

The WMD Pretext, The Senate Voted “To Approve a Fabricated War”. The AUMF Against Iraq (HJ Res. 114).

The Senate has finally decided that the AUMF (Authority to Use Military Force) SJ Res 23 is no longer relevant

By [Renee Parsons](#)

Global Research, March 30, 2023

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the **Translate Website** button below the author’s name.

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

As if in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the dastardly deed in March, 2003, the US. – except for those Senators who opposed its repeal. Twenty years ago, in response to the 911 attack, the US illegally invaded Iraq in a ‘[shock and awe](#)’ campaign that devastated the people of Iraq and was initiated under the false [weapons of mass destruction](#) pretense.

That original Resolution to “[authorize the use of US Armed Forces](#) against those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the US” was specific to 911 and approved within days of the September 11th attack. With the intent to threaten US military action, the Senate approved that Resolution [98 – 0](#) which has remained in effect for the last twenty years. The AUMF was also [liberally utilized](#) over the years to justify other questionable foreign interventions.

It was however [HJ Res. 114](#) “*The AUMF Against Iraq Resolution of 2002*” that a willing Senate voted to approve an intentionally [fabricated war](#) which never discovered weapons of mass destruction as were alleged to exist by the US [Secretary of State](#) in front of the UN’s world community. On a [77 – 23](#) vote, the US went to war for a total cost of \$3 trillion with [4,500 American deaths](#) and 32,000 wounded. By December, 2011, 39,000 Americans troops were withdrawn leaving a custodial force in place.

During his “[Beyond Vietnam](#)” speech in 1967 from the pulpit at Riverside Church, New York City, the **Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.** described it concisely: “*The greatest purveyor of violence in the world: My own Government.*”

Twenty years later, "[S 316](#), *A Bill to Repeal **Authorizations** for Use of Military Force Against Iraq*" was introduced and debated in the Senate with a series of Republican amendments, all of which were defeated with most in opposition to repeal.

Sen. Rand Paul's (SC) [amendment](#) to repeal AUMF failed on a spectacular vote of [89 - 6](#) and was followed by **Sen. Mike Lee's** (Utah) [amendment](#) to terminate AUMF after two years unless Congress voted to continue also failed [76 - 19](#). In addition, **Sen. Josh Hawley's** (Mo.) [amendment](#) to appoint an Inspector General to investigate \$113 Billion sent to Ukraine failed [68 - 26](#) with no Democrats in support. **Sen. Rick Scott** (Fl.) offered an [amendment](#) to conduct a full investigation of the withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan which also failed [62 - 33](#) also with no Democrats in favor. **Sen. Tim Kaine**, Democratic floor manager for S 316, determined that the Hawley Scott amendments were not germane and called on Democrats to vote No.

After almost two weeks of casual debate which began on March 16th, final passage was adopted on a [66 - 30](#) vote which surpassed the necessary sixty vote filibuster requirement. The Aye votes included eighteen Republican Senators while the thirty Nay votes were all Republicans. Those Republican Ayes were Sens. Braun (Ind.), Budd (NC), Cassidy (La.), Collins (Me.), Cramer (ND), Daines (Mt.), Grassley (Iowa), Hawley (Mo.), Hoeven (ND), Lee (Utah), Lummis (Wyo.), Marshall (Ks.), Moran (Ks.), Murkowski (Alas.), Paul (Ky.), Schmitt (Mo.), Vance (Ohio), Young (Ind.)

The question remains why thirty Republican Senators cast Nay votes against the repeal of the AUMF. There were suggestions that an existing AUMF would protect American troops still located in Iraq or Syria. If that is a legitimate concern the simple answer is to bring all American troops home. Why exactly are there still Americans in Syria or Iraq and who benefits from an AUMF in place - the military industrial complex or perhaps Israel; certainly not American enlisted sons and daughters.

There was also the suggestion that a new AUMF be adopted to replace that being repealed which leads to speculation that there is some future military engagement lurking in the background.

In any case, it is fair to speculate a direct correlation between the AUMF, as the [invasion of Iraq](#) in 2003 set the stage for decades of unconstitutional armed interventions spreading death and destruction, chaos and loathing amongst countries unable to defend themselves yet rich in natural resources. Syrian oil, Libyan gold, and Afghan Bank funds among other appropriated commodities were all irresistible targets.

As the US magnified its simulation as a decadent Roman Empire into an [international](#) bully in pursuit of political power, geographic territory and valuable resources that belonged to others, including its own fiscal malfeasance, the American Empire has been on an irreversible path of self-destruction as a Constitutional exemplar for the world - all of which comes as a direct result of US meddling and instigation of economic and military pathological disasters never heeding the implications of their narcissistic imperialist agenda on the rest of the planet.

It is not surprising that the White House or the State Department response to the announcement of the Russia-China alliance comes as the US political establishment and its European allies continue to fan the flames of dissension; assuming a golden opportunity to

take Putin down, destroy Russia and carve up its riches. The exact opposite has occurred. The US foreign policy establishment which prefers to function within its own narrow framework of reality, like any group of sociopaths, with no understanding of how US behavior is interpreted by those who dare question its motives, remains in a stupor, oblivious to the long term repercussions of their deeds - and those chickens are coming home to roost.

What they call the multi-party alliance has grown since September 2006 into [BRICS](#) (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) as a global geopolitical force encompassing over 3 billion people, 41% of the world's population and 25% GDP. It is expected to add [Saudi Arabia](#), Iran, Argentina, Algeria, Turkey and others to its membership at their next meeting.

The Xi-Putin [Agreement](#) included strengthening the [multipolar economic](#) order by reducing dependence on the petro-dollar while embracing the yuan as currency in Asia, Africa and Latin America. While the dollar as world reserve currency provides the US with its superior status, it is a role they themselves have damaged as [decline of the Dollar](#) will nullify US [sanctions](#) (aka agents of regime change) routinely applied to some of the planet's most vulnerable nations. Xi also suggested a peace plan for de-escalation followed by a ceasefire leading to negotiations as well as resistance to [NATO's initiatives](#) into the Asia-Pacific region.

Russian **Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov** told an interviewer that Moscow was "[working actively](#)" to move away from the U.S. dollar and [encouraged others](#) like Iran which raises a logical question:

With US antagonism towards Iran, why should that country continue to trade in the Dollar? That same question may be asked to those thirty countries which are now living under [US sanctions](#). The answer is clear.

President Joe Biden claimed the alliance was '[vastly exaggerated](#)' with assurance that western countries have '*expanded their alliances.*' However, exhibiting a failure to grasp the meaning of inclusivity, the US [uninvited](#) two NATO partners to its upcoming Summit for Democracy based on unrelated policy disagreements. Proving that hypocrisy is no stranger to US foreign policy, **Secretary of State Antony Blinken** cavalierly refused a ceasefire and cited '*sovereignty*' as a number one goal suggesting '*this war could end tomorrow*' with National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan lecturing about "[respecting the sovereignty of all nations.](#)"

Immediately after their rendezvous, Xi was hosting Brazilian [President Lula](#), Putin was touring [African](#) nations while Biden was traveling to Canada to convince Trudeau about the wisdom of a Haiti [invasion](#).

It is worth noting that the aggressive language of the AUMF granted the US [President](#) authority to use all "*necessary and appropriate force*" against those whom he determined "*planned, authorized, committed or aided*" the September 11 attacks. It has been some months since the Russians announced that they would hold the '*decision maker nations*' responsible; those nations who were in the background supplying weapons to Ukraine and fomenting the war would be considered answerable for their behavior.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Renee Parsons served on the ACLU's Florida State Board of Directors and as president of the ACLU Treasure Coast Chapter. She has been an elected public official in Colorado, staff in the Office of the Colorado State Public Defender, an environmental lobbyist for Friends of the Earth and a staff member of the US House of Representatives in Washington DC.

Featured image is from Dandelion Salad/flickr/cc

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Renee Parsons](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Renee Parsons](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca