



La guerre en Afghanistan, histoire d'un état qui a échoué

Mémoire présenté à

**Audiences populaires sur la guerre en Afghanistan et la
militarisation de la politique étrangère du Canada**

**Pour
Le retrait des troupes canadiennes de l'Afghanistan !**

Organisé par:

Collectif Échec à la guerre



Table des matières

Introduction	3
Comment Le Canada Devient-il Impliqué ?	4
La réalité de l'Afghanistan	5
Que se passe-t-il à Ottawa?	6
Rapport Manley.....	8
Où es-ce qu'on s'en va ?	9
Es-ce que c'est une histoire de deux états qui ont échoués?	10
Annexe 1: Le grand jeu des Amériques	11
Annexe 2: Le Génocide du l'OTAN en Afghanistan	14
Annexe 3: Oxfam averti d'un désastre humanitaire en Afghanistan.....	16
Annexe 4: Ottawa cache la vérité aux Canadiens en rependant de fausses information à propos de l'Afghanistan	17



Introduction

L'énorme rassemblement qui a eu lieu à Montréal le 13 février, 2001 refusant la guerre sur l'Irak était le point alarmant pour le gouvernement canadien actuellement, et tout autre gouvernement suivant.

Ce jour là quand plus de deux cents cinquante mille personnes sont sortis dans les rues de Montréal à -25° (-40 avec le facteur éolien), le gouvernement canadien avait été forcé de refuser la participation à la destruction et à l'invasion de l'Irak, le massacre de presque un million de personnes et le déclenchement de la pire violence sectaire.

Tandis que la guerre en Irak était une violation très claire du droit international et d'une vraie agression contre des personnes innocentes, la guerre en Afghanistan clairement ne l'était pas, au moins pour le public.

Dans le cas de l'Afghanistan, le 11 Septembre a été très bien utilisé forçant le monde à accepter l'agression de la première puissance mondiale contre une des plus pauvres nations sans arme du monde.

Dans les deux cas c'était dans l'intérêt d'un groupe qui contrôle la première puissance mondiale qui l'a employé pour réaliser leur « agenda » et livrer un message clair au monde, c'est la nouvelle ère!

L'invasion de l'Irak et de l'Afghanistan violait tous les deux les droits internationales, en fait ni l'un ni l'autre n'ont reçu l'approbation du Conseil de sécurité.

L'invasion Étasunienne de l'Afghanistan n'avait jamais été approuvée par le Conseil de sécurité. La résolution du Conseil de sécurité à ce moment-là était d'amener les malfaiteurs à la justice et non pas à la guerre.

Mais après avoir envahi l'Afghanistan et le renversement du gouvernement, Washington a gagné l'autorisation de l'ONU pour le nouveau gouvernement qu'elle a installé, et l'OTAN continue son intervention.

Si la guerre en Irak est légale, la guerre est-elle ainsi sur l'Afghanistan ? Mais comment le Canada devient-elle impliquée ?



Comment Le Canada Devient-il Impliqué ?

Tandis que le gouvernement canadien écoutait les gens concernant la guerre en Irak, celle de l'Afghanistan avec la bénédiction de l'ONU a donné au gouvernement canadien la raison d'accepter la présence de nos jeunes canadiens sur le terrain en Afghanistan et la nomination d'un gouvernement Pro-occidental.

Les Canadiens et les Québécois ont été trompés dans l'affaire de l'Afghanistan, ils ont pensé que la mission est là comme une vraie mission de paix et toutes les personnes afghanis sont heureuses, mais cela est pour alléger l'échec sur des missions tel que la Bosnie et le Rwanda, qui a été ombragée par la nature incompétente et raciste des forces militaire.

En même temps les États-Unis n'ont pas oublié la réponse négative du Canada concernant sa guerre en Irak, alors l'Afghanistan était le prix à payer.

Le 2 février, 2002 c'était la première contribution Canadienne à l'invasion Étasunienne de l'Afghanistan en envoyant 800 de nos enfants à Kandahar. C'était quatre mois avant la nomination du président afghan, Hamid Karzai en juin 2002.

En juillet 2003, le Canada a évacué ses troupes de Kandahar et a envoyé 1800 additionnel à Kaboul, d'où elles se sont déplacées de nouveau à Kandahar le 5 août 2005 pour une mission de construction. C'était la période où on a prit la pleine responsabilité de la région quelque mois plus tard.

Et tandis que la guerre en Afghanistan est perdue depuis octobre 2001, le gouvernement conservateur cherche à obtenir un nouveau mandat pour prolonger les interventions militaires canadiennes jusqu'à février 2011, sans prendre en considération la réalité de l'Afghanistan.



La réalité de l'Afghanistan

L'invasion et l'intervention en Afghanistan ont été établies sur des mensonges et des histoires forgées, incluant mais pas limitant : La démocratisation, liberté de choix, la libération des femmes, ces points qui n'ont pas été réalisées et ne pourraient être réalisé par la force.

Les droits humains des peuples ne peuvent être réalisés que par des mouvements populaires. Ce qu'on voit en Afghanistan comme résultat de l'invasion continue n'est rien qu'humiliation.

Parmi plusieurs rapports de sources indépendantes telles qu'amnistie international, médecins sans frontière et plusieurs autres médias indépendants, ont déclarés que l'Afghanistan est arrivé à des points critiques très sérieux, alors que le gouvernement désigné ne commande que Kaboul le capital, les autres régions sont contrôlées par des milices différentes.

Le résultat de cette invasion sur ce pays et sur ce peuple déchirés est comme suit :

1. Un nombre élevé de victime civile entre femmes et enfants où il n'existe pas de registre pour les victimes Afghans de cette guerre insouciante de l'OTAN.
2. Manque de médicaments et d'approvisionnements alimentaires de base particulièrement pour des enfants.
3. Augmentation sans précédent de la prostitution.
4. Culture d'opium, où l'Afghanistan est devenu le fournisseur numéro un dans ce marché.
5. Le taux le plus élevé de torture autorisé par notre silence qui fait des histoires similaires de la prison d'Abu Ghraib et de Guantanamo.

Le problème est dans le refus du gouvernement canadien de laisser à la société canadienne la chance de participer à une vraie aide aux afghans. Au contraire, le gouvernement Canadien insiste sur le fait que toute aide doit passer par l'armée.

Tout ceci ne pourrait être compromis pour quelques écoles inutiles présentés comme un grand accomplissement des canadiens, les enfants ont besoin de la paix pour pouvoir aller aux écoles bien meublées. Ils ont besoin d'une vie paisible, quelque chose que nous ne pouvons les offrir avec notre compréhension actuelle de leurs besoins.

La réalité en Afghanistan reflète la situation à Ottawa.



Que se passe-t-il à Ottawa?

Malgré énorme opposition à la mission, où presque 70% des Québécois ont refusé cette mission, 62% réclamant le retrait des troupes avant 2009 et 41% réclamant le retrait immédiat, dans le dépit tout ceci, le gouvernement canadien va dans une autre direction en appelant l'agrandissement et l'augmenter de la mission.

Ottawa est devenu le centre de ce dilemme en Afghanistan, où notre gouvernement n'est pas capable d'agir dans le meilleur intérêt des Canadien et des Afghans, La mission afghane a été contrôlée par la crainte et par la puissance dans les parties politiques.

Le gouvernement conservateur est très clair dans son "agenda"; un "agenda" qui pourrai être résumé en regardant l'ajout et le recrutement intensif de nos enfant sans l'armée.

En même temps, le parti libéral qui est déjà divisé sur la question a aidé le prolongement de la mission jusqu'en Février 2009. La division a aussi aidé à passer la soi disant nouvelle loi anti-terroriste (certificat de sécurité C-3).

En agissant soi disant comme un parti responsable le Bloc Québécois ne doit pas survivre l'illusion de la face de la mission humanitaire de l'armée en Afghanistan en appelant de changer la mission. Cette mission qui a était partagée par le parti Libéral

Le seul parti qui représente l'opinion de la population est le NPD, Sachant que sa voix n'a jamais était entendu et c'est eux qui ont demandé un retrait immédiat, mais n'a pas convaincu les voix hésitantes du BQ et des Libéraux.

Les attentes de cette guerre sont très hautes, ou on peut entendre :

1. On ne connaît vraiment pas le vrai nombre de nos victimes, On connaît seulement le nombre de corps, mais est-ce qu'on connaît les chiffres concernant les blessés, tel que les dommages mentales et physiques de nos enfants qui arrivent de l'Afghanistan.
2. Pas d'informations concernant la condition des familles de ceux qui retournent de cette mission d'invasion.



3. Le publique n'a pas d'idée du genre et du type de message que le gouvernement passe à nos enfants pour les convaincre de combattre là-bas, Est-ce qu'ils savent la réalité de cette mission ? On n'a pas encore oublié le cauchemar du Rouanda.
4. La couverture médiatique est un scandale sans précédent.
5. On est en train de perdre notre crédibilité sur la scène internationale, spécialement quand on regarde les autres agressions militaires d'autres armée dans le monde comme en Iraq, La Palestine, Le Liban et d'autres.
6. En faisant cela, on est en train de développer un symptôme d'hypocrisie quand nos pratiques deviennent contradictoires à nos slogans et nos « agendas » publicisés.
7. En faisant cela on est en train de créer une génération qui souffrira de schizophrénie ou de double personnalité.



Rapport Manley

Dès le jour 1 de la formation de la commission Manley le but de cette mission était clair, C'était une autre tentative du gouvernement conservateur pour justifier sa participation embarrassante de cette mission.

Le Caractère de ses recommandations sont à l'image de sa formation où les cinq membres des groupes choisis sont : John Manley, ancien vice premier ministre et ancien ministre d'affaire étrangère, Derek Burney, ancien ambassadeur canadien au États-Unis; Pamela Wallin, ancienne console générale à New York ; Paul Tellier, ancien employé du conseil du parti; et Jake Epp, ancien ministre dans le cabinet fédéral.

On s'est attendu à ce que les résultats de ce rapport particulièrement avec la décision des États-Unis de déplacer 3000 de ses troupes en Afghanistan et de sa pression sur l'Allemagne et les autres membres de l'OTAN à participer à l'occupation de l'Afghanistan. Un geste qui a été contesté fortement par la population de ces pays.

Un des commentaires importants du rapport de ce comité est le souvenir d'une canadienne tel que Lester Pearson. C'est quand John Manley, a défendu la mission en citant le nom du héros canadienne Lester Pearson.

Puisque les Canadiens ont tendance à associer l'Afghanistan à la torture et à un style cowboy « guerre au terrorisme » alors l'invocation du nom de Pearson était absurde même ridicule.

Francis Boyle, professeur de droit international à l'université de l'Illinois Faculté de droit explique que la tentative de Manley de placer le manteau de Pearson sur la mission Afghane s'élève à un "vrai abaissement de la mémoire et de son accomplissement monumental (de Pearson) pour la paix mondiale."

Boyle indique qu'il a suggéré à ses étudiants le modèle de maintien de la paix de l'ONU conçu par Pearson pour la crise de Suez en 1956. "C'était le premier modèle pour tous ce qui sont venus après lui. Pearson a mérité grandement son prix de paix Nobel."

Mais où es-ce qu'il s'en va notre gouvernement ?



Où es-ce qu'on s'en va ?

On est sûre que l'Afghanistan et beaucoup d'autres pays ont besoin de reconstruction, de modernité et développement, par contre les forces d'occupation ne peuvent apporter la stabilité et la liberté à une population en les tuants.

L'opinion de plusieurs politiciens et quelque analyses politiques incluant la notre, croyons que l'Afghanistan n'aura pas sa paix et sa stabilité jusqu'à ce que son peuple se réunissent sous le même flambeau pour construire leur démocratie et leur liberté.

1. arriver a une entente pour cesse le feu dans une période de six mois.
2. Commencer dès la première journée de cesser les opérations militaires et commencer les vraies négociations entre les divers partis afghanes sous la supervision de civiles et des experts de l'ONU et l'OCI (Organisation des conférences Islamique).
3. Établir une force policière de l'ONU et l'OCI pour prendre le control de la sécurité.
4. Un retrait des forces internationales incluant les forces Canadienne du sol afghan dans une période de six mois.
5. Un mandat clair et limité doit être donné aux forces policières pour une période de 12 mois pour établir un accord pour partager et réconcilier la gouvernance.

Ce plan ne dépend pas seulement du Canada, alors le Canada doit soumettre un plan de retrait avec une note de trois (3) mois d'un seul coté si le plan n'est pas accepté ou de six (6) mois si le plan est accepté.

Cela est la meilleure solution pour l'Afghanistan, une histoire qui a échoué, mais la grande question reste :

- C'est quoi notre rôle dans l'arène internationale.
- Qu'es ce que le Canada et les Canadiens feront pour la paix dans le monde.
- Es-ce qu'on va devenir un pays indépendant ou des suiveurs des super forces dans leurs positions injustes sur la terre.
- C'est quoi notre rôle à jouer dans l'OTAN et c'est quoi le but de l'OTAN et notre adhésion et implication dans ce club?

Les réponses sont dans les questions, mais allons nous réussir ?



Es-ce que c'est une histoire de deux états qui ont échoués?

L'Afghanistan devient un état qui a échoué où sont gouvernement ne contrôle pas plus la capitale Kabul (s'il est capable de le faire), où les forces d'occupation sont éparpillé dans le pays semant la terreur et la mort dans la population civile, spécialement les enfants et les femmes, sans aucune amélioration nulle part, néanmoins protégeant l'afflue du gaz naturel pour fournir les États-Unis par un président Afghan désigné.

Le Canada a échoué en Afghanistan dans l'implantation de la démocratie, et na reçu en retour que l'isolement de son gouvernement dans les murs du palais présidentiel.

La légitimité de la présence de POTAN en Afghanistan, avec 13,000 autres militaires Américains sous le commandement direct des derniers est questionnable car cela signifie que toutes les troupes présentes sont sous le commandement direct de G.W.Bush.

Mais en urgeant et pressant les Canadiens à garder le combat là-bas, ils essayent de coller cette mission d'occupation au nom de Lester B. Pearson au lieu de G.W.Bush.

Le Canada est présentement sur une intersection où il peut aider au vrai progrès en Afghanistan en présidant l'initiative de paix, ou rejoindre l'Afghanistan et deviennent deux états jumeaux qui ont échoués.



Annexe 1: Le grand jeu des Amériques

« America's great game »

By: [John Pilger](#)

Published 10 January 2008

The US and Britain claim defeating the Taliban is part of a "good war" against al-Qaeda. Yet there is evidence the 2001 invasion was planned before 9/11

"To me, I confess, [countries] are pieces on a chessboard upon which is being played out a game for dominion of the world." - Lord Curzon, viceroy of India, speaking about Afghanistan, 1898

<http://www.newstatesman.com/200801100021>

I had suggested to Marina that we meet in the safety of the Intercontinental Hotel, where foreigners stay in Kabul, but she said no. She had been there once and government agents, suspecting she was Rawa, had arrested her. We met instead at a safe house, reached through contours of bombed rubble that was once streets, where people live like earthquake victims awaiting rescue.

Rawa is the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan, which since 1977 has alerted the world to the suffering of women and girls in that country. There is no organisation on earth like it. It is the high bar of feminism, home of the bravest of the brave. Year after year, Rawa agents have travelled secretly through Afghanistan, teaching at clandestine girls' schools, ministering to isolated and brutalised women, recording outrages on cameras concealed beneath their burqas. They were the Taliban regime's implacable foes when the word *Taliban* was barely heard in the west: when the Clinton administration was secretly courting the mullahs so that the oil company Unocal could build a pipeline across Afghanistan from the Caspian.

Indeed, Rawa's understanding of the designs and hypocrisy of western governments informs a truth about Afghanistan excluded from news, now reduced to a drama of British squaddies besieged by a demonic enemy in a "good war".

When we met, Marina was veiled to conceal her identity. Marina is her *nom de guerre*. She said: "We, the women of Afghanistan, only became a cause in the west following 11 September 2001, when the Taliban suddenly became the official enemy of America. Yes, they persecuted women, but they were not unique, and we have resented the silence in the west over the atrocious nature of the western-backed warlords, who are no different. They rape and kidnap and terrorise, yet they hold seats in [Hamid] Karzai's government. In some ways, we were more secure under the Taliban. You could cross Afghanistan by road and feel secure. Now, you take your life into your hands."

The reason the United States gave for invading Afghanistan in October 2001 was "to destroy the infrastructure of al-Qaeda, the perpetrators of 9/11". The women of Rawa say this is false. In a rare statement on 4 December that went unreported in Britain, they said: "By experience, [we have found] that the US does not want to defeat the Taliban and al-Qaeda, because then they will have no excuse to stay in Afghanistan and work towards the realisation of their economic, political and strategic interests in the region."

The truth about the "good war" is to be found in compelling evidence that the 2001 invasion, widely supported in the west as a justifiable response to the 11 September attacks, was actually planned two months prior to 9/11 and that the most pressing problem for Washington was not the Taliban's links with Osama Bin Laden, but the prospect of the Taliban mullahs losing control of Afghanistan to less reliable mujahedin factions, led by warlords who had been funded and armed by the CIA to fight America's proxy war against the Soviet occupiers in the 1980s. Known as the Northern Alliance, these mujahedin had been largely a creation of Washington, which believed the "jihadi card" could be used to bring down the Soviet Union. The Taliban were a product of this and, during the Clinton years, they were admired for their "discipline". Or, as the *Wall Street Journal* put it, "[the Taliban] are the players most capable of achieving peace in Afghanistan at this moment in history".



The "moment in history" was a secret memorandum of understanding the mullahs had signed with the Clinton administration on the pipeline deal. However, by the late 1990s, the Northern Alliance had encroached further and further on territory controlled by the Taliban, whom, as a result, were deemed in Washington to lack the "stability" required of such an important client. It was the consistency of this client relationship that had been a prerequisite of US support, regardless of the Taliban's aversion to human rights. (Asked about this, a state department briefer had predicted that "the Taliban will develop like the Saudis did", with a pro-American economy, no democracy and "lots of sharia law", which meant the legalised persecution of women. "We can live with that," he said.)

By early 2001, convinced it was the presence of Osama Bin Laden that was souring their relationship with Washington, the Taliban tried to get rid of him. Under a deal negotiated by the leaders of Pakistan's two Islamic parties, Bin Laden was to be held under house arrest in Peshawar. A tribunal of clerics would then hear evidence against him and decide whether to try him or hand him over to the Americans. Whether or not this would have happened, Pakistan's Pervez Musharraf vetoed the plan. According to the then Pakistani foreign minister, Niaz Naik, a senior US diplomat told him on 21 July 2001 that it had been decided to dispense with the Taliban "under a carpet of bombs".

Acclaimed as the first "victory" in the "war on terror", the attack on Afghanistan in October 2001 and its ripple effect caused the deaths of thousands of civilians who, even more than Iraqis, remain invisible to western eyes. The family of Gulam Rasul is typical. It was 7.45am on 21 October. The headmaster of a school in the town of Khair Khana, Rasul had just finished eating breakfast with his family and had walked outside to chat to a neighbour. Inside the house were his wife, Shiekra, his four sons, aged three to ten, his brother and his wife, his sister and her husband. He looked up to see an aircraft weaving in the sky, then his house exploded in a fireball behind him. Nine people died in this attack by a US F-16 dropping a 500lb bomb. The only survivor was his nine-year-old son, Ahmad Bilal.

"Most of the people killed in this war are not Taliban; they are innocents," Gulam Rasul told me. "Was the killing of my family a mistake? No, it was not. They fly their planes and look down on us, the mere Afghan people, who have no planes, and they bomb us for our birthright, and with all contempt."

There was the wedding party in the village of Niazi Qala, 100km south of Kabul, to celebrate the marriage of the son of a respected farmer. By all accounts it was a wonderfully boisterous affair, with music and singing. The roar of aircraft started when everyone was asleep, at about three in the morning. According to a United Nations report, the bombing lasted two hours and killed 52 people: 17 men, ten women and 25 children, many of whom were found blown to bits where they had desperately sought refuge, in a dried-up pond. Such slaughter is not uncommon, and these days the dead are described as "Taliban"; or, if they are children, they are said to be "partly to blame for being at a site used by militants" - according to the BBC, speaking to a US military spokesman.

Return of opium

The British military have played an important part in this violence, having stepped up high-altitude bombing by up to 30 per cent since they took over command of Nato forces in Afghanistan in May 2006. This translated to more than 6,200 Afghan deaths last year. In December, a contrived news event was the "fall" of a "Taliban stronghold", Musa Qala, in southern Afghanistan. Puppet government forces were allowed to "liberate" rubble left by American B-52s.

What justifies this? Various fables have been spun - "building democracy" is one. "The war on drugs" is the most perverse. When the Americans invaded Afghanistan in 2001 they had one striking success. They brought to an abrupt end a historic ban on opium production that the Taliban regime had achieved. A UN official in Kabul described the ban to me as "a modern miracle". The miracle was quickly rescinded. As a reward for supporting the Karzai "democracy", the Americans allowed Northern Alliance warlords to replant the country's entire opium crop in 2002. Twenty-eight out of the 32 provinces instantly went under cultivation. Today, 90 per cent of



world trade in opium originates in Afghanistan. In 2005, a British government report estimated that 35,000 children in this country were using heroin. While the British taxpayer pays for a £1bn military super-base in Helmand Province and the second-biggest British embassy in the world, in Kabul, peanuts are spent on drug rehabilitation at home.

Tony Blair once said memorably: "To the Afghan people, we make this commitment. We will not walk away . . . [We will offer] some way out of the poverty that is your miserable existence." I thought about this as I watched children play in a destroyed cinema. They were illiterate and so could not read the poster warning that unexploded cluster bombs lay in the debris.

"After five years of engagement," reported James Fergusson in the *Independent* on 16 December, "the [UK] Department for International Development had spent just £390m on Afghan projects." Unusually, Fergusson has had meetings with Taliban who are fighting the British. "They remained charming and courteous throughout," he wrote of one visit in February. "This is the beauty of *malmastia*, the Pashtun tradition of hospitality towards strangers. So long as he comes unarmed, even a mortal enemy can rely on a kind reception. The opportunity for dialogue that *malmastia* affords is unique."

This "opportunity for dialogue" is a far cry from the surrender-or-else offers made by the government of Gordon Brown. What Brown and his Foreign Office advisers wilfully fail to understand is that the tactical victory in Afghanistan in 2001, achieved with bombs, has become a strategic disaster in south Asia.

Exacerbated by the assassination of Benazir Bhutto, the current turmoil in Pakistan has its contemporary roots in a Washington-contrived war in neighbouring Afghanistan that has alienated the Pashtuns who inhabit much of the long border area between the two countries. This is also true of most Pakistanis, who, according to opinion polls, want their government to negotiate a regional peace, rather than play a prescribed part in a rerun of Lord Curzon's Great Game.



Annexe 2: Le Génocide du l'OTAN en Afghanistan « NATO Genocide in Afghanistan »

JURIST Contributing Editor Ali Khan*

<http://jurist.law.pitt.edu/forumy/2008/01/nato-genocide-in-afghanistan.php>

JURIST Contributing Editor Ali Khan of Washburn University School of Law says that in the name of the "war of terror," NATO forces in Afghanistan are committing genocide by systematically hunting down and destroying the Taliban, a puritanical Islamic group, contrary to the terms of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide...

Sloganeers, propagandists and politicians often use the word "genocide" in ways that the law does not permit. But rarely is the crime of genocide invoked when Western militaries murder Muslim groups. This essay argues that the internationally recognized crime of genocide applies to the intentional killings that NATO troops commit on a weekly basis in the poor villages and mute mountains of Afghanistan to destroy the Taliban, a puritanical Islamic group. NATO combat troops bombard and kill people in Taliban enclaves and meeting places. They also murder defenseless Afghan civilians. The dehumanized label of "Taliban" is used to cloak the nameless victims of NATO operations. Some political opposition to this practice is building in NATO countries, such as Canada, where calls are heard to withdraw troops from Afghanistan or divert them to non-combat tasks.

Dehumanization

In almost all NATO nations, the Taliban have been completely dehumanized — a historically-tested signal that perpetrators of the crime of genocide carry unmitigated intentions to eradicate the dehumanized group. Politicians, the armed forces, the media, and even the general public associate in the West the Taliban with irrational fanatics, intolerant fundamentalists, brutal assassins, beheaders of women, bearded extremists, and terrorists. This luminescent negativity paves the way for aggression, military operations, and genocide. Promoting the predatory doctrine of collective self-defense, killing the Taliban is celebrated as a legal virtue. To leave the Taliban in control of Afghanistan, says NATO, is to leave a haven for terrorism.

A similar dehumanization took place in the 16th and 17th centuries when NATO precursors occupied the Americas to purloin land and resources. The killings of native inhabitants were extensive and heartless. Thomas Jefferson, the noble author of the Declaration of Independence, labeled Indians as "merciless savages." President Andrew Jackson pontificated: "What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms." Promoting the predatory doctrine of discovery, the United States Supreme Court later ratified the pilgrims' crimes, holding that "discovery gave an exclusive right to extinguish the Indian title (to land). ([T]he Indians were fierce savages...To leave them in possession of their country was to leave the country a wilderness."

The predators have not changed their stripes a bit. They come, they demonize, they obliterate. They do all this in the name of superior civilization.

The Facts

The NATO website lists its killings in Afghanistan. These killings are also reported in the world media, often with a shameless tone of gratitude as if NATO forces are engaged in wiping out cannibals. In 2007 alone, NATO helicopters and precision guided munitions bombed and killed over six thousand "Taliban." Read the following recent attacks, which the NATO itself reports, and smell the scent of genocide:

On January 19, 2008, NATO launched a preemptive strike relying on "credible intelligence" that the Taliban were planning to mass on a NATO base. The attack killed two dozen "insurgents" in the Watapoor District of Kunar Province, though the exact number of casualties could not be confirmed because of the rough mountainous region. The world media reported that numerous civilians were killed and 25 bodies were buried in just one mass grave.



On January 12, 2008, NATO forces conducted what it calls a "precise strike" on a compound in Kapsia Province targeting Taliban leaders. NATO claimed that the civilians were cleared from the compound before the attack. The claim is absurd because any removal of civilians from the compound would have alerted the battle-hardened Taliban that an enemy attack was imminent.

On September 20, 2007, NATO forces launched "Operation Palk Wahel" to kill and remove the Taliban from an area in the Upper Gereshk Valley. Numerous civilians were killed. The evidence of the genocide was so obvious that NATO admitted that it "was unaware of civilians in the vicinity of the target and unfortunately it appears that a number of non-combatants were caught in the attack and killed."

The Law

The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (entered into force, 1951) is binding on all states including the 26 member states of NATO. The Genocide Convention is jus cogens, the law from which no derogation is allowed. It provides no exceptions for any nation or any organization of nations, such as the United Nations or NATO, to commit genocide. Nor does the Convention allow any exceptions to genocide "whether committed in time of peace or in time of war." Even traditional self-defense - let alone preemptive self-defense, a deceptive name for aggression - cannot be invoked to justify or excuse the crime of genocide.

In murdering the Taliban, NATO armed forces systematically practice on a continual basis the crime of genocide that consists of three constituent elements - act, intent to destroy, and religious group. The crime, as defined in the Convention, is analyzed below:

Act. The Convention lists five acts, each of which qualifies as genocide. NATO forces in Afghanistan are committing three of the five acts. They are killing members of the Taliban. They are causing serious bodily harm to members of the Taliban. They are deliberately inflicting on the Taliban conditions of life calculated to bring about their physical destruction in whole or in part. Any of these three acts committed one time constitutes the crime of genocide. NATO combat troops have been committing, and continue to commit, these acts through multiple means and weapons.

Intent to Destroy. The crime of genocide is a crime of intent. It must be shown that NATO combat troops and the high command ordering these troops carry the requisite intent to destroy the Taliban. Mere negligent killings do not qualify as genocide. The statements of NATO's Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and those of NATO spokesmen leave no doubt that the NATO conducts military operations to "hunt and destroy" the Taliban. Preemptive strikes to kill the Taliban are sufficient proof that NATO troops and commanding generals have specific intent to destroy as many Taliban members as they can find. The weekly murderous planning and intelligence gathering to locate and eliminate the Taliban leaders and members further demonstrate that the killings in Afghanistan are not negligent, accidental, or by mistake. For all legal purposes, NATO's incessant and deliberate killings of the Taliban are powered with the specific intent to destroy a religious group.

Religious Group. The Genocide Convention is far from universal in that it does not protect all groups from genocide. Its protection covers only four groups: national, ethnic, racial and religious. (Political groups are not protected). The Convention does not require the complete eradication of a protected group as a necessary condition for the crime of genocide. Even part destruction of a protected group constitutes the crime. It is no secret that the Taliban are a religious group. (They may also qualify as a national (Afghan) or ethnic (Pushtun) group). The Taliban advocate and practice a puritanical version of Islam. The Convention does not demand that the protected group advocate and practice a form of religion acceptable to the West or the world. The questionable beliefs and practices of a religious group are no reasons to destroy the group. That the Taliban are armed or support terrorism or oppress women are unlawful excuses to commit genocide. (All reasons that Hitler had to murder Jews would be simply irrelevant under the Convention).

The Holding

It may, therefore, be safely concluded that NATO combat troops and NATO commanders are engaged in murdering the Taliban, a protected group under the Genocide Convention, with the specific intent to physically and mentally destroy the group in whole or in part. This is the crime of genocide.

* Ali Khan is a professor at Washburn University School of Law in Kansas.



Annexe 3: Oxfam averti d'un désastre humanitaire en Afghanistan « Oxfam warns of humanitarian disaster in Afghanistan »

Thursday Jan 31, 2008

http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20080131/wl_uk_afp/afghanistanbritainaidngooxfam

LONDON (AFP) - Aid agency Oxfam warned Thursday of the risk of a humanitarian disaster in Afghanistan unless Western countries make a "major change of direction" in their strategy in the violence-scarred country.

In an open letter to Prime Minister Gordon Brown, the group said progress in improving ordinary Afghans' lives was being held back by increasing insecurity.

The flourishing drug trade and related criminality was among major factors threatening progress in the country, where NATO-led forces are struggling against a still-fierce insurgency some six years after the Taliban was ousted.

"As an NGO which has had operations and supported partners in the country for nearly 20 years, we urge you to support a major change of direction in order to reduce suffering and avert a humanitarian disaster," it said.

"There has been undoubted social and economic progress in Afghanistan, but it has been slow and is being undermined by increasing insecurity," wrote Oxfam International's director Barbara Stocking.

Setting out five key recommendations, she underlined the importance of reducing Afghan poverty, which she said was a major element fueling the insurgency.

"Afghans turn to narcotics, criminality, or even militancy, if they cannot feed their families. Military action addresses symptoms, not the underlying causes or conditions," she wrote.

Targetting aid more on rural areas was also important, she said, lamenting that "only a fraction" of international assistance supports agriculture and rural development.

She also singled out lack of coordination as a problem -- an issue highlighted by the withdrawal of diplomat Paddy Ashdown's bid for a new job as the UN's special envoy in the country, after Kabul blocked the move.

"Too much aid is slow, wasteful, ineffective or uncoordinated.

"In light of the spreading insurgency and increasing Afghan dissatisfaction with the rate of progress, urgent action is required to achieve greater donor coherence and aid effectiveness," said the Oxfam chief.

The Oxfam warning came after two US reports said that insurgency-wracked Afghanistan will become a failed state if urgent steps are not taken to tackle worsening security and lacklustre reconstruction and governance efforts.

The Atlantic Council of the United States warned that civil sector reform "is in serious trouble," while the Afghanistan Study Group called for a new special envoy to coordinate all aspects of US policy there.

Southern Afghanistan has seen the worst violence since the Taliban were ousted from power in the US-led invasion in 2001 after the September 11 attacks masterminded by Al-Qaeda, whose leaders were given sanctuary by the Taliban



Annexe 4: Ottawa cache la vérité aux Canadiens en repandant de fausses information à propos de l'Afghanistan

« Government Panel Gets It Wrong on Afghanistan: Report on Afghanistan the latest example of Ottawa hiding the truth from Canadians »

Published on Sunday, January 27, 2008

by Eric Margolis*

<http://www.commondreams.org/archive/2008/01/27/6653/>

The report on Afghanistan delivered Monday by the Manley panel was deeply disappointing. Its totally predictable findings could have been written without the panel of instant Afghan experts wasting millions of tax dollars.

This whitewash was designed to provide political cover for the Harper government, which has hung its hat on the failing war in Afghanistan, and provide it an escape hatch if the kabob hits the fan. It's the latest example of the Liberals pathetic failure to demand Ottawa answer tough questions about the mess in Afghanistan.

Most disturbing, the report claimed continued military operations in Afghanistan, which has so far cost 79 Canadians dead and untold billions, were necessary to "enhance" Canada's international influence. Two days later, another Canadian soldier died in action.

As one who spends half his time abroad, I can attest that Canada's military role in Afghanistan is virtually unknown to Americans, save occasional pats on the back to the Harper government from Bush administration officials. Many Americans can't find Canada, never mind Afghanistan, on the map.

In Europe and Asia, most people regard the Afghanistan conflict as a 19th century-style colonial war over future oil pipeline routes, and NATO's role there the result of severe arms-twisting by Washington. That's why most NATO troops are kept out of combat.

Canada's position as one of the world's most respected, admired nations has nothing to do with its military role in Afghanistan. Quite the contrary.

RASH BLUNDER

Ottawa's rash blunder into a tribal civil war in Afghanistan, and one-sided policy in the Mideast, have put Canada squarely in the gun sights of violent anti-western groups, and make it appear an eager spear carrier in the Bush/Cheney wars in the Muslim world. Every bombed Afghan village breeds new enemies for Canada.

Ottawa is hiding the full truth about Afghanistan from Canadians. Our flag-waving media has further obscured the facts.

When did we last see a report filed from the side of the Taliban and its growing number of allies?

The report's claim that Afghanistan's U.S.-imposed regime is "democratic" is absurd. CIA "asset" Hamid Karzai was installed by Washington and is kept in power by U.S. troops and a stream of cash payoffs to drug-dealing tribal chiefs. His rigged "election" was supervised by U.S. troops and bought with \$100 bills.

Afghanistan's so-called "national army" is made up of U.S.-paid mercenaries. The "army" does not need more training, as Manley claims. It needs loyalty to a legitimate national government — which does not exist. Half of Afghanistan's population, the Pashtun tribes (source of Taliban), has been largely excluded from political power. Until included, there will be no stability, never mind democracy.

Ominously, the war is spreading into Pakistan. Canada is backing Musharraf's dictatorship in Pakistan while claiming to be fighting for "democracy" in Afghanistan.

The report soft-soaped government corruption. It ignored the 800-lb. gorilla in Kabul: Senior government officials up to their turbans in the heroin trade. Canada, the U.S. and NATO find themselves patrons of the world's leading narcostate, which supplies 90% of the world's heroin and runs on drug money.

The drugs are exported through Pakistan, another key western ally. Taliban eliminated the drug trade before being overthrown.



Most important, Manley's report completely ignored the biggest problem of all. Canada has no political objective in this aimless war beyond making high-ranking Ottawa officials feel self-important at NATO meetings.

The Karzai regime, which rules only Kabul, would not last a week without western troops. There is no prospect of national political consensus until the Taliban and its allies are brought into the process. The reborn Afghan Communist Party is again a dominant influence in Kabul, including running torture prisons to which Canada had, until recently, been sending captives.

Canada is not being ennobled by this sordid, ugly, drug-fueled war. Its honour and reputation are being injured, its security endangered.

The Manley report is the political equivalent of a subprime mortgage. It does the nation a disservice.

** Eric Margolis writes a regular column for the Toronto Sun.*