

**Subject:** [Fwd: Re: Your e-mail re District Iraq resolution.]

**Date:** Tue, 25 Feb 2003 22:55:46 -0800

**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

**To:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:** Re: Your e-mail re District Iraq resolution.

**Date:** Tue, 25 Feb 2003 22:53:49 -0800

**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

**To:** Ernie Crist <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**CC:** Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>, rianvan@aol.com, Mayor and Council - DNV <council@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Directors Team <managecomm@dnv.org>, lsissons@cnv.org, adangelo@nsnews.com

**References:** <52819DEA9F2ED74FBF51B612D0E5A01C2AFD2D@mail2k.cdnv.dnv.ca>

Ernie - of course you are right about the requirement for a unanimous vote of the UN Security Council to approve war. That process is on-going right now and there is speculation that one or more of the permanent members might abstain in a vote.

In any case, I didn't think I was moralizing by pointing out that Iraq is in direct violation of UN Resolution 1441 which authorizes military force to ensure compliance. I drew attention to Iraq's known quantities of chemical and biological weapons because some people are now saying that since they can't be found by a few inspectors then such weapons don't exist.

The credibility of the UN is in question. Will the UN enforce international law or are its resolutions meaningless? If the Security Council chooses not to enforce the law then the institution is indeed irrelevant -- in which case, a coalition of nations led by the US and Britain will likely take unilateral action to disarm Iraq. Where will Canada stand? With Chretien, we may never know for certain.

Yes, there are grave consequences and risks in taking military action; however, there are equally grave consequences and risks for NOT acting to enforce international law. Many in the Islamic world already consider the West in general and the US and Britain in particular to be the enemy (9/11 demonstrated this quite clearly). The reasons for this are varied and complicated. But now I'm getting off topic so I'll end it here.

As always, Ernie, I value your perspective on all issues, this one included. Keep up the fight!

Sincerely,  
-Brian

Ernie Crist wrote:

Hello Brian:

There is only one issue and that is the legal issue. I don't give a tinker's damn about Saddam Hussein. And now that I have done my duty I want to return to my own little village quarrels. I have deliberately stayed away from the morality of this issue precisely for the reasons that are now being raised by various people including yourself. In summary, however, no country may wage war on another country unless such a war is sanctioned by the UN. What is more a decision for war has to go through the Security Council.

At that level the vote has to be unanimous unless any member abstains in which case the vote of that particular member does not count. If a resolution is vetoed by any member of the Security Council of which France, the US, Britain, China and Russia are permanent members then any further (unilateral) action is illegal. This is why the US is twisting everybody's arm. That is how the UN constitution was drafted and it was drafted specifically with that in mind. It is a safety valve against "hotheads" etc. The whole idea was to emphasize collectivism.

None of the arguments presented in terms of Saddam being a tyrant etc., has anything to do with the question we are dealing with and with the motion I made. If the UN thinks that a war is justified then they may, by unanimous vote of the Security Council (other than abstentions), so decide. If such a situation cannot be achieved by the US despite its arm twisting then it simply means that there are doubts (right or wrong and for whatever reason) on the part of the Security Council as a collective body. It is like a jury in a court of law. A decision has to be unanimous. If, on the other hand, Canada supports any unilateral action then we are guilty of being participants in an illegal war. In that case we may not only be held accountable as a country but also as individuals.

To be more to the point. If we participate in an illegal war against Iraq, then any other country may consider us to be outside the law and treat us as an enemy. This includes the Islamic world, not to speak of other countries including those armed with weapons of mass destruction. I am sure you know what that means. It is a road fraught with potentially grave consequences. Some people find this difficult to understand but this is what I have been trying to convey all along. When I said "what goes around comes around" I was not joking.

Ernie

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Brian Platts [<mailto:bpplatts@shaw.ca>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 25, 2003 1:43 PM

**To:** Ernie Crist

**Cc:** Elizabeth James; [RIanvan@aol.com](mailto:RIanvan@aol.com); Mayor and Council - DNV; FONVCA (E-mail); Directors Team; [LSissons@cnv.org](mailto:LSissons@cnv.org); [adangelo@nsnews.com](mailto:adangelo@nsnews.com)

**Subject:** Re: Your e-mail re District Iraq resolution.

Dear Ernie - the issue of legality is not as clear as you make it out to be. My reading of the crisis indicates that Iraq is in "Material violation of UN Resolution 1441" which authorizes military action to force Saddam Hussuin to disarm if he does not do so voluntarily. In other words, it can well be argued that the UN has already authorized the use of force.

Until as late as '95 (when UN inspectors were kicked out of the country) it was confirmed that Iraq still maintained large stockpiles of of chemical and biological weapons including anthrax as well as sarin and VX nerve agents. By UN Resolution, Iraq was to provide evidence that these weapons of mass destruction had been accounted for and destroyed.

The UN weapons inspectors are NOT supposed to be investigative agents tasked with finding banned materials; their job is to verify Iraqi compliance and not play hide-and-seek. Saddam has consistently failed to comply with international law, and is emboldened with the knowledge that the UN is so constipated with competing interests that it will ultimately back down on enforcement of its own resolutions. In this regard, the microscope should clearly be focused on the credibility UN itself.

As for whether or not District Council should debate this issue, my only concern is that it is a debate without all the necessary information at hand. After all, Council does not even consider a Development Variance Permit without a staff report. I trust that you are well-informed about this issue, but are other members of Council?

Sincerely,  
-Brian

Ernie Crist wrote:

Dear Ms James:

1. Since when do we invade or bomb the hell out of a country because its people (in our opinion) are led by a jackass? He is their jackass not ours. Surely you are not proposing that we should invade or bomb the US because they have violated the UN Charter time and time again or are you? I am afraid you can't argue with me on this one. Once again, law is the issue. If what you are saying is true than it is up to the people of Iraq to get rid of their Man just as it is up to us to get rid of our donkeys.

2.

[Ernie Crist]

3. -----Original Message-----

**From:** Elizabeth James [<mailto:cagebc@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2003 3:46 PM

**To:** Ernie Crist; [RIanvan@aol.com](mailto:RIanvan@aol.com)

**Cc:** Mayor and Council - DNV; FONVCA (E-mail); Directors Team; [LSissons@cnv.org](mailto:LSissons@cnv.org); [adangelo@nsnews.com](mailto:adangelo@nsnews.com)

**Subject:** RE: Your e-mail re District Iraq resolution.

Clr. Crist:

Is what Saddam has been doing for ten years legal? And, while two wrongs do not make a right, he has been contributing mightly to the deaths and misery in his won country. Even many of his own people want the West to get rid of him.

It might not be legal for me to kill my neighbour but, if my neighbour is starving and killing his children, which is the lesser of two evils?

But that's beside my points which are (a) Chretien doesn't know himself where he stands; (b) Chretien's motives are certainly not pure; and (c) NV District has enough of its own stuff to clean up without starting in on this issue.

Further, since it is Council's job to reflect the wishes of District citizens, perhaps it would be courteous to discover first what position they would like Council to take.

I repeat, I do not want a war; I would prefer the UN inspectors to broker a deal but, in the final analysis it's likely not going to be possible to successfully negotiate a deal with a deceitful man who has murdered many of his own people and many of his neighbours.

Sincerely,

Liz

[<ernie\\_crist@dnv.org>](mailto:ernie_crist@dnv.org) wrote:

Dear Ms James:

If you think that these issues are of secondary importance you may wish to ask the citizens of those countries that are and will suffer the consequences including Canadians.

Beware - an illegal war against Iraq will be construed as a war against Islam - beware again. "What goes around comes around". But notwithstanding my opinion - THE ISSUE IS THE LEGALITY OF THE MATTER - IT SEEMS THAT THIS IS THE ONE ASPECT YOU SEEM TO OVERLOOK.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Elizabeth James [<mailto:cagebc@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2003 3:09 PM

**To:** Ernie Crist; [RIanvan@aol.com](mailto:RIanvan@aol.com)

**Cc:** Mayor and Council - DNV; FONVCA (E-mail); Directors Team; [LSissons@cnv.org](mailto:LSissons@cnv.org); [adangelo@nsnews.com](mailto:adangelo@nsnews.com)

**Subject:** Re: Your e-mail re District Iraq resolution.

24 February, 2003

Dear Clr. Crist:

I must admit to having some sympathy with your position. Like any normal person I, too, abhor the thought of war and am cynical as to the motives of politicians who drive us toward it. Further, there is little doubt you are accurate in your facts.

All of that said, time allows Council only a finite amount of time in which to do its work. Accordingly, I think it more appropriate for the District to tend first to its own chickens and, when it has proven capable of doing that job efficiently, to then lift its eyes to wider horizons! This is especially so when one realizes that the Prime Minister doesn't even know himself where his government stands from day to day. He says one thing, Mr. Manley another and our emissary to Washington, DC yet another.

Last but not least, one should be extremely suspicious of the stance of those such as Jacques Chirac of France, whose countries continue to benefit mightily from the so-called food for oil program and from sales of nuclear material to Iraq, and who sanctimoniously talk about, "my dear friend Saddam Hussein" and the modern equivalent of *Peace in our Time*. Surely we have learned by now where such a stand will get us!

So, once again, while not being enamoured of Mr. Bush - or of his father - I prefer to throw in my lot with him than with Mr. Hussein.

Sincerely,

Liz James

**Ernie Crist** [<ernie\\_crist@dnv.org>](mailto:ernie_crist@dnv.org) wrote:

Dear Ms Sargent:

You have stated that this issue is outside the jurisdiction of local government. You are in error.....

---

[With Yahoo! Mail you can get a bigger mailbox -- choose a size that fits your needs](#)

---

[With Yahoo! Mail you can get a bigger mailbox -- choose a size that fits your needs](#)