. Lord Hutton led a public campaign against this decision on the grounds that **Lord Hoffmann**, one of the five Law Lords, had links to human rights group Amnesty International. The verdict was then overturned by a panel of seven Law Lords which included **Lord Hutton**.

Sinn Féin and former IRA member (volunteer) **Danny Morrison** wrote in *The Guardian*: *"Although in the Belfast high court Hutton occasionally acquitted republicans and dismissed the appeals of soldiers, nationalists generally considered him a hanging judge and the guardian angel of soldiers and police officers. [...] I was amused at the response of sections of the media and British public [to Hutton's exonerating the Blair government]. Do they know anything about how the establishment works?"*

In his role as Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs, **Lord Falconer** has sought to make it easier for government bodies to refuse to release documents under the Freedom of Information Act (2000), on the grounds that they are too expensive and too time-consuming for civil servants to find.

VOLTE FACE

In unprecedented circumstances on 17th March 2003 following an earlier "visit" to the USA, the Attorney General was invited to respond to a parliamentary question on the legal basis for the use of force by the United Kingdom against Iraq. The written answer: just 337 words. Our learned friend, with remarkable economy, had now established that authority to use force unilaterally against Iraq had sprung up out of the "combined effects" of past U.N. Security Council **Resolutions 678, 687, and 1441**. The argument was beguilingly simple but flawed. (See Hansard for the text or our attached copy). The very next day on March the 18th the Foreign Office's Deputy Legal Adviser **Elizabeth Wilmshurst** tendered her resignation and we quote:

"*I regret that I cannot agree that it is lawful to use force without a second Security Council Resolution: she further added, "I cannot in all conscience go along with advice within the Office or to the public or parliament – which asserts the legitimacy of military action without such a*

*resolution, particularly since the use of force on such a scale amounts to (and here it comes!!) "**the crime of aggression"*** (my emphasis); *nor can I agree with such action in circumstances which are so detrimental to the international order and the rule of law*."

So the advice of the 7 March becomes the "view" of the 17 March 2003 with something coming along in the meanwhile to change the AG's mind. Next question, having given the legal advice on the 7 March, how many lawyers does it take + One Attorney General to draft an answer to a parliamentary question? The answer:
"Those involved were myself, the Solicitor General, two officials in my Office, three officials from the Foreign & Commonwealth Office and Christopher Greenwood QC. The draft was also discussed with the then Lord Chancellor, Lord Irvine of Lairg. I was fully involved throughout the drafting process and personally finalized and of course approved the answer."

Amazing how a 337 word text should require the input and authorship of nine lawyers and senior civil servants. All of them require carpeting for their involvement in this illegal venture and I'm sure their appearances in the witness box & testimonies on the stand will knock Coronation Street off top-billing! If the "view" was the same as the earlier advice, then why were quite so many people needed to re-affirm that which had already been formulated?

The identity of those involved also points out the fact that the Parliamentary advice WAS NOT legal advice; it was something else, part of a public relations exercise, a document designed to persuade and NOT to advise. The AG confirmed as much when he told the House of Lords that Professor **Christopher Greenwood QC** had been first instructed on 13th March, 2003 (the same day as the Falconer/Morgan meeting), *"but was not instructed to advise on whether military action would be lawful*". This was a Written Answer to a Parliamentary Question, House of Lords, 21 March 2005, Hansard, col. WA4. As regards Baroness Morgan and Lord Falconer, the Attorney states that neither they "nor any official in the Prime Minister's Office had any involvement whatsoever in the drafting of the answer". The formulation leaves open the possibility that these two confidantes of the PM contributed to the Attorney General's change of mind, on the journey between the advice and the "view". As a senior member of the Bar put it:
"It would be interesting to know whether the Attorney's view became "clearer" before the meeting of the 13 March, or during the course of the meeting or after the meeting."

So over to you. What then is the difference between the "views" of the Attorney General on the legality of the use of armed force against Iraq and his "advice" on this subject? Well, he responded that the 17 March, Parliamentary answer was, "*a summary of my view of the legal position, rather than a detailed consideration of the legal issues. The statement was, nevertheless consistent with my legal advice*". House of Lords, 6 November, 2003, Hansard, col. WA129.

Fifteen months later on 26 February, 2005, came a response with an apparently contradictory emphasis: "*The answer to the parliamentary question did not purport to be a summary of my confidential legal advice to Government.*" Statement from AG 25 February, 2005.

In other words, the answer to the PQ was a summary of the Attorney General's "view of thee legal position" but not of his confidential legal advice. AND the "view" is "consistent with" the advice, but not a summary of it. This is sheer sophistry, it makes little sense and is dissembling and deliberately evasive and misleading and he knows it and so do you. It is also a lie - as we now know - for him to claim that the 17 March parliamentary answer is "consistent with" the 7 March legal advice. With hindsight we can not only see the falsification of the reason for war in the first place i.e. that weapons of mass destruction existed at all and were an imminent threat to us or the world at large, but also that the advice and the "view" which took us there are a)quite different and b)inconsistent. The press smelled a rat, the public smelled a rat and hopefully you still agree that justice was not seen to be done. It is time therefore to re-do that which should have been done at the time. Publication of the document was still being refused and questions multiplied catalysed by **Sir Andrew Turnbull's** appearance before the House of Commons Select Committee on Public Administration in mid March 2005.

"*I want to have one more go at trying to find out what happened about this wretched legal advice",* Tony Wright MP, the Committee Chairman told the Cabinet Secretary. Sir Andrew's responses provided no greater clarity. He appeared to tell the Committee that there was no formal legal advice beyond a single sheet of A4. He suggested that there was no other legal advice only *"work that had gone on earlier".*

Later in March 2005 the Foreign Office was forced to respond to a freedom of information request for a complete copy of the 18 March resignation letter of **Elizabeth Wilmhurs**t, the deputy Foreign Office legal adviser. The original release of this letter had "missing lines," the eventual full copy did not. So what had the government tried to cover up? Well, the missing lines confirm that there was earlier legal advice and so **Sir Andrew Turnbull** could be and is probably a bare faced liar. The missing lines:

"*My views accord with the advice that has been given consistently in this office, before and after the adoption of the SCR 1441 and with what the Attorney General gave us to understand was his view prior to his letter of the 7 March*".

The view expressed in that letter has of course changed again into what is now the official line. The letter showed that there had not been one change of mind but two: from initial agreement with the Foreign Office legal advisers (war would be illegal without a further and explicit Security Council Resolution) into the equivocal "advice" of the 7 March and finally with a hop step and a jump and home for tea by five, to the unequivocal "view" that emerged on the 17th March, just three days before the war. Bravo! The then Prime Minister, **Tony Blair**, enveloped by a growing scandal, called upon support from Gordon Brown, who hoists himself on his own petard and lays testimony to his culpability both personally, constitutionally, and magisterially via the doctrine of Cabinet Collective Responsibility; when asked whether he would have proceeded in EXACTLY THE SAME WAY as Mr Blair, the Chancellor and now soon to be indicted, current PM, gave a one word answer, "*Yes".* See B. Roberts and O. Blackman, Mirror, 29 April 2005 p.11. See also Johnathan Oliver, "Blair Lied To Us Over Iraq, Say Half of All Voters," Mail on Sunday, 1 May 2005, p.2.

GOLDSMITH ON THE RACK?

"You have asked me for advice on the legality of military action against Iraq without a further resolution of the Security Council."

With these very words did the Attorney General open his legal advice on the 7 March 2003. They destroy the claims by **Sir Andrew Turnbull** and **Jack Straw** that the Attorney's change of mind was the result of a new fact that emerged between the 7th and the 17th March 2003; the collapse of negotiations for a second Security Council resolution, for that fact had ALREADY been foreseen in the previous advice. It is now clear that the 7 March advice WAS the AG's final formal written legal advice. A photocopy of the entire letter is attached to this submission.

When the advice was finally published it became clear that the 17 March Parliamentary answer was NOT a summary of the conclusions previously drawn at all, and not even consistent with this earlier advice. Publication of the memo showed once and for all that the Attorney General of the United Kingdom and Commonwealth had changed his mind about the legality of a war between the 7 March and 17 March 2003. On the 7 March he advised the PM only that a "reasonable case" could be made that **Resolution 1441** could "in principle" revive the authorisation to attack Iraq. Just 10 days later the Attorney General is saying unequivocally to the Cabinet and Parliament and let's not forget the troops and the people that, *"a material breach of Resolution 687 revives the authority to use force under **Resolution 678**".* No hesitation! No caveat! Hard factual and clinical, but according to the then PM (remember) to suggest that the Attorney General (his appointment by the way to the post) had changed his mind was, "patently absurd". So who did he meet with on his American trip? What was offered to persuade him to change his stance? He states that, "I was impressed by the strength and sincerity of the views of the US Administration", he writes to the Prime Minister.

LIAR - LIAR - PANTS…..

The Attorney General stated to the **Butler Inquiry** that he met with the US lawyers on the subject of the legality of the war on 11 February 2003. When specifically asked by the Butler Inquiry if he had had ANY CONTACT WHATSOEVER WITH ANY AMERICAN LAWYERS IN RELATION TO THE WAR, AT HIS OFFICE PRIOR TO FEBRUARY 2003, he replied that he had had none, although he did recall an earlier meeting with William Taft, the then Legal adviser to the State Department. This meeting was in September 2002 and not about the war.

This reticence to detail was not shared by some of the AG's US counterparts. **William Taft 4th** was Colin Powell's legal adviser at the US State Department and he recalls that the meeting of

the February 2003 *"was something that grew out of a series of conversations between Secretary Powell and Secretary of State Straw […] Mr Straw said his lawyers were looking at this, the Attorney General in particular and asked, could the AG meet with Powell's lawyers/ Because of that, Lord Goldsmith arranged to talk to us about our views*". Observer 1 May 2005 p.15

Mr Taft also identified the main US lawyers with whom, he, the Attorney General met and I trust you're ahead of me, here on who they're going to be.
"Lord Goldsmith met with me and one or two others in the State Department most of the morning. He then met with our Attorney General, and met with people at the Pentagon – Jim Haynes, and Judge Gonzales, and John Bellinger."

This is an interesting list. Messrs Haynes and Gonzales and US Attorney General, General Ashcroft, were closely associated with the preparation of the post 9/11 legal advice in the run up to the tortures, disclosures and allegations at Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib (Taft by the way objected to much of the advice).

Also note that during the months before the war Britain was desperately campaigning for a second UN resolution. These attempts finally collapsed in the first week of March 2003. By then there had been a significant development. On 11 February 2003 Lord Goldsmith met with John Bellinger the Third, then legal adviser to the White House's National Security Council and later legal Adviser to the State Department. The meeting took place at the White House according to **Philip Sands QC** in his book, "Lawless World", page 196, Lls 22-34. A White House official told him: "I met with Mr Bellinger and he said: "*we had trouble with your Attorney, we got him there eventually*." When **Philip Sands QC** put this to **Mr. Bellinger**, he reflected upon it and then told him; "*I do not recall making such a statement*", adding diplomatically, "*I doubt that an individual of **Lord Goldsmith's** eminence would adopt a legal argument based on pressure from the US government*". In any event this seems to have been the moment around which the Attorney General's views shifted.

Lord Goldsmith's conduct has, incidentally, been referred to the Bar Council by a group of fifty barristers including four QC's requesting an investigation of the possibility that the AG permitted a parliamentary answer to be given in his name which did not accurately reflect the contents of his advice raising issues under paragraph **307(a**) of the Bar's Code of Conduct (independence, integrity and freedom from external pressure) and paragraph **307(c**), (no compromising of professional standards to please a client, the court or a third party). The Bar council said that it did not have jurisdiction (i.e. non justiciability on interest of foreign affairs) after obtaining expert legal advice, presumably from the highest authority in the land - the Attorney General. [We now have as a side line Geoffry Vos, ex Chairman of the Bar Council, fighting for the banks against the people in the legal Dream Team for the Banks v. The People. HMMM!]

BLAIR A PLOTTER ?
Q: WHO COULD BELIEVE IT OF HIM?
A: THE WHOLE COUNTRY

Sir Jeremy Greenstock knew that on the 31st January 2003 the then Prime Minister, **Tony Blair**, had met with **President Bush** at the White House for two hours, and that Bush had told him that if efforts to get a second resolution failed, "*military action would follow anyway*". Mr. Blair's response? According to a note of that meeting the Prime Minister told President Bush that he was, "*solidly with the President and ready to do* <u>whatever it took</u> *to disarm Saddam"*. It seems therefore the Prime Minister had already taken his decision, well before he went through the farce of asking the Attorney General to jump through the Parliamentary hoops and before he made a mockery of the British nation: - this also goes some way in showing just how unhelpful the Attorney's advice must have been on the 7th March. The Attorney General's 7th March advice is attached (in full) and it is quite clear why the military would have taken one look at it and ran the other way. It is clear now also, to see why it was never shown to the Cabinet or to Parliament and it is also obvious why the government didn't want this document to get it to the public domain. The equivocal 13 page advice became the unequivocal one page "view" of the 17 March 2003. A war that only a few days prior was a war that the AG had concluded would "**<u>most likely be unlawful"</u>** became "definitely lawful". Cost of this war to date: thousands of lives and billions of dollars in war machinery and stolen oil revenues all being siphoned off via banks such as J.P. Morgan and oil field infra structure and support organisations like Dowell Schlumberger, of which Dick Cheney is President and please "forget ye not" that the Bush

Family's wealth is founded on Texan soil and the black-gold there-under. Who has been held accountable, so far, for this debacle? To whose account has this bill been marked?

ACCOUNTABILITY – ACCOUNTABILITY – NO ACCOUNTABILITY!

We see therefore that Bush and Blair had decided to go to War as early as 31 January 2003. We see therefore that they were wasting everyone's time in feigning a search for **W.M.D.**, in fact knowing all along that there were no **W.M.D.**'s: Plan A, bye the way was to "plant them" as soon as possible once they were upon Iraqi soil and as a consequence come out looking like Kings of The World in the ticker tape welcome as they metaphorically rode home, job done! We see furthermore that in this meeting of the 31 January neither Bush nor Blair were in possession of any information which might lead to the hard evidence required for a second Security Council Resolution. They were dependent upon **Hans Blix** and he didn't deliver.
(NB. Invoking Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle [HUP] a well known quantum physical postulate, **Hans Blix** remarked to the world's press on the 7 March 2003, coincidentally the same day that the Attorney General of the UK, Lord Goldsmith delivered his legal advice to the PM, that he was, *"amazed how the Administration can have 100% certainty as to these weapons (**W.M.D.**) existence but have zero certainty as to their whereabouts".*

How then to establish Saddam's non-cooperation with the inspectors? The absence of hard evidence by British and US Intelligence and Secret Service Agencies becomes blindingly clear when the discussion turns to the fact that the UN Inspectors might not deliver the long desired smoking-gun. Other options were considered, President Bush told the PM, (PARAPHRASED): The US was thinking of flying U2 reconnaissance aircraft with fighter cover over Iraq, painted in UN colours. If Saddam fired upon them, he would be in breach". There was also the possibility of wheeling in a defector to make a public presentation about Saddam's **W.M.D.** and also the possibility of Saddam being assassinated. What we were given in the end was spin not fact; we were lied to and deceived by those we paid and trusted to govern us with good faith. No, politician in the past 200 years has actually done for the citizenry what they were pledged to do, but that is by the way. These bandits went a tad too far and are now going to be made TO SIT UNDER THE LAZER LIGHT OF TRUTH. The public require closure on this one and they will have it thanks to us.

From memos we have from **Jack Straw's** office we can see that as of January 2003 he is under no delusion about the fact that there is insufficient evidence to go to war against Saddam Hussein. He wrote a private note to the PM expressing hope that **Hans Blix** or **Mohammed ElBaradei** would produce a big smoking gun that would be sufficient for them to report a *"breach sufficient to trigger Operational Paragraphs 11 and 12 of Resolution 1441, a further meeting of the Security Council and a resolution authorising the use of force".*

Such tardiness and deceit led to the subsequent unsurprising events. The 7th July 2005 bombings in London on the eve of both the G8 Summit and George Bush's birthday, and this act was taken as an excuse and opportunity to attack international rules. The Bush Administration had used the staged 9/11 atrocity - (CIA Inspired terrorist plot. On 707 flight simulators top pilots, including ex CIA pilot John Lear, son of Bill Lear of "Lear Jet Inc". fame, have stated that even after six attempts they could not guarantee hitting the Towers first time without a test run i.e. straight into them on a cold run in!!) - to pass the Patriot Act and launch a massive attack on the global "rule of law". Tony, following in his buddies footsteps used the London bombings to attack the European Human Rights Convention. He denied that there could be any connection between the war in Iraq and these bombings (in some measure true, as he had sponsored the latter on the 7 July 2005), instead what he focussed on was constraint and erosion of liberties. The **Civil Contingencies Act 2004** preceded the Belmarsh fiasco where the government were looking for indefinite detention without trial or charge. Following Lord Bingham's judgement the government repealed the law. Blair was furious that his 1984 Orwellian inspired legislation had been thrown out and assured the judiciary of Britain that these former detainees and intended deportees would not be tortured or otherwise harmed in the countries to which they would be subsequently sent. The government announced that it would sign agreements with Algeria, Egypt, Jordan and Libya to ensure Muslim extremists could be returned to their home countries. Chillingly, Blair further added: "*Should legal obstacles arise, we will legislate further, including, if necessary, amending the Human Rights Act in respect of the interpretation of the European Convention on Human Rights."* DailyTelegraph, 6 August, 2005. p.1

The then Home Secretary **Charles Clarke,** said in August 2005 that, *"I don't know what you are talking about by international law"* – the Home Secretary saying that the British government would no longer feel constrained by international obligations in defining its responses to terrorism. *"Home Secretary Charles Clarke confirmed that the government would not be constrained by international conventions or by the way the judiciary interpreted them."* Daily Telegraph 23 August, 2005 p.4.

On the other hand from someone who did have the honour to withdraw from the trough on moral grounds, **Robin Cook**, we have the following: *"No one who shared in the decisions ever took responsibility by resigning and some were even promoted. […] It is difficult to understand what government figures mean when they say that we must listen to the message of the election if yet again there is no practical consequence to the verdict of the voters on Iraq". Guardian 7 May 2005 p.22. Cook is now dead as you will know.*

COLONEL TIM COLLINS LEADER OF 16TH AIR BRIGADE INTO IRAQ

In his book "A Life In Conflict", **Tim Collins** maintains that the military are very pissed off because of the assurances they'd received from people like Geoff Hoon, the then Minister for Defence. The liberation basket of benefits and services that they were told they were going to deliver to the Iraqi people never materialised and , in hind-sight, were never going to materialise because there was no back up or semblance of back up to rebuild the country's infrastructure even in the first weeks when it was going to be needed the most. Therefore we have many senior people in the British military who, shall we say, are looking for a little "pay back". Iraq turned in to an absolute blood bath of internecine fighting with the CIA blowing up the Golden Mosque in Baghdad just to ensure if any of the poor be-leaguered people thought of coming to their senses then there was just enough of a push to keep them thrashing at shadows for the next few decades, while the banks and the politicians, as ever it has been, take the obscene profit. And the proof they never wanted to invade on humanitarian grounds can be seen in the reflected pools of Texas and the pan handle in the USA where even now into the two and a half years post Hurricane Katrina (23 August 2005), taking place in their own back yard, the Bush/Bank regime has not, nor will it ever, paid to have its own cities re-built, and one thing is for sure: if they won't do it for their own sheared to the bone taxpayers, then they ain't ever going to do it for no A-rab!

What is perfectly clear is that there never was a plan to help the Iraqi people after the regime change. Now, nearly 5 years after the war, many Iraqis are with less water, power, hospital treatment, food or security than ever faced them in the darkest days of the Saddam regime. So if a measure of oppression is the subjugation and desperation of a group of people then we must admit that their plight in Iraq is now far worse, not far better, and the difference now is that the **Bush** family and **Cheney** via his directorship at Dowell-Schlumberger and **Rumsfeld, Blair** and **Wolfowitz** cleaned up and continue to clean up the only thing that they ever wanted to clean up and that is THE OIL. It was all done for oil and that's why they went in. Blair benefited and so did J.P.Morgan Cazenove bank, a notoriously black-hatted, Jewish-Rothshild controlled enterprise for money laundering for the CIA and other nefarious organisations and continued drug running, and this bank is the home, at half a million sterling a year, to **Tony Blair.**

DOWN – ING STREET

As for the current encumbent of the chair at the front of the trough, **Gordon Brown** knew and was fully briefed by Blair on everything that was involved in the pre-Iraqi war posturing and he accepted the deal as it was put to him. No reservations, no dissatisfaction no resignation on moral grounds, he got the PM'ship for keeping his mouth closed and going along on the ride: he did as the rest of the cabinet did , accepted full ministerial responsibility and therefore each one is as guilty as any other. They knew the game plan, they knew the date and they knew the consequences and they now know the cost. Accessories before the fact, every last one of them and they are going to jail!

The illegal war and illegal occupation of Iraqi and the theft of their oil and the theft from the British electorate of the most sacred of all property that an individual can possess in a democracy, his vote, makes **Tony Blair** and his government as well as those who now continue to promote the same irrationality, lunacy and criminality for their own ends and are despised by every man, woman and child and beast, in every town, village and hamlet; on any street corner in this once fair isle, the most debauched and criminally insane bunch of tyrants and sponsors of state terrorism as the planet has ever witnessed. They need to be stopped and they need to

be stopped now before the overwhelming earth changes set in which will then preclude anyone from knowing:

The best laid plans of politicians (who could almost be called human) over the past two thousand years have produced our, so called, humane and modern view of the world and everything in it. Look at it and look hard my friend! We have poverty stacked upon poverty and war and want and neglect on every street corner and shanty town on the planet. Democracy works! Sure it doesn't. Capitalism works – yes, that's sure, but only for the capitalist. Look at capitalist Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Philippines, Russia and China, and capitalist Latin America where even now according to the United Nations Children's Aid Foundation 95% of the world's populations still have to get by on subsistence levels of $1 per day. **Tony Blair's** new boss at J.P.Morgan is a fellah named Jamie Dimon and in 2006 he was 19th in the Fortune 500 rankings of the "World's Highest Paid Men". Nice.

RECLAMATION OF THE COUNTRY

Now, it is time for the people to have their say. The people this time are going to hear the truth of exactly what's been going on – the facts one way or the other. They will then become self-empowered nightmares for the controlling elite, the deciders of their destiny and woe betide anyone seen to have stood in the way or deliberately attempted to prolong these deceptions. From this point in time, partly facilitated by this publicly broadcast document, along with accompanying warrants, hopefully signed by you this day, we declare the Kingdom of the United Kingdom as "The Floor of Malkuth"; polarised: squares of black or white and stand upon one or the other you will. No dis-association will be allowed, no claiming to be a bit good or a bit bad, no keeping of one white square at a distance from the other black one and saying, "Look how good am I today, then Look how bad am I tomorrow". Nor the constant lament of the proletariat: "*It's nothing to do with me"* or the equally pathetic, *"But what can I do about it after all there's just one of me!*" The opposition rule via a process of divide and conquer: from here on in if you are not on our side then you *are* on the other. It's so simple, but not perfection, but in this polarity based, dualistic 3rd density consciousness which currently prevails, it will have to suffice. There's no standing still on a tight-rope my friend!

So today in February 2008, on we role with ever increasing certainty towards a police controlled prison-planet state, where the average citizen is picked up on CCTV cameras 350 times per day and non of it legislated for. Where you are monitored at the ATM, the town centre and at the Mall, and as you gas up your car, as you drive to work along the pock marked high-ways told to hurry but forced to go slow for the cameras. It's the game of mixed messaging, it is the equivalent of putting the batteries in the radio the wrong way around and it's all about control; and then we wonder why we're all doing so very badly, yet all the while encouraged to smile that sickly sweet smile that fools no one, but attempts to persuade our neighbour all is sort of well; well what? Play the game or don't fit in. Well, my question to you would be, "Do you really, honestly and truthfully want to fit into this mad-house?"

As we conclude the FBI are speaking to our senior police officers who are considering handing over our private data and personal records to the Stalinist - Gestapo Regime, those Pentagon Polecats, as well as loading onto us Unilateral Extradition Treaties and a never ending interminable drone about terrorists and Bin Laden controlling a vast international network or assassins and terrorists whilst living in a cave in northern Pakistan using nothing but his cell phone. I can't even get a signal in Mow Cop. Who are/were these senior police officers? Well, they're people like Lord Stevens, former Met. Police Chief and Ian Blair, co-conspirator, presently acting as National Security advisor to Gordon Brown in order to show him where all the bodies are buried and what things NOT to step in or on and people like Ian Blair the current Met. Police Chief who I wouldn't trust to help me across the road safely, never mind look after a police badge. If ever there was something in a name then there is in this one! Is any one, other than me, NOT buying this s'crap!!

And:

"**LONDON** (Reuters) **30 January 2008** - More than one million Iraqis have died as a result of the conflict in their country since the U.S.-led invasion in 2003, according to research conducted by one of Britain's leading polling groups. The survey, conducted by Opinion Research Business (ORB) with 2,414 adults in face-to-face interviews, found that 20 percent of

people had had at least one death in their household as a result of the conflict, rather than natural causes. The last complete census in Iraq....."

As of January 2008, the US government has managed to sign over 100 bi-lateral immunity agreements concerning **Article 98(2)** of the Rome Statute of the ICC – Kissinger being the chief instigator. And no we haven't forgotten him; he's next.
What more needs to be said.

We leave you in the love and light of the One Infinite Creator.

Peter A. M. Smith. LL.B, FRC; SPECIAL COUNSEL , Planetary Citzen.
In Association with the Alpha and Omega Order Melchizedek.

May All Things Be Auspicious
May Excellence Increase
And May Christ, Buddha, Sacred Law of One Dharma
Flourish At The Hands of the Ordination.

Cro Maat!

Signed:

"Les lois sont des toiles d'araignees a travers lesquelles passent les grosses mouches et ou restent les petites".

(Laws, like spider's webs, catch the small flies and let the large ones go free).
Honore de Balzac

cc. All docts.

Interpol, BBC, Reuters, Metropolitan Police NSY, Hanley Police, US Dept. Justice, Home Office, Dept of Constitutional Affairs, Elizabeth Battenberg/Saxe-Coberg Gotha at Buckingham Palace , The Bushes at The White House, Amnesty International, United Nations NY, ICJ, ICC at The Hague, FBI, CIA Langley, Virginia; MI5, MI6 London, The Red Cross, Zurich CH., J.P.Morgan Cazenove Moorgate, London.

INTERPOL
General Secretariat
200, quai Charles de Gaulle
69006 Lyon
France

Fax: (33) 4 72 44 71 63