

Is Russia's Invasion of Ukraine "Really Worse" Than America's & UK's Invasion of Iraq?

By [Eric Zuesse](#)
Global Research, October 25, 2022

Region: [Europe](#), [Middle East & North Africa](#),
[Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)
Theme: [History](#), [Intelligence](#)
In-depth Report: [IRAQ REPORT](#), [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

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](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

America and UK invaded Iraq on 20 March 2003. Russia invaded Ukraine on 24 February 2022. Which was worse?

Let's first examine the invasion of Iraq:

U.S. President George W. Bush seems to have been informed, in advance, about a *New York Times* article (which was the lead-story in the newspaper on Sunday, 8 September 2002), titled "[U.S. SAYS HUSSEIN INTENSIFIES QUEST FOR A-BOMB PARTS](#)", in which the sources were anonymous "Administration officials." The story concerned "aluminum tubes" that were "intended as casing for rotors in centrifuges, which are one means of producing highly enriched uranium ... to make an atomic bomb, Bush administration officials said today."

So, [on Saturday, September 7th, of 2002, U.S. President Bush said, while standing beside British Prime Minister Tony Blair,](#)

We just heard the Prime Minister talk about the new report. I would remind you that when the inspectors first went into Iraq and were denied — finally denied access, a report came out of the Atomic — the IAEA that they were six months away from developing a weapon. I don't know what more evidence we need [in order for Congress to authorize an invasion of Iraq].

PRIME MINISTER BLAIR: Absolutely right.

Then, as soon as the weekend was over, on Monday 9 September 2002, was issued by the IAEA the [following](#):

Related Coverage: Director General's statement on Iraq to the IAEA Board of Governors on 9 September 2002 [this being a republication of their notice three days earlier, on 6 Sep.].

Vienna, 06 September, 2002 – With reference to an article published today in the New York Times [which, as usual, stenographically reported the Administration's false allegations, which the IAEA was trying to correct in a way that would minimally offend the NYT and the U.S. President], the International Atomic Energy Agency would like to state that it has no new information on Iraq's nuclear programme since December 1998 when its inspectors left Iraq [and verified that no WMD remained there at that time]. Only through a resumption of inspections in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687 and other relevant resolutions can the Agency draw any conclusion with regard to Iraq's compliance with its obligations under the above resolutions relating to its nuclear activities.

Contact: Mark Gwozdecky, Tel: (+43 1) 2600-21270, [e-mail: M.Gwozdecky@iaea.org](mailto:M.Gwozdecky@iaea.org).

It even linked to the following statement from the IAEA Director General amplifying it:

Since December 1998 when our inspectors left Iraq, we have no additional information that can be directly linked without inspection to Iraq's nuclear activities. I should emphasize that it is only through resumption of inspections that the Agency can draw any conclusion or provide any assurance regarding Iraq's compliance with its obligations under these resolutions.

So, this was proof of the falsehood of Bush's and Blair's reference, on September 7th, to the IAEA, in which Bush-Blair were saying that, upon the authority of the IAEA itself, there was "the new report ... a report came out of the Atomic — the IAEA that they were six months away from developing a weapon. I don't know what more evidence we need."

Because of the news-media's ignoring the IAEA's denial of the President's statement, the author of the IAEA's denial, Mark Gwozdecky, spoke again nearly three weeks later, by phone, with the only journalist who was interested, Joseph Curl of the *Washington Times*, who headlined on 27 September 2002, "[Agency Disavows Report on Iraq Arms](#)" — perhaps that should instead have been "President Lied About 'Saddam's WMD'" — and Curl quoted Gwozdecky:

"There's never been a report like that [which Bush alleged] issued from this agency. ... When we left in December '98 we had concluded that we had neutralized their nuclear-weapons program. We had confiscated their fissile material. We had destroyed all their key buildings and equipment." Other news-media failed to pick up Curl's article. And, even in that article, there was no clear statement that the President had, in fact, *lied* — cooked up an IAEA 'report' that never actually existed. Actually, the IAEA hadn't even so much as been *mentioned* in that *New York Times* article.

Bush had simply lied, and Blair seconded it, and the 'news'-media stenographically accepted it, and broadcasted their lies to the public, and continued to do so, despite the IAEA's having **denied**, as early as [September 6th](#), that they had issued any such "new

report" at all. (The IAEA had, apparently, somehow known in advance that someone would soon be saying that the IAEA had issued a report alleging that Iraq was resuming its nuclear program.) [Virtually all](#) of the alleged news-media (and not *only* the *NYT*) entirely ignored the IAEA's *denial* (though it was not merely one bullet, but rapidly fired on four separate occasions, into the wilderness of America's 'news'-media) that it had issued any such "report." All of them were actually only propaganda-media: they *hid* the fact that George W. Bush was simply lying. Both the U.S. Government and its media were frauds.

The day after that 7 September 2002 **unquestioned lie by Bush, saying Iraq was only six months from having a nuclear weapon**, and citing the IAEA as his source for that, the *New York Times* ran their article. It included such hair-raisers as

"The jewel in the crown is nuclear,' a senior administration official said. 'The closer he gets to a nuclear capability, the more credible is his threat to use chemical or biological weapons. Nuclear weapons are his hole card.'"

The fake 'news' — stenography from the lying Government and its chosen lying sources (in this case anonymous Administration-officials) — came in an incessant stream, from the U.S. Government and its 'news' media (such as happened also later, regarding [Honduras 2009](#), Libya 2011, [Yemen 2011-](#), Syria 2011-, [Ukraine 2014](#), and Yemen 2015-). Do the American people never learn — ever — that their Presidents and 'news'-media) now lie *routinely*?

Also on Sunday, September 8th, of 2002, the Bush Administration's big guns were firing off against Iraq from the Sunday 'news' shows; and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice delivered her famous ["we don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud"](#) statement, which was clearly building upon the lying Bush allegation of the day before, that the International Atomic Energy Agency had just come up with this ominous "Atomic" "new report."

Then, President Bush himself, on 12 September 2002, addressed the U.N. General Assembly, seeking authorization to invade:

We will work with the U.N. Security Council for the necessary resolutions. But the purposes of the United States should not be doubted. The Security Council resolutions will be enforced — the just demands of peace and security will be met — or action will be unavoidable. And a regime that has lost its legitimacy will also lose its power.

Events can turn in one of two ways: If we fail to act in the face of danger, the people of Iraq will continue to live in brutal submission. The regime will have new power to bully and dominate and conquer its neighbors, condemning the Middle East to more years of bloodshed and fear. The regime will remain unstable — the region will remain unstable, with little hope of freedom, and isolated from the progress of our times. With every step the Iraqi regime takes toward gaining and deploying the most terrible weapons, our own options to confront that regime will narrow. And if an emboldened regime were to supply these weapons to terrorist allies, then the attacks of September the 11th would be a prelude to far greater horrors.

Bush (and Blair) failed to win any authorization to invade, but did it anyway. They should be hung for it. They were atop a bi-national and entirely bipartisan (in each of the two countries) public-deception operation, like had occurred in Germany during Hitler's time. (Hitler was a boon for the nation's armaments-makers then, just as America's Presidents

now are for America's armaments-firms.)

And both of America's political Parties are controlled by their billionaires, who [fund the political careers of the politicians whom those mega-donors want to become s'elected' by the public to win public offices](#). For example, whereas George W. Bush lied America into invading and destroying Iraq, Barack Obama and Joe Biden lied America into believing that their [coup](#) overthrowing and replacing Ukraine's [democratically elected](#) Government in February 2014 was *instead* a 'democratic revolution' there. It's so bad that even the progressive Democratic Party site, David Sirota's "The Daily Poster," has NEVER exposed anything about [that Obama coup](#) and about those Obama-Clinton-Biden lies about Ukraine, and about the U.S. Government's planned conquest of both Russia and China — the things that might actually produce WW III (in other words: are even more important than what they *do* report about). In fact, Sirota had the nerve, on 15 February 2022, to post to Vimeo an anti-Republican-Party propaganda video, ["The Pundits Who Lied America Into A War"](#), against the Republican Party's liars who deceived the American people into invading and destroying Iraq in 2003 — though almost all leading Democrats, including Joe Biden, and Hillary Clinton, had voted in the U.S. Senate *for* (not *against*) that lie-based invasion, and though all Democratic-Party 'news'-media (and not ONLY the Republican-Party ones) unquestioningly transmitted the Bush-Administration's lies to the American people, against Iraq, in order to fool Americans into supporting the then-upcoming U.S. invasion.

That Sirota video entirely ignores the *Democratic-Party* "Pundits" — such as the Party's think tank, the Brookings Institution, whose [Michael O'Hanlon](#) and [Kenneth Pollack](#), propagandized on TV and elsewhere to invade Iraq (such as in Pollack's Council on Foreign Relations article, ["Invasion the Only Realistic Option to Head Off the Threat from Iraq, Argues Kenneth Pollack in The Threatening Storm"](#) did). Whereas Democrats blame Republicans, and Republicans blame Democrats, it's the billionaires of BOTH Parties who actually *fund* all of these lies and liars — and who *continue* to fund those liars' careers, and to present them on their 'news'-media as 'experts', to fool the public to okay the trillions of dollars that the U.S. Government pays to those billionaires' corporations such as Lockheed Martin, to profit from those wars. It's hypocrisy on top of lying, so as to convey an impression that neoconservatism — U.S. imperialism — is a 'Republican' (or else a 'Democratic') evil, when it's ACTUALLY an evil by the *billionaires* who fund BOTH Parties AND who fund the 'news'-media, both liberal and conservative, and who profit from those invasions.

It's not just the lies of America's Presidents; it is the lies that are funded by America's billionaires, who placed such people as that into Congress and the White House. This regime is an aristocracy, and imperialism is second nature to aristocrats. But an aristocracy is [a dictatorship by the very rich](#) — NOT any sort of democracy. This is [the type of dictatorship](#) that America now has — NOT a Republican dictatorship, or a Democratic dictatorship, but a dictatorship by the aristocracy, of BOTH Parties. They have made a mockery of their 'democracy'. Practically everything they do is fake, except the vast harms that they produce.

That's what led up to America's invasion of Iraq. [Here](#) and [here](#) is what led up to Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

So: which is worse?

Were America and UK sanctioned for invading and destroying Iraq on the basis of

lies? Should Russia be sanctioned for doing what the U.S. forced it to do [in order to protect Russia's national security?](#)

*

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

This article was originally published on [The Duran](#).

Investigative historian **Eric Zuesse's** new book, [AMERICA'S EMPIRE OF EVIL: Hitler's Posthumous Victory, and Why the Social Sciences Need to Change](#), is about how America took over the world after World War II in order to enslave it to U.S.-and-allied billionaires. Their cartels extract the world's wealth by control of not only their 'news' media but the social 'sciences' — duping the public. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from CovertAction Magazine

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

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