



Chilcot and the Lie that Won't Die!

In January 1991 a US led coalition began carpet bombing Iraq. The latter's invasion of neighbouring Kuwait was, they said, the perfect cause, since all nations agree the aggressor must be repelled.

Dropping more tonnage in less than a month than was dropped by all powers combined in World War II, they massacred a large part of Iraq's conscript army and destroyed much of the infrastructure of the country. Coalition casualties were fewer than would have been expected in comparable military exercises outside of war.

Iraq's surrender did not end the 'war'. This 'aggressive' regional 'superpower' had to be contained.

Having used them against the Iraqis the 'allies' decided that weapons of mass destruction would be the new 'cause'. After all, this too is a 'principle' on which we all 'agree'.

While the coalition powers increased their arms sales to Iraq's neighbours, in violation of their own UN resolutions, Iraq's defences were dismantled and sanctions were imposed which were so wide ranging Iraq could no longer adequately feed or care for its people.

During this twelve year period the combined effects of continual illegal bombing raids using intelligence supplied by 'weapons inspectors' and the 'United Nations' sanctions killed more than a million people with others dying slowly from the effects of the depleted uranium released into the atmosphere by allied bombs, tanks and shells.

The media in the allied countries reported a story of Iraqi 'intransigence'. In the war on 'Saddam', Iraq was rarely if ever referred to by its name or treated as a nation.

In 2003 the invasion finally came. The warnings of some establishment figures that 'regime change' would unleash sectarian violence across the region came true and the WMDs were not found. The terrible lie - that the 'war' was about weapons of mass destruction - would be sustained now by the only narrative left ... the narrative of the 'mistake'.

With the publication on the 6th July of the Chilcot Report, the lie began the final stage of its journey to becoming official 'truth'.

The war makers knew what objectives were being served by the terrorism inflicted on another poor country. Supported by historical precedent, the 'evidence' is substantial and easy to interpret; the opening of new 'markets', the reinforcing of outside political control.

Since they were not the reason for the war, it didn't matter what anyone believed or was told about WMD. And as the war makers had sought the disintegration of Iraq, why would it matter to them what happened after.

We can assume that people who know they've made a 'mistake' try not to repeat it. After Libya and in light of the ongoing pursuit of regime change in Syria, we can assume that, like the WMD, the narrative of the 'mistake' doesn't actually need to be 'believed'.

Kim Bryan, 8th July 2016