

But The Damage Is Done

The Daily Mirror has **apologised** – sort of – for publishing a pack of lies about British soldiers abusing Iraqi prisoners. Responding to pressure from their shareholders and others, they have sacked their editor Piers Morgan.

However, Morgan himself **refuses to apologise**. Like **Greg Dyke** before him, he has no idea what he has done.

Sat, 05/15/2004 - 15:43 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Bush and Blair never apologised for cheating two countries!

The simple truth remains unnoticed by the authors on this web-site - there is no WMD in Iraq. Publishing fake photos is a child play comparing to what Bush and Blair have done to the image of two countries - they run a fake war - where is their apology after all???

by a reader on Mon, 05/17/2004 - 10:11 | [reply](#)

No, it was a real war

a reader remarks:

The simple truth remains unnoticed by the authors on this web-site ... Bush and Blair ... [ran] a fake war...

In fact we have already covered this in considerable depth [here](#), and particularly [here](#).

by [Editor](#) on Mon, 05/17/2004 - 10:39 | [reply](#)

Either the links are wrong or you avoiding answering

The links refer to conspiracy theories topic. I hope, the editor simply mad a mistake. The question remains: where is Iraqi WMD?

by a reader on Mon, 05/17/2004 - 12:57 | [reply](#)

Re: Either the links are wrong or you avoiding answering

a reader asked:

the links refer to conspiracy theories topic. I hope, the editor simply mad[e] a mistake. The question remains: where is Iraqi WMD?

No, the links are correct and we commend them to you. If you believe that we know where the Iraqi WMD are, then that is one kind of conspiracy theory. If, as seems more likely, it was a rhetorical question and you believe that the WMD never existed and Mr Blair and Mr Bush (or whoever is 'behind' them) have known that all along, then that is another kind of conspiracy theory. This is why we referred you to our series on conspiracy theories.

In particular, if you want to know why the belief in question is a conspiracy theory, consult that series. If you want to know our explanation of why conspiracy theories of this type tend to be false, consult that series. If you want further analysis of the role of conspiracy theories in the world today, and the harm that they do to their holders, we ask you to be patient. The series will continue.

Hope that helps.

by [Editor](#) on Mon, 05/17/2004 - 13:30 | [reply](#)

So, what was the reason to invade Iraq then?

I might have forgotten how frantically inspectors were searching for WMD in Iraq and believe that "illegal weapon possession" was the reason to go. Now, after you have noticed that it would be wrong to assume that Bush/Blair knew that there is no WMD all the way, then the only option remains as a reason - Saddam's refusal to admit inspectors or his wicked intentions to acquire WMD - is it what you trying to say? I thought we would never see the rise of "pre-crime units" in a civilised country, but reality proved me wrong...

If Bush and Blair didn't know that WMD existed for sure and discovered the truth together with the rest of the world - then they led two countries on war without a serious reason (nevertheless, the consequences are goddamn serious). You shouldn't be too keen on conspiracy theories in order to realise that. A number of other countries either do not admit inspectors or admit possessing WMD. A number of other countries exhibit dictatorship state model and incite/sponsor terrorism openly. And these are the cases when we know for SURE.

The damage Daily Mirror made is much much less important now. The damage done by Bush/Blair to Iraq, US, UK and the rest of the world by their unilateral action is incomparable - and there is neither apology nor a resolution from them both. There is a great opportunity for radical muslims in Iraq now to come into power sooner or later (as it already happened - thanks to Americans - in Afganistan not long ago). Of course, it would be rather silly conspiracy theory to assume that Bush/Blair never leave the opportunity to help brothers-muslims in a dodgy way.

by a reader on Mon, 05/17/2004 - 17:08 | [reply](#)

Why?

'I might have forgotten how frantically inspectors were searching for WMD in Iraq and believe that "illegal weapon possession" was the reason to go. Now, after you have noticed that it would be wrong to assume that Bush/Blair knew that there is no WMD all the way, then the only option remains as a reason - Saddam's refusal to admit inspectors or his wicked intentions to acquire WMD - is it what you trying to say? I thought we would never see the rise of "pre-crime units" in a civilised country, but reality proved me wrong...'

Saddam and his goons had already committed mass murder, tortured people by the bushel, started a war and was running a vicious Stalinist police state in his country. He was also running WMD programmes, presumably to start another war. Part of the reason was to prevent whatever evil he had planned and part of it was his past history. Also

<http://www.settingtheworldtorights.com/node/view/326.html>

by **Alan Forrester** on Mon, 05/17/2004 - 18:19 | [reply](#)

Also: Bush and his goons

have already committed mass murder, tortured people by the bushel, started a war and is running a vicious Stalinist police state in his country(well still working on the last one!).

by a reader on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 02:24 | [reply](#)

The killing of innocents

"For nearly 12 years, Staff Sgt. Jimmy Massey was a hard-core, some say gung-ho, Marine. For three years he trained fellow Marines in one of the most grueling indoctrination rituals in military life - Marine boot camp.

The Iraq war changed Massey. The brutality, the sheer carnage of the U.S. invasion, touched his conscience and transformed him forever. He was honorably discharged with full severance last Dec. 31 and is now back in his hometown, Waynsville, N.C.

When I talked with Massey last week, he expressed his remorse at the civilian loss of life in incidents in which he himself was involved.

Q: You spent 12 years in the Marines. When were you sent to Iraq?

A: I went to Kuwait around Jan. 17. I was in Iraq from the get-go. And I was involved in the initial invasion.

Q: What does the public need to know about your experiences as a Marine?

A: The cause of the Iraqi revolt against the American occupation.

What they need to know is we killed a lot of innocent people. I think at first the Iraqis had the understanding that casualties are a part of war. But over the course of time, the occupation hurt the Iraqis. And I didn't see any humanitarian support."

Full article [here](#).

The crimes of Piers Morgan and the BBC pale into insignificance compared to the above.

by a reader on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 05:05 | [reply](#)

Having your cake and eating it

If...you believe that the WMD never existed and Mr Blair and Mr Bush (or whoever is 'behind' them) have known that all along, then that is another kind of conspiracy theory

If you believe that WMD existed, that Bush and Blair knew this, and that the WMD have now vanished then, among other things, you have to account for why they were never used (and are not now being used by insurgents, terrorists, and such-like), why no-one has come forward to say where they are (esp. now that Saddam is gone), why satellite observations etc have not picked up the tell-tale signs of burial, and why the inspection programs carried out by the UN and by the US missed them. Seems like you need one whooper of a conspiracy theory.

On the other hand, if you do not now believe that WMD existed then you should be demanding an apology from Bush and from Blair for all the evidently fallacious claims that were made. Just like you rightfully demand an apology from Morgan and from Dyke. It matters not whether Bush and Blair did or did not know whether the claims they made were false (and it is not a conspiracy theory to believe that WMD never existed and that Bush and Blair *did not know*). It was their business to find out and they screwed up.

Judging from Alan Forrester's comment, you believe that Iraq had WMD programs "presumably to start another war". Now I might ask why he couldn't have been running them for deterrence (or, indeed, need them to start a war when he could just as well have started one with conventional weapons), but have you actually paid close attention to **what David Kay said? He talked about WMD-related program activities. For example, they found:**

1. clandestine network of laboratories and safehouses within the Iraqi Intelligence Service that contained equipment subject to UN monitoring and suitable for continuing CBW research.

2. A prison laboratory complex, possibly used in human testing of BW agents, that Iraqi officials working to prepare for UN inspections were explicitly ordered not to declare to the UN.

3. Reference strains of biological organisms concealed in a

scientist's home, one of which can be used to produce biological weapons.

4. New research on BW-applicable agents, Brucella and Congo Crimean Hemorrhagic Fever (CCHF), and continuing work on ricin and aflatoxin were not declared to the UN.

5. Documents and equipment, hidden in scientists' homes, that would have been useful in resuming uranium enrichment by centrifuge and electromagnetic isotope separation (EMIS).

6. A line of UAVs not fully declared at an undeclared production facility and an admission that they had tested one of their declared UAVs out to a range of 500 km, 350 km beyond the permissible limit.

....

Note the equivocations, the use of phrases such as "that would have been useful", "suitable for continuing", "possibly used". If you read the speech with a critical eye, it is difficult to conclude that Saddam had any weapons programs of any significance. In any case, what David Kay concluded is a long way from the claims about actual WMD that were made prior to the war. You might argue that one of the reasons we went to war was to remove the uncertainty but what if the uncertainty arose because of failures in intelligence gathering and interpretation? Are we running the risk of making similar mistakes in the future by not demanding - as it seems you are not - full accountability (with attendant apologies)?

by a reader on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 05:57 | [reply](#)

Everyone was told that WMD was THE REASON

But not the past history. Full stop.

by a reader on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 07:59 | [reply](#)

What next?

I can't recall Bush or Blair coming on television to tell us that "We must wage war on Saddam's Iraq because it is a Stalinist regime that commits atrocities and violates human rights". What they told us was that Saddam had WMDs, and that was the reason, period. So you are left with two uncomfortable realities:

1. Bush and Blair's intelligence workers had their facts seriously wrong.
2. Bush and Blair knew there were no WMD, and had ulterior motives.

Since you reject (2) on the grounds that it is a conspiracy theory,

you are left with (1). What consequences do you think such a serious and costly error should have for future international action by Britain and by the US?

by a reader on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 11:25 | [reply](#)

And Back In Reality...

Somebody wrote:

'Everyone was told that WMD was THE REASON

'But not the past history. Full stop.'

And Some other person wrote:

'I can't recall Bush or Blair coming on television to tell us that "We must wage war on Saddam's Iraq because it is a Stalinist regime that commits atrocities and violates human rights". What they told us was that Saddam had WMDs, and that was the reason, period.'

George Bush **said**:

'The threat comes from Iraq. It arises directly from the Iraqi regime's own actions -- its history of aggression, and its drive toward an arsenal of terror. Eleven years ago, as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War, the Iraqi regime was required to destroy its weapons of mass destruction, to cease all development of such weapons, and to stop all support for terrorist groups. The Iraqi regime has violated all of those obligations. It possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons. It has given shelter and support to terrorism, and practices terror against its own people. The entire world has witnessed Iraq's eleven-year history of defiance, deception and bad faith.'

So obviously people people were not told that WMD was the reason. Some people like to imagine that Bush and Blair said WMD were the reason but they are wrong.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 13:17 | [reply](#)

Re: And Back in Reality...

Also, here are the conditions that President Bush said, in his [address to the United Nations](#), Iraq would have to meet if it wanted peace:

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately and unconditionally forswear, disclose, and remove or destroy all weapons of mass destruction, long-range missiles, and all related material. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all support for terrorism and act to suppress it, as all states are required to do by U.N. Security Council resolutions. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will cease persecution of its civilian population, including Shi'a, Sunnis, Kurds,

Turkomans, and others, again as required by Security Council resolutions. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will release or account for all Gulf War personnel whose fate is still unknown. It will return the remains of any who are deceased, return stolen property, accept liability for losses resulting from the invasion of Kuwait, and fully cooperate with international efforts to resolve these issues, as required by Security Council resolutions. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all illicit trade outside the oil-for-food program. It will accept U.N. administration of funds from that program, to ensure that the money is used fairly and promptly for the benefit of the Iraqi people.

Human memory does not work in the way that it subjectively seems to. We do not store the equivalent of movie footage of our experiences and later play it back. We actually store only a tiny fraction of that amount of information, and not in the form of images but only *clues* for our later use. When we remember something, it is through a creative process of interpreting those clues in the light of our broader interpretation and explanations. This is why we are capable of understanding events, including their causes and the universal laws and principles that underlie them. But it is also why it is so easy to forget things that we did experience but which contradicted our interpretation of what must be happening, as here:

I can't recall Bush or Blair coming on television to tell us that "We must wage war on Saddam's Iraq because it is a Stalinist regime that commits atrocities and violates human rights".

and also to remember states of affairs that never happened, because we assume that they must have, as here:

What they told us was that Saddam had WMDs, and that was the reason, period.

The internet has exactly the opposite virtue: it remembers facts superbly well but cannot tell you how to interpret them.

by a reader on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 15:41 | [reply](#)

Re: And Back in Reality...

George Bush did indeed say:

It [Iraq] possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons.

In the same speech he also says:

If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today -- and we do -- does it make any sense for the

world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger

and develops even more dangerous weapons?

We've also discovered through intelligence that Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical or biological weapons across broad areas. We're concerned that Iraq is exploring ways of using these UAVS for missions targeting the United States.

The evidence indicates that Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program.

Satellite photographs reveal that Iraq is rebuilding facilities at sites that have been part of its nuclear program in the past. Iraq has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes and other equipment needed for gas centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.

If the Iraqi regime is able to produce, buy, or steal an amount of highly enriched uranium a little larger than a single softball, it could have a nuclear weapon in less than a year.

Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof -- the smoking gun -- that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud.

Nothing in these statements has proved true - and every one of these statements was questionable at the time the speech was given. Alan, are you not the least bit curious why? Or angry. Do you not think George Bush is as accountable for these mistakes as Piers Morgans or Greg Dyke were for theirs?

by a reader on Tue, 05/18/2004 - 22:02 | [reply](#)

They led two nations on war not having enough information

All the evidences Bush/Blair have given were either very modest or incomplete or wrong. They always left a room for speculations that they personally know something quite convincing but cannot disclose because it would harm their intelligence sources. So, they made faces trying to passuade and then started the war.

At the end of the day it turned out that they didn't know anything special at all. They deliberately started the war knowing that there is still not enough evidence - is it a "conspiracy theory" way of thinking?

All the other reasons are not strong enough for public and for me personally. All the other evils can constitute many other countries behaviour. So, Bush/Blair knew that without WMD there wouldn't be enough reasons to go. And again they deliberately stressed WMD issue in order to achive the goal. They knew that there is not

enough reasons but they did it anyway - is it still a conspiracy

theory?

Amongst other countries that 1) supported terrorism (Syria, Iran, Saudi Arabia do much more on this account) 2) have or develop WMD (Northern Korea does more on this account) 3) have evil regimes (all the above plus many more countries). All this had been known to public before Iraq war. But Bush has insisted on Iraq. So, once again, Bush deliberately led countries to strike on Iraq instead. Why such persistence?

In my PERSONAL VIEW - the reason is fairly simple - PERSONAL VENDETTA of BUSH FAMILY (and a good opportunity to do it in the light of 9/11). Now you can call me any names: conspiracy theorist or whatever. Just tell me if making logical analysis should always be called "conspiracy theory" or only sometimes?

by a reader on Wed, 05/19/2004 - 09:45 | [reply](#)

Personal vendetta of the Bush family

a reader wrote:

In my PERSONAL VIEW - the reason is fairly simple - PERSONAL VENDETTA of BUSH FAMILY (and a good opportunity to do it in the light of 9/11).

If so, then one of the following statements must be true:

1. Mr Blair is a member of the Bush family
2. Mr Blair is a dupe, in the sense defined [here](#)

Which is it?

by [David Deutsch](#) on Wed, 05/19/2004 - 15:23 | [reply](#)

The misleading statements of GW

The series on conspiracy theories is entertaining and mostly spot-on. But on the issue of whether GW lied or not, has the World seen [this](#) and [this](#)?

At the very least, there seems to be a lot of evidence that the Bush administration made many misleading statements on Iraq. And some that were just outright wrong.

by a reader on Thu, 05/20/2004 - 00:13 | [reply](#)

Re: The misleading statements of GW

a reader wrote

At the very least, there seems to be a lot of evidence that the Bush administration made many misleading statements on Iraq. And some that were just outright wrong.

Why describe events in terms that equivocate over precisely the

issue that is in dispute? In this case, the word 'mislead' has two different meanings: one is to make a statement intended to cause the listener to believe something that one does not believe oneself, and the other is to make a statement which one believes to be true but is in fact false.

The document cited by a reader is rather long so I admit I did not study it carefully. However, dipping into it at random, I found very little even purporting to show that Administration officials misled anyone in the first (guilty) sense. If I am right that it is mostly about the second (innocent) sense, and presumably relies on the equivocation to make readers conclude that the Administration misled the public in the guilty sense, then ironically, the document itself is misleading in the guilty sense.

So ask yourself this: if Saddam's WMD stockpiles are found tomorrow, how much of the 'evidence' in the document will still seem to show Administration statements to have been 'misleading'? Whatever in the document does not pass that test is not evidence.

by [David Deutsch](#) on Thu, 05/20/2004 - 01:21 | [reply](#)

The definition of "misleading"

Why describe events in terms that equivocate over precisely the issue that is in dispute? In this case, the word 'mislead' has two different meanings: one is to make a statement intended to cause the listener to believe something that one does not believe oneself, and the other is to make a statement which one believes to be true but is in fact false.

Fair point. The [second link](#) I provided above is a searchable database of statements that is complementary to the document I cited. The methodology section on this second link provides an in-depth explanation of what is meant by misleading:

"... For purposes of the database, a statement is considered "misleading" if it conflicted with what intelligence officials knew at the time or involved the selective use of intelligence or the failure to include essential qualifiers or caveats.

The database does not include statements that appear mistaken only in hindsight. If a statement was an accurate reflection of U.S. intelligence at the time it was made, the statement is excluded from the database even if it now appears erroneous.

To determine whether a statement was misleading, the Special Investigations Division examined the statement in light of intelligence known to the Administration at the time of the statement. The primary sources for determining the intelligence available to the Administration were (1) the portions of the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate ..."

So the authors are clearly saying that the statements were selective

and contained information known by the Administration to be wrong. Does this make GW guilty in the first sense of misleading above? No, of course, we can't conclude that. But it does makes the *Bush administration* guilty in that sense (assuming, of course, that the statements are as the authors claim).

by a reader on Thu, 05/20/2004 - 03:06 | [reply](#)

In Which Sense Did Piers Morgan Mislead?

Did he publish pictures intended to cause the reader to believe something that he did not believe himself, or did he publish pictures which he believed to be true but were in fact false? If he misled in the latter sense, then - taking your view above - isn't he thereby innocent? Just curious.

by a reader on Thu, 05/20/2004 - 05:07 | [reply](#)

Re: In Which Sense Did Piers Morgan Mislead?

a reader asked:

If he misled in the latter sense, then - taking your view above - isn't he thereby innocent?

Yes. If he thought that the pictures were genuine, and if he was telling the truth when he said that he had "**extensively checked**" their veracity and the identities of the providers, then, obviously, he would have misled his readers only in the innocent sense of the word.

by [David Deutsch](#) on Thu, 05/20/2004 - 13:08 | [reply](#)

Partisan?

Given that you admit that it is possible that Piers Morgan thought the pictures were genuine, perhaps it is not surprising that he refuses to apologise and that "he has no idea what he has done". It seems that the World is willing to extend the benefit of the doubt to George Bush, but not to Piers Morgan. Did the Bush administration "extensively check" the evidence they had before making the statements they did?

by a reader on Fri, 05/21/2004 - 01:19 | [reply](#)