

THE EVIDENCE MOUNTS!

ANOTHER BUSH DEFECTOR!

By: **Ted Lang**

The lies, fraud and misrepresentations on the part of the Bush administration in usurping presidential authority, supported by Congress' "war powers" carte blanche authority allowing President George W. Bush to declare war on any nation of his choosing for any reason, is beginning to come home to roost!

On the heels of the revelations made public by Bush's former Secretary of the Treasury, Paul O'Neill, confirming the activities of the Project for the New American Century, or PNAC, this secret cabal of Bush advisors that no one in America voted for has been exposed as a reality. And of course, the Bush apologists on talk radio and at *FOXNews* have hastened to damage control mode, as has the Bush administration, and have denigrated O'Neill and his statements as merely those of a former disgruntled employee who had been fired. The Bushies and the *Foxes* offer that O'Neill just wanted to get even, and that he was incompetent, and that the unjustified invasion of Iraq was just an extension of the original intention of the Clinton administration. Therefore, case closed!

But now, along comes former U.N. Inspector David Kay, who resigned after "nine fruitless months [after having been] in charge of the Iraq Survey Group," as offered in an article entitled "New WMD blow for Blair," which originated in the United Kingdom's *Guardian Unlimited* written by Duncan Campbell and Patrick Wintour, and carried on the website of *Information Clearing House*.

The January 24th article continues, "David Kay, a hardline CIA official close to the Republicans also criticized President George Bush **for failing to give him adequate support.**" [Emphasis added] This coincides with the funding and requested documents stonewalling President George Bush exercised in withholding support to his and Congress's joint Kean 9-11 Commission investigating the circumstances surrounding the events of the infamous terrorist attack on America. It will be recalled, when a draft report was to be made available to the people and its representatives in Congress, Bush ordered 28 pages of that report redacted and kept secret.

In another article carried by *Information Clearing House*, which originated in the UK's *The*

Independent, also dated January 24th, Andrew Buncombe writes, "David Kay, who stood down yesterday as head of the Bush administration's hunt for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, said that **he did not believe that any stockpiles of such weapons ever existed.** [Emphasis added]

Buncombe, in his article entitled "Saddam's WMD Never Existed, Says Chief American Arms Inspector," states that Kay said, "What everyone was talking about is stockpiles produced after the end of the [1991] Gulf War and I don't think there was a large-scale production programme in the Nineties." Buncombe continues, "The Bush administration appears determined to continue its public stance that such weapons could be discovered." But if that's the Bush administration's take these days, what about the imminent threat that Iraqi WMD posed as offered by Bush in his 2003 State of the Union address to the nation?

In an *Associated Press* article carried on Alex Jones' *Prison Planet.com* entitled "Powell says Iraq might not have had banned weapons before the war," *AP* offers, "Kay left his post Friday. Asked about Kay's remarks in an interview with the Reuters news agency, [Secretary of State Colin] Powell said: 'The open question is, how many stocks they had, if any, and if they had any, where did they go, and if they didn't have any, then why wasn't that known beforehand?'"

The article continues, "The failure to find banned nuclear, chemical or biological weapons in Iraq, or evidence of robust programs to make them, has kept alive criticism of Bush and could prove to be a significant election-year issue. Asked whether Kay's assessment was correct or whether Powell was correct in suggesting during a U.N. appearance last February that Iraq had large unaccounted-for stocks of toxins and poison gas, Powell replied: 'I think the answer to the question is, **I don't know yet.**'" [Emphasis added]

It is curious that such information vital to the American people is available, at least as at the time of this effort, only from Reuters, and United Kingdom news sources *The Independent* and the *Guardian Unlimited*. Why isn't this blockbuster on the front pages of the Sunday newspapers here in America? Is Jayson Blair still in charge over at the *New York Times*?

On their website for Friday, January 23rd, *The People's Voice* carried a January 21 article entitled, "The Color of Bush's Sky," originally posted on *truthout.org* authored by William Rivers Pitt. Pitt was commenting on President George W. Bush's 2004 State of the Union address. Of particular interest, was Pitt's summarization of Bush's account of the administration's efforts regarding WMD. Pitt begins, "The Iraq lie came when Bush claimed that David Kay's weapons inspection teams had found materials and equipment to construct weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. In point of fact, Kay and his people found no such thing, just as the denigrated UNMOVIC inspectors likewise found no such thing."

Pitt itemizes the laundry list of WMD previously offered up by the Bush administration: "The promised 26,000 liters of anthrax, 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin, 1,000,000 pounds of sarin and mustard and VX nerve agent, the 30,000 munitions to deliver this stuff, the mobile biological

weapons labs, and the uranium from Niger that so disgraced the last State of the Union speech Bush gave, somehow failed to turn up."

Now compare these "facts" to the responses given by Secretary of State Colin Powell. Returning to the *Associated Press* article documenting Powell's difficulties in coming up with standard, pat answers, the article states, "While making clear he believes the war was justified nonetheless, Powell said that if caches of chemical and biological arms are not found, the reason for the error must be determined."

After providing a laundry list of specific WMDs, we are now searching for one single, solitary "error?" And "if" an "error," Powell asks, "...then why wasn't that known beforehand?"

Reflect now upon the fact that President George W. Bush gave his State of the Union address to Congress and the nation, as required by the Constitution, last Tuesday, January 20, 2004. The following statement has been taken directly from the text of Bush's speech:

"But let us be candid about the consequences of leaving Saddam Hussein in power. We're seeking all the facts. Already, the Kay Report identified dozens of weapons of mass destruction-related program activities and significant amounts of equipment that Iraq concealed from the United Nations. Had we failed to act, the dictator's weapons of mass destruction programs would continue to this day. Had we failed to act, Security Council resolutions on Iraq would have been revealed as empty threats, weakening the United Nations and encouraging defiance by dictators around the world."

On the following Friday, January 23rd, only three days after Bush's State of the Union, President George Bush's top Iraqi weapons of mass destruction inspector resigned. He was not fired, as was the case with O'Neill. He cannot, therefore, be dismissed as a disgruntled employee looking to even an imaginary score. Referring to Buncombe's *The Independent* article again, he writes: "Despite [Kay] having the resources of more than 1,000 personnel dedicated to the hunt for such weapons, an interim report issued by Mr. Kay in **October** conceded that no weapons had been found, even though there was evidence Iraq had retained the 'template' of a weapons programme." [Emphasis added]

We must now analyze what constitutes the term "template." It is probably a collection of technical narratives and reports, preliminary engineering drawings and renderings, and perhaps actual blueprints for weapons and weapons systems designs. But they hardly constitute the imminent threat that Bush alleged in his first State of the Union to convince US to launch an unprovoked attack upon another sovereign nation. And Bush's declaration that the "Kay Report identified dozens of weapons of mass destruction-related program activities and significant amounts of equipment" was designed to slip into this "template" definition Powell was talking about.

Templates do not represent an imminent threat to America. Nor is this other than an intended

confusion of words designed to allow Bush wiggle room. Presenting "facts" in the 2003 SOTU, and then confirming the successful execution of activities to protect America based upon these "facts," won't hold up in Bush's 2004 SOTU either. The Kay Report did not find weapons of mass destruction as the Bush administration had itemized as per the list provided by Pitt. The Kay Report discussed its non-findings back in October, nearly three months ago. Clearly, this cannot be written off as a mere intelligence gaffe similar to the Niger "yellowcake."

Considering the Constitutional requirement on the part of the President to deliver a State of the Union address and report to the representatives of the people of the United States, I think it safe to assume that that address and report be truthful. It should be truthful, especially in light of the fact that many human lives have been lost due to the prevarications on the part of President George W. Bush and members of his administration. We have had members of our military killed, soldiers comprising our so-called Department of Defense, now converted by Bush and his administration to a Department of War.

Bush has converted the State of the Union address to just another pack of campaign lies in the vile, worse-than-worthless pursuit of party politics. The best interests of the people of the United States are never a matter of concern, it would seem. Is there an opposition party? Is there a free and independent press? When will we be hearing from either?

Related article: [THE LIE'S THE LIMIT?](#)

"[Published originally at EtherZone.com](#) : republication allowed with this notice and hyperlink intact."

[Mail this article to a friend\(s\) in two clicks!](#)

Ted Lang is a columnist for the [The Patriotist](#) and the [Sierra Times](#) He is a regular columnist for Ether Zone.

Ted Lang can be reached at: tlang1@optonline.net

Published in the January 28, 2004 issue of Ether Zone.

Copyright © 1997 - 2004 [Ether Zone](#).

[We invite your comments on this article in our forum!](#)