

MONITOR

International Edition

Miesięcznik
Monthly

Rok 4 Nr 45
Londyn 30 kwietnia 2004
UK: £1.00
US: \$1.50
EU: €1.50

www.elamco.strayduck.com

Gorzka radość zjednoczenia, str. 2

**Greetings, America. My Name is
Osama bin Laden, p 11**

**UK Diplomats attack Blair policy
on Middle East, p. 3**

**US Diplomats attack Bush policy
on Middle East , p. 7**

„What the f* are we
doing here?”, p. 12**

Sami swoi, str. 11

Bitterness would tinge my father's joy at unification

IN THE GRAND scheme of history, this week's enlargement of the European Union, to include eight of the former communist countries plus Cyprus and Malta will unquestionably be remembered as one of the milestones of the early 21st century. A hundred years from now, enlargement will probably be the subject of far more essays by schoolchildren than the terrorist attacks of September 11. In this sense, the lofty rhetoric which we will hear in the next few days from political leaders across Europe will be amply justified.

Emotionally, too, it is impossible not to be moved by the unification of Europe, especially for somebody like me. My father was born in the tempestuous eastern borderlands between Poland and Russia, and brought up speaking five languages. He was an involuntary actor in the tragic drama of European history and geography, but always saw himself as a citizen of Europe.

His conversation was as likely to be peppered with quotations from Voltaire, Pushkin or Heine. The books he read to me at bedtime alternated between Dickens, Hugo and Sienkiewicz. And all his life, he dreamt that one day Warsaw would regain the title it conferred on itself in the interwar years when he grew up: "the Paris of the East".

Sadly, my father died just over 15 years ago, a tantalising few months

before the Berlin Wall fell and his dreams began to come true. Yet if he were alive today, I fear that he would be disillusioned. His celebrations would be tinged with bitterness and his joy at the unification of Europe marred by a sense of injustice and even betrayal, as it is among millions of his compatriots in the new member states.

A Polish friend recently compared Warsaw or Budapest or Prague today with how they were 15 years ago, when they expelled the Russians. There is freedom, to be sure, and that

played, the unheated hospitals, the vanishing public services, the physical decay. Is this the progress that the people of Eastern Europe were told to expect in 1989 when they threw off communism?

History and technology are supposed to be moving faster than ever, but consider what Frankfurt, Hamburg or even Milan or Rome looked like in 1960, 15 years after the devastation of the Second World War. Poverty, homelessness, economic insecurity seemed to be vanquished. Health and education were readily available to

Gorzka radość zjednoczenia

Anatole Kaletsky to znany komentator ekonomiczny londyńskiego Timesa. W przededniu zjednoczenia Europy pod szyldem Unii Europejskiej zastanawia się jak przyjąłby ten dzień nieżyjący już jego ojciec, urodzony – jak pisze – „na rozległych rubieżach między Polską i Rosją”.

W roku 1960 – 15 lat od zakończenia wojny – Niemcy, Francja, a nawet Włochy przeżywały rozkwit gospodarczy, przypomina Kaletsky. Z Turcji waliły tłumy, by podejmować się prac, których Niemcom nie chciało się już wykonywać.

A jak wyglądają nowe kraje członkowskie z Europy Wschodniej 15 lat po obaleniu komunizmu? Korzyści ekonomiczne ze stowarzyszenia z Unią Europejską w ciągu 10 lat już się praktycznie wyczerpały, a teraz przyjdzie po-

nosić koszty członkostwa. Paradoksalnie, szczyt inwestycji zagranicznych dla nich minął, bo inwestycje przemysłowe kierować się będą teraz do krajów poza Unią, gdzie nie dosięgnie ich rygorystyczne ustawodawstwo unijne w zakresie ośton socjalnych i ochrony środowiska.

Mój ojciec – wspomina Kaletsky – znał 5 języków i czytał mi do poduszki książki Dickensa, Victora Hugo i Sienkiewicza i zawsze marzył, aby Warszawa mogła kiedyś odzyskać status miasta jako „Paryż Wschodu”. Nie wiem jednak, jak by się czuł widząc tyle biedy, tylu żebraków, ludzi bezdomnych, bezrobotnych, nieogrzewane szpitale, fizyczny rozkład tkanki społecznej. „Na pewno odczuwał by radość ze zjednoczenia. Ale byłaby to radość zaprawiona goryczą”. (t,m) ■

is the most important prize, said my friend. But look at the poverty, the beggars, the homeless, the unem-

all. Unemployment was non-existent and workers were flooding in by the

(Continued on page 5)

UK Diplomats attack Blair policy on Middle East

Full text of the letter in which 52 former British diplomats have savaged Tony Blair over his policy in the Middle East

Dear Prime Minister:
 We the undersigned former British ambassadors, high commissioners, governors and senior international officials, including some who have long experience of the Middle East and others whose experience is elsewhere, have watched with deepening concern the policies which you have followed on the Arab-Israeli problem and Iraq, in close cooperation with the United States.

Following the press conference in Washington at which you and President Bush restated these policies, we feel the time has come to make our anxieties public, in the hope that they will be addressed in Parliament and will lead to a fundamental reassessment.

The decision by the USA, the EU, Russia and the UN to launch a "road map" for the settlement of the Israel/Palestine conflict raised hopes that the major powers would at last make a determined and collective effort to resolve a problem which, more than any other, has for decades poisoned relations between the West and the Islamic and Arab worlds.

The legal and political principles on which such a settlement would be based were well established: Presi-

dent Clinton had grappled with the problem during his presidency; the ingredients needed for a settlement were well understood and informal agreements on several of them had already been achieved.

But the hopes were ill-founded. Nothing effective has been done either to move the negotiations forward or to curb the violence.

*Letter to The Times April 30, 2004
 From Sir Jeremy Greenstock*

Sir, I see that I am regarded by the authors of the diplomats' letter as having at least partially supported their criticisms of the British Government's Iraq policy (report, April 29). This is not the case. I suggested certain amendments, because the letter was factually inaccurate on certain points, and insufficiently balanced.

Not all my amendments were taken on board, and I was not consulted on the final version. I made it clear that I would not co-sign it, not just because of my recent position, but because I disagreed with some of it: it was unfairly confrontational and offered no alternative way forward.

Of course there is controversy over Iraq, and policy should be openly debated. But I support the continuation of the British effort to construct a stable and democratic Iraq, and will continue to do what I can to help realise this prospect.

Yours faithfully,
JEREMY GREENSTOCK
 (UK Special Representative in Iraq, September 2003-March 2004),
 12 West Lodge Avenue, W3 9SF. April 29.

Britain and the other sponsors of the road map merely waited on American leadership, but waited in vain.

Worse was to come. After all those wasted months, the international

community has now been confronted with the announcement by Ariel Sharon and President Bush of new policies which are one-sided and illegal and which will cost yet more Israeli and Palestinian blood.

Our dismay at this backward step is heightened by the fact that you yourself seem to have endorsed it, abandoning the principles which for nearly four decades have guided international efforts to restore peace in the Holy Land and which have been the basis for such successes as those efforts have produced.

This abandonment of principle comes at a time when rightly or wrongly we are portrayed throughout the Arab and Muslim world as partners in an illegal and brutal occupation in Iraq.

The conduct of the war in Iraq has made it clear that there was no effective plan for the post-Saddam settlement. All those with experience of the area predicted that the occupation of Iraq by the Coalition forces would meet serious and stubborn resistance, as has proved to be the case.

To describe the resistance as led by terrorists, fanatics and foreigners is neither convincing nor helpful. Policy must take account of the nature and history of Iraq, the most complex country in the region.

(Continued from page 3)

However much Iraqis may yearn for a democratic society, the belief that one could now be created by the Coalition is naive.

This is the view of virtually all independent specialists on the region, both in Britain and in America. We are glad to note that you and the President have welcomed the proposals outlined by Lakhdar Brahimi. We must be ready to provide what support he requests, and to give authority to the United Nations to work with the Iraqis themselves, including those who are now actively resisting the occupation, to clear up the mess.

The military actions of the Coalition forces must be guided by political objectives and by the requirements of the Iraq theatre it-

self, not by criteria remote from them. It is not good enough to say that the use of force is a matter for local commanders. Heavy weapons unsuited to the task in hand, inflammatory language, the current confrontations in Najaf and Falluja, all these have built up rather than isolated the opposition.

The Iraqis killed by coalition forces probably total between ten and fifteen thousand (it is a disgrace that

the Coalition forces themselves appear to have no estimate), and the number killed in the last month in Falluja alone is apparently several hundred including many civilian men,

Times (London) May 1, 2004

The virtues of diplomats' intervention

FROM MR ANDREW STUART

Sir, I am one of the 52 diplomats whom you mock so comprehensively (Andrew Roberts's Comment and leading article, April 28; see also letters April 30 etc). I was not a member of the Camel Corps. I speak Finnish, Luganda and Indonesian, not Arabic. I was ambassador to a country neither big nor small. I left the Foreign Office early to do some of the things of which Andrew Roberts might approve (though I have never tried my hand at the eternal verities of journalism). If I had drafted our round-robin letter, I might have put one or two things differently. I am not against the US as a world policeman and I am glad that our Government thinks it important to stay friends with it.

But I don't see how we can be accused of being cross and cringing at the same time. Britain has weakened the UN and allowed the French to occupy the moral high ground in the Security Council. We have gone to war on a false prospectus. It does not need a degree from Oxbridge to know that Iraq was at best a hotchpotch of ethnicities, spatchcocked together by the Versailles treaty and the SykesPicot agreement.

Helicopter gunships are poor tutors in democracy, whether in Iraq or Palestine. Nor is it sensible for an arbitrator to side openly with one party, as George Bush has done with Ariel Sharon.

Why not try listening to the diplomats instead of mocking them? They are not all stupid.

Yours faithfully,

ANDREW STUART

(Ambassador to Finland, 1980-83),

Long Hall, North Street, Wareham, Dorset BH20 4AG.

April 30.

women and children.

Phrases such as "We mourn each loss of life. We salute them, and their families for their bravery and their sacrifice," apparently referring only to those who have died on the Coalition side, are not well judged to moderate the passions these killings arouse.

We share your view that the British Government has an interest in

working as closely as possible with the United States on both these related issues, and in exerting real influence as a loyal ally. We believe that the need for such influence is now a matter of the highest urgency.

If that is unacceptable or unwelcome there is no case for supporting policies which are doomed to failure.

Yours faithfully,

Sir Brian Barder: Ambassador Ethiopia 82-86; Poland 86-88; High Commissioner in Australia 91-94;

Paul Bergne: Ambassador Afghanistan;

Sir John Birch: Ambassador Hungary 89-95;

Sir David Blatherwick: Ambassador Ireland 91-95; Egypt 95-99;

Sir Graham Boyce: Ambassador Kuwait 96-99; Egypt 99-01;

Sir Julian Bullard: Ambassador Federal Republic of Germany 84-88;

Juliet Campbell: Ambassador Luxembourg 88-91;

Sir Bryan Cartledge: Ambassador Hungary 80-83; USSR 85-88;

Sir Terence Clark: Ambassador Iraq 85-89; Oman 90-94;

David Colvin: Ambassador Belgium 96-01;

Francis Cornish: Ambassador Israel 98-01;

Sir James Craig: Ambassador Syria 76-79 and Saudi Arabia 79-94;

Sir Brian Crowe: Ambassador Austria 89-92; Basil Eastwood: Ambassador Syria 96-00; Switzerland 01-03;

Sir Stephen Egerton: Ambassador Iraq 80-82; Saudi Arabia 86-89; Italy 89-92;

William Fullerton: Ambassador Somalia 83-87; Kuwait 92-96; Morocco and Mauritania 96-99;

Dick Fyjis-Walker: Ambassador Sudan 79-84; Pakistan 84-87;

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 2)

millions from Turkey for the jobs that Germans no longer cared to do. By 1960, Germany had already overtaken Britain to become Europe's richest country and even in Italy *la dolce vita* was back in full swing.

Now consider Eastern Europe today. The ten new EU members will account for 25 per cent of Europe's population but only 5 per cent of its GDP. Estimates of how long it will take their living standards to catch up with the present EU average range from 15 years to 50 or more.

To acknowledge that Eastern Europe's gratitude towards the West will be tinged with resentment is not to suggest that the EU is to blame for the absence of a German-style economic miracle.

Although it is true that countries such as Poland and Hungary initially found Western markets closed to some of their most competitive products and received far less financial support in real terms than Germany and Italy did under the Marshall Plan, these are not the main reasons for their exasperatingly slow economic progress. Internal economic mismanagement, political turmoil and corruption are more important causes of disappointing performance.

Perhaps most important was the lack of industrial infrastructure and managerial skills. Poland and Hungary never had their Siemens, Krupps, Volkswagens, Mitsubishis or even Fiats, capable of being transformed into globally-competitive powerhouses. In

many ways, therefore, the situation in Eastern Europe in 1989 was far more difficult than it was for Germany, Italy and Japan in 1945.

But my main point in comparing Eastern Europe today with Germany in 1960 is not to cast aspersions on what has been achieved since the Cold War ended. It is to try to understand the impact of enlargement on Europe, not just in terms of lofty historic and cultural aspirations, but also through the bread-and-butter issues which dominate politics and public life.

In many of the new member countries, enlargement could produce an even deeper disillusionment with the EU, since most of the economic benefits of joining have already accrued, while the costs will start to be paid only next week.

As candidate countries they enjoyed almost a decade of unfettered access to EU markets and big inflows of capital from multinational companies eager to use them as a low-cost base. Foreign investment peaked in most of the accession countries two to three years ago and several are now seeing a reversal of capital flows. Ironically, the decline in foreign investment is partly a consequence of the move to full EU membership.

Companies in the accession countries will now be subject to the full panoply of EU environmental and labour regulations and the prospect of rapidly rising wages and social costs.

Thus industries, such as textiles and footwear, where investment is driven

mainly by the search for low wages are relocating to the next wave of candidate countries — Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia and eventually Turkey — to keep their access to EU markets without the regulatory and social costs.

To make matters worse for the accession countries, taxes will have to be raised and public services cut to comply with the Stability Pact and interest rates may need to be kept very high if inflation is to be squeezed down to the artificially low levels required for eurozone membership.

While some of these painful adjustments will be beneficial in the long run, they are likely to exacerbate a populist backlash against the EU.

Meanwhile the only tangible benefits of full membership — the free movement of labour, the agricultural subsidies and the cohesion transfers — have been denied. Eastern Europeans will have the right to work only in Britain, Ireland and maybe Sweden and the Netherlands.

All other EU countries will deny them employment rights for up to seven years. Agricultural subsidies to Eastern Europe's farmers will remain a fraction of those paid to existing members and the net flows of money from cohesion funds will be derisory after the budget contributions which new members start paying on Saturday are taken into account. (...) (t,m)

THE TIMES

ANATOLE KALETSKY

APRIL 29, 2004 ■

Protest 52

Bezprecedensowym wydarzeniem w Anglii był ogłoszony 26.4.04 protest elity dyplomacji brytyjskiej przeciwko prowadzonej przez premiera Blaira polityce na Bliskim Wschodzie. „Z rosnącym zaniepokojeniem obserwujemy politykę wobec Iraku i w kwestii konfliktu izraelsko-palestyńskiego” – podkreśla 52 byłych ambasadorów i innych wysokich funkcjonariuszy rządu JKM (*pełny tekst listu zob. str. 3*).

Za poważny błąd sygnatariusze protestu uważają odstąpienie przez USA – i Wielką Brytanię – od realizacji planu pokojowego znanego pod nazwą „mapy drogowej”, bowiem tego rodzaju

polityka „nieuchronnie prowadzi do klęski”.

Były minister spraw zagranicznych Robin Cook, który ustąpił z gabinetu Tony Blaira na znak protestu przeciwko atakowi na Irak, stwierdził w wywiadzie telewizyjnym dla Kanału 4, że prezydent Bush – jednostronnym poparciem dla izraelskich planów aneksji części terytoriów okupowanych – złamał porozumienie, że w zamian za brytyjską akceptację inwazji Iraku realizować będzie ową „mapę drogową”

Na rysunku satyrycznym w Timesie dyskutuje dwóch dżentelmenów: „Patrz, krytykują naszą politykę na Bliskim Wschodzie”. A na to drugi: „A to my mamy jakąś politykę bliskowschodnią?”. (m) ■

US diplomats blast Middle East policy of President Bush

Full text of diplomats' letter to George W Bush

Dear Mr President:

We former US diplomats applaud our 52 British colleagues who recently sent a letter to Prime Minister Tony Blair criticising his Middle East policy and calling on Britain to exert more influence over the United States.

As retired foreign service officers we care deeply about our nation's foreign policy and US credibility in the world.

We also are deeply concerned by your April 14 endorsement of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's unilateral plan to reject the rights of three million Palestinians, to deny the right of refugees to return to their homeland, and to retain five large illegal settlement blocs in the occupied West Bank.

This plan defies UN Security Council resolutions calling for Israel's return of occupied territories.

It ignores international laws declaring Israeli settlements illegal.

It flouts UN Resolution 194, passed in 1948, which affirms the right of refugees to return to their homes or receive compensation for the loss of their property and assistance in resettling in a host country should they choose to do so.

And it undermines the Road Map for peace drawn up by the Quartet, including the US. Finally, it reverses longstanding American policy in the Middle East.

Your meeting with Sharon followed a series of intensive negotiating sessions between Israelis and Americans, but which left out Palestinians.

In fact, you and Prime Minister Sharon consistently have excluded Palestinians from peace negotiations.

Former Palestinian Information Minister Yasser Abed Rabbo voiced the overwhelming reaction of people around the world when he said: "I believe President Bush declared the death of the peace process today".

By closing the door to negotiations with Palestinians and the possibility of a Palestinian state, you have proved that the United States is not an even-handed peace partner.

You have placed US diplomats, civilians and military doing their jobs overseas in an untenable and even dangerous position.

Your unqualified support of Sharon's extrajudicial assassinations, Israel's Berlin Wall-like barrier, its harsh military measures in occupied territories, and now your endorsement of Sharon's unilateral plan are costing our country its credibility, prestige and friends.

It is not too late to reassert American principles of justice and fairness in our relations with all the peoples of the Middle East.

Support negotiations between Palestinians and Israelis, with the United States serving as a truly honest broker.

A return to the time-honored American tradition of fairness will reverse the present tide of ill will in Europe and the Middle East - even in Iraq.

Because the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is at the core of the problems in the Middle East, the entire region - and the world - will rejoice along with Israelis and Palestinians when the killing stops and peace is attained.

Published May 4 2004 (ft,m) ■

(Continued from page 4)

Sir Marrack Gouling: Ambassador Angola 83-85; Under Secretary General, Special Political Affairs, UN, New York;

Sir John Graham: Ambassador Iraq 74-77; Iran 79-80; UK Permanent Representative to Nato, 82-86;

Sir Andrew Green: Ambassador Syria 91-94; Saudi Arabia 96-00;

Vic Henderson: Ambassador Yemen 97-01;

Peter Hinchcliffe: Ambassador Kuwait 87-90; Jordan 93-97;

Brian Hitch: High Commissioner to Malta 88-91;

Sir Archie Lamb: Ambassador Kuwait 74-77; Norway 78-80;

Sir David Logan: Ambassador Turkey 97-01;

Christopher Long: Ambassador Switzerland 88-92; Egypt 92-95; Hungary 95-98;

Ivor Lucas: Ambassador Syria 82-84; Assistant Secretary-General Arab-British Chamber of Commerce 85-87;

Ian McCluney: Ambassador Somalia 89-90; High Commissioner, Sierra Leone 93-97;

Maureen MacGlashan: Ambassador Holy See 95-98;

Philip McLean: Ambassador Cuba 94-98;

Sir Christopher McRae: High Commissioner Pakistan 94-97;

Oliver Miles: Ambassador Libya 84; Luxembourg 85-88; Greece 93-96;

Martin Morland: Ambassador Burma 86-90; UK Permanent Representative to UN and other international organisations, Geneva, 90-93;

Sir Keith Morris: Ambassador Colombia 90-94;

Richard Muir: Ambassador Oman 94-99; Kuwait 99-02;

Sir Alan Munro: Ambassador Algeria 84-87; Saudi Arabia 89-93; Stephen Nash:

Ambassador Georgia, 95-98; Albania 98-99; Latvia 99-02;

Robin O'Neill: Ambassador Austria 86-89; Belgium 89-92;

Andrew Palmer: Ambassador Cuba 86-88; Holy See 91-95;

Bill Quantrell: Ambassador Republic of Cameroon, Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Chad 91-95;

Sir David Ratford: Ambassador Norway 90-94;

Sir Tom Richardson: Ambassador Italy 1996-2000;

Andrew Stuart: Ambassador Finland 80-83;

David Tatham: Ambassador Yemen Arab Republic 84-87; Lebanon 90-92; Governor Falklands: 92-96;

Sir Crispin Tickell: Ambassador Mexico 81-83;

Derek Tonkin: Ambassador Vietnam 80-82; Thailand 86-89;

Charles Treadwell: Ambassador: UAE 71-73; Oman 75-79;

Hugh Tunnell: Ambassador Bahrain 92-95;

Jeremy Varcoe: Ambassador Somalia 87-89;

Sir Harold Walker: Ambassador Bahrain 79-81; UAE 81-86; Ethiopia 86-90; Iraq 90-91;

Sir Michael Weir: Head of Arabian Department 66; Ambassador Cairo 79-85;

Alan White: Ambassador Chile 87-90

April 26, 2004 ■

US diplomats attack Bush

Fifty-three former US diplomats on May 4, 2004 accused the White House of sacrificing America's credibility in the Arab world - and the safety of its diplomats and soldiers - because of the Bush administration's support for the Israeli prime minister, Ariel Sharon.

The strongly worded rebuke, which paid tribute to last week's broadside from 52 former British diplomats against the government's policy in Iraq, marked a rare public display of dissent for state department personnel.

Its central charge that the Bush administration is unfairly tilted towards Mr Sharon as President Bush has gone a step further and, contrary to international law, endorsed a continued Jewish settlement in the occupied West Bank

The last broadside from American diplomats was delivered during the Vietnam war era. It is particularly unusual for US government personnel to criticise policy on Israel.

Unlike the British version, which was scathing of Mr Blair's alliance with Washington in Iraq as well as Israel and the Palestinians, the American diplomats' critique was wholly focused on Middle East policy.

It said Washington had overthrown decades of US diplomatic tradition last month when Mr Bush endorsed a plan for Gaza with no Palestinian involvement. "By closing the door to negotiations with Palestinians and the possibility of a Palestinian state, you have proved that the US is not an even-handed peace partner. You have placed US diplomats, civilians and military doing their jobs overseas in an untenable and even dangerous position," the letter says.

It goes on to accuse the Bush administration of "unabashed support" for Israel's strategy of assassinating Palestinian leaders and military operatives, and urges Washington to change course. "A return to the time-honoured American tradition of fairness will turn the present tide of ill will in Europe and the Middle East - even in Iraq," it adds.

The letter, which was initiated by a former ambassador to Qatar, Andrew Killgore, was endorsed mainly by those who had served for years in Arab countries. Supporters include the former ambassadors to India, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Egypt. The petition was also endorsed by two recent rebels against the Bush administration policy: John Brady Kiesling, who resigned last year in protest against the war, and Greg Thielmann, an intelligence analyst who accused Washington of distorting information on Iraqi weapons programmes. (g,m) ■

MONITOR

International Edition

“Wszyscy żyjemy pod tym samym niebem, ale nie każdy z nas widzi ten sam horyzont” (Konrad Adenauer)

Listy, Letters, Lettres, Briefe

Za chlebem

Fala narastała wyraźnie już od miesiący. Teraz w Londynie trudno się już gdziekolwiek poruszyć, aby nie usłyszeć polskiej mowy. Nikt dokładnie nie wie ilu jest nowych przybyszów z Polski. Ich liczbę szacuje się na „kilkaset tysięcy”. Może 200 tysięcy, może nawet ćwierć miliona. A może jeszcze więcej.

Stara emigracja wojenna patrzy na nich bokiem. Żadna z organizacji polonijnych nie zaoferowała się z jakąkolwiek pomocą dla mas zdezorientowanych młodych ludzi tułających się po stolicy Anglii.

Co bardziej „zasłużeni działacze polonijni” są bowiem bardzo zajęci. Kolejnymi „balami emigracji”, zebraniami organizacji polonijnych (obecnie już niemal bez członków) i przyjęciami w Ambasadzie RP z okazji przyjęcia Polski do Unii Europejskiej.

W londyńskiej dzielnicy Ealing, zamieszkałej przez wielu Polaków, zorganizowano wielką (w założeniu) imprezę wręczenia przez polską telewizję Polonia nagród dla „wybitnych w krzewieniu polskości” działaczy. Bilety wstępu po £20. Ani jednego nowego przybysza (który z nich miałby do stracenia taką sumę). Sala do połowy świeciła pustkami.

Zbudowany przez emigrację wojenną w latach 60. Polski Ośrodek Społeczno-Kulturalny (POSK) w londyńskiej dzielnicy Hammersmith jest oblegany przez setki ludzi z Polski chcących uzyskać jakieś informacje, ale działacze polonijni nie mają dla nich ani czasu, ani środków finansowych na udzielenie jakiegokolwiek pomocy.

Fundusz powierniczy PAFT (Polonia Aid Foundation Trust) dysponuje wprawdzie sumą około 2,5 miliona funtów, ale wydawana jest ona wyłącznie na potrzeby własne, zaś największą jednorazową dotację w wysokości 70 tysięcy

We welcome letters and contributions from our readers preferably by email to:
elamco@dsl.pipex.com

Listy i artykuły od naszych czytelników nadsyłane najlepiej pocztą elektroniczną email na ww. adres są zawsze mile widziane.

funtów Fundusz przyznał planowanemu w przyszłości Muzeum Zagłady Żydów w Warszawie. Na pomoc dla nowych imigrantów z Polski nie przeznaczył jak dotąd nawet złamanego grosza. Podobnie Stowarzyszenie Polskich Kombatantów, dysponujące również znacznymi funduszami.

Media angielskie podają, że poczynając od 1 maja codziennie przybywa z Polski do Anglii kilkadziesiąt autobusów (około 1 tysiąca osób dziennie) z Polakami liczącymi na znalezienie w Anglii jakiejś pracy.

Na fali bezrobotnych z Polski, podobnie jak na każdej fali, unoszą się na wierzchu często różne męty. W budynku POSK doszło już do krwawej bijatyki. Musiała interweniować policja. Niektórzy z przybyłych dziwią się, że w angielskich biurach pośrednictwa pracy (job centres) urzędnicy nie rozumieją co się do nich mówi po polsku. Ich zdaniem mieszkający od dawna w Anglii Polacy powinni pełnić tam bezinteresownie funkcje tłumaczy. I nni domagają się przyznania im natychmiast mieszkań kwaterunkowych i bezpłatnego umieszczenia dzieci w prywatnych szkołach, bo „angielskie szkolnictwo państwowe stoi na niskim poziomie”.

Są również głosy chwalcące zatrudnionych tu od niedawna Polaków za pracowitość. Władze twierdzą, że sytuacja „jest pod kontrolą”. Na wyspach jest pół miliona wolnych miejsc pracy. Panuje przekonanie, że po pierwszym szoku dla obu stron sytuacja się jednak unormuje, a męty odpłyną.

Niewielu tylko ma czas na refleksję, że zjednoczenie Europy dla wielu Polaków oznacza już tylko możliwość znalezienia w końcu legalnej pracy i wyrwania się z Polski, w której, mimo ucieczki – jak się szacuje – około miliona młodych ludzi, bezrobocie nadal oscyluje w granicach 20% i jest najwyższe w całej Unii Europejskiej. (m) ■

◆◆ GŁOSY | ODGŁOSY ◆◆ GŁOSY | ODGŁOSY ◆◆ GŁOSY ◆◆ GŁOSY | ODGŁOSY ◆◆ GŁOSY | ODGŁOSY ◆◆ GŁOSY |

Times (London) April 8, 2004

Sir, You report that President Bush has accused Moqtada al-Sadr of “seeking to determine Iraq’s future through force”.

What has Mr Bush been trying to achieve over the past year?

Yours faithfully,

COLIN PARSONS,
Hastings, East Sussex TN34 1TY.
col.par@btinternet.com

* * * *

Times (London) April 19, 2004

Deteriorating security in Iraq

From Professor Sir Timothy Garden and others

Sir, We watch the deteriorating security situation in Iraq with deep sadness.

The coalition forces should have only one purpose: to promote the rule of law in a chaotic post-conflict environment. The military must not themselves be above the law; we learnt that lesson in our own prolonged counter-insurgency operation in Northern Ireland.

British soldiers are not naturally more restrained than their American cousins. Hard training and discipline have instilled into them the importance of working within the constraints of normal civilian law when trying to build trust with the community.

If we seek to bring democracy to Iraq, the rule of law should come first; and coalition forces must be just as subject to it as are the ordinary citizens. This means that often a direct military response will be disallowed in favour of a more peaceable solution of a police nature.

This is always a hard lesson for the military to learn. The Northern Ireland peace process would not have been helped by the use of attack helicopters against IRA strongholds. Israel degrades its security with each use of excessive force in Gaza Likewise, bombing mosques or strafing houses makes any settlement in Iraq more difficult to achieve.

We strongly believe that all forces in Iraq should be required forthwith to act within the confines of normal civil le-

gal rules. After power is transferred on June 30, any agreement on the status of foreign forces with the new transitional government must require that the military operate within the law.

Yours,

TIMOTHY GARDEN
(Assistant Chief of Defence Staff, 1992-94),
JOHN STANIER
(Chief of the General Staff, 1982-85),
BRYAN THWAITES,
HAROLD WALKER
(Ambassador to Iraq, 1990-91),
Centre for Defence Studies, London

* * * *

Times (London) April 19, 2004

Sir, Many Arabs delight in their desert heritage, where poetry and good conversation were respected. Arabs often circle topics without revealing their true feelings unless in company with trusted friends. Some appear to Westerners to be incapable of taking and holding a position.

There are two exceptions: Islam, and Palestine. The latter is a unique Arab rallying point. Its power to arouse Arab solidarity is just beginning to be recognised by Westerners.

Nothing (Islam apart) comes close in terms of focusing instant, public and vociferous agreement across the diversity of the Arab world than the need for a secure and recognised Palestinian state, preferably at peace with its Israeli cousins. No other matter joins Arabs more quickly than the imbalance of international, mainly American, support for Middle East UN resolutions that cite Israel and Palestine.

It is Palestine, not Iraq, where American courage is needed now. If President Bush were to establish Palestine, I believe almost everything else would fall into place.

Yours faithfully,
JEREMY WILLIAMS,
(Defence Attaché, Abu Dhabi, 1989–92, Bahrain, 1992),

* * * *

Times (London) April 27, 2004

Sir, Mr Stuart Bonar (letter, April 26) is so right in his assertion that, unlike previous generations, young Britons today do not have to march off to war on the Continent. Now they just march off to war in other continents.

Yours faithfully,
CYRIL N. COWLEY,
Stockton-on-Tees

* * * *

Times (London) April 29, 2004

Sir, The easing of US economic sanctions against Libya (In brief, later editions, April 24) has not included arms exports, presumably because Libya remains on the US list of states that allegedly sponsor terrorism.

Since Ariel Sharon has now threatened to assassinate Yassir Arafat (report, same day), presumably all US arms exports to Israel will be banned forthwith. Or does terrorism against Arabs simply not count?

Yours faithfully,
Dr RUPERT READ,
School of Economic and Social Studies, University of East Anglia,
Norwich

* * * *

Times (London) April 29, 2004

From Professor Sir Bryan Thwaites

Sir, You assert (leading article, April 26) that Israel is “a country that . . . abides by the rule of law”.

Then Mr Mordechai Vanunu’s abduction was lawful. So was the recent assassination of a Palestinian leader. So is the barbaric wall cutting through Palestinian villages, and the settlements. Oh Sir, come on!

Yours faithfully,
BRYAN THWAITES,
A13 Albany, Piccadilly W1J 0AL.
bryan.thwaites@btopenworld.com

* * * *



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 20 March 2003, the USA, the UK and supporting nations (“the coalition”) commenced a full-scale military invasion of Iraq.

The invasion was sought to be justified by the perceived threat of Iraq’s alleged weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and the need for Iraq to comply with various UN Security Council Resolutions relating to disarmament, dating back to November 1990.

The invasion lasted until 1 May 2003 and various methods of attack and weapon systems were used that caused significant civilian casualties. Current estimates suggest that at least 20,000 civilians were injured and over 8,000 were killed during the hostilities.

Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), other groups and individual politicians from around the world have expressed numerous serious concerns about the number of civilian casualties and about the weapons and methods of warfare used by the coalition forces in the light of clear obligations under international humanitarian law.

These concerns are intensified in the light of the wide-ranging definitions of “crimes against humanity” and “war crimes” in Articles 7 and 8 of the Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court (ICC Statute).

Various NGOs and groups in the UK, USA, Canada and elsewhere sought to establish by means of an independent inquiry whether, in

the light of available evidence about the attacks, crimes against humanity and war crimes have been committed.

REPORT OF THE INQUIRY INTO THE ALLEGED COMMISSION OF WAR CRIMES BY COALITION FORCES IN THE IRAQ WAR DURING 2003

Fully respecting these initiatives, an independent panel of eight leading academic international lawyers accordingly met in London on 8 and 9 November 2003.

The Panel heard oral evidence from eye-witnesses and expert witnesses, were presented with two volumes of written evidence and were assisted by written and oral submissions by Leading and Junior Counsel to the Inquiry.

After due deliberation during the Inquiry and afterwards, the Panel made certain findings, which are presented in this report.

It should be stressed that it was not the Panel’s function to determine the legality of the war or whether those responsible for alleged war crimes should be prosecuted. Its function was limited to providing an answer to the following question:

‘Is there sufficient cause and evidence for the International

Criminal Court Prosecutor to investigate members of the UK Government for breaches of the ICC Statute in relation to crimes against humanity and/or war crimes committed during the Iraq conflict and occupation 2003?’

The Panel has answered this question in the affirmative. (...)

It has analysed evidence concerning various matters, including the employment of weapon systems using depleted uranium, damage to civilian infrastructure and in particular

electricity supplies, the conduct of the occupation and the preservation of the cultural heritage of Iraq. (...)

The matters to be investigated should include (...) circumstances in which the USA may have led attacks that involve the commission of war crimes (...) attacks on the media, (...) attacks launched on locations or means of transport, which were not “military objectives”, causing civilian casualties in breach of provisions of International Criminal Court, given the use of sub-munitions (“cluster bombs”) in urban areas by UK forces was such use prohibited under the ICC Statute (...) etc.

[Monitor was represented at this Conference held at the London School of Economics and will gladly send a full 34-page copy of the report by email on request]

(o,m) ■

Greetings, America. My Name is Osama bin Laden.

Po zamachu bombowym w Madrycie, Osama bin Laden w taśmie dźwiękowej ogłoszonej przez stacje arabskie zaproponował krajom zachodnim (z wyjątkiem USA), że odstąpi od ich atakowania jeżeli zaprzestaną one działań przeciwko krajom arabskim.

Było to powtórzenie założeń strategii, omówionej szerzej w wywiadzie udzielonym w roku 1999 amerykańskiemu miesięcznikowi Esquire:

By John Miller

[February 1999, Volume 131, Issue 2](#)

http://www.esquire.com/features/articles/2001/010913_mfe_binladen_9.html

(...) For the future, bin Laden told me his first priority is to get the American military out of Saudi Arabia, the holiest of lands in Islam. "Every day the Americans delay their departure, they will receive a new corpse." (...)

Civilians?

"We do not differentiate between those dressed in military uniforms and civilians; they are all targets in this *fatwa*." Bin Laden argued that American outrage at attacks on American civilians constitutes a great double standard.

Bin Laden believes that what we consider to be terrorism is just the amount of violence required to get the attention of the American people. His aim is to get Americans to consider whether continued support of Israel is worth the bloodshed he promises.

"So we tell the Americans as people," bin Laden said softly, "and we tell the mothers of soldiers and American mothers in general that if they value their lives and the lives of their children, to find a nationalistic government that will look after their interests and not the interests of the Jews. The continuation of tyranny will bring the fight to America, as Ramzi Yousef and others did. This is my message to the American people: to look for a serious government that looks out for their interests and does not attack others, their lands, or their honor. And my word to American journalists is not to ask why we did that but ask what their government has done that forced us to defend ourselves." (...)

(Pełny tekst wywiadu znaleźć można pod wskazanym wyżej adresem lub wpisując do wyszukiwarki Google słowa: Esquire Osama bin Laden) (esq,m) ■

SAMI SWOI

Rząd brytyjski zaniepokoił się, że wszystkie kontrakty na odbudowę Iraku zgarniają wielkie korporacje amerykańskie i postanowił podjąć środki zaradcze.

Stosowana przez Amerykanów metoda jest prosta. Najpierw prezydent Bush występuje do Kongresu o środki na „odbudowę Iraku”. Najnowsza transza to ponad 80 miliardów dolarów. Z kolei prezydent ogłasza „przetarg”, do którego dopuszczone zostają tylko firmy amerykańskie, dziwnym zbiegiem okoliczności najczęściej powiązane z wiceprezydentem lub innymi notablami obecnej administracji waszyngtońskiej...

Rząd Tony Blaira uznał, że takiemu sojusznikowi jak on należy się więcej i z misją lobbingu do Waszyngtonu udali się wiceprezident spraw zagranicznych Mike O'Brien, oraz specjalny wysłannik rządu brytyjskiego ds. handlu Brian Wilson.

Przed kamerami Serwisu Światowego telewizji BBC wystąpił dr Isam Khafaji, dyrektor działającej w Iraku pozarządowej organizacji Iraq Revenue Watch, mówiąc o marnotrawstwie i nadużyciach przy kontraktach irackich. Stwierdził on, że wielkie korporacje amerykańskie, dzięki kontaktom w Waszyngtonie, przechwytyują za nic ciężkie pieniądze amerykańskiego podatnika.

Udział tych rekinów amerykańskiego big biznesu praktycznie ogranicza się do zagwarantowania sobie lukratywnego kontraktu, którego same nie zamierzają bynajmniej wykonywać, gdyż jego realizację przekazują firmom irackim za 1/6 ceny kontraktowej. Dla siebie za tę „usługę” zatrzymują 5/6. „To skandal” – nie mógł powstrzymać się od okrzyku dziennikarz BBC. Irakijczyk nie zaprzeczył... (b,t,m) ■

„What the f*** are we doing here?”

Taktyka zmasowanego odwetu przeciwko Irakijczykom, których Amerykanie traktują jak „podludzi” (subhumans) budzi sprzeciw dowództwa wojsk brytyjskich w Iraku – pisała w połowie kwietnia br. prasa brytyjska powołując się na wypowiedź anonimowego wysokiego oficera brytyjskiego.

Neokonserwatywny londyński dziennik Daily Telegraph, znany z udzielania pełnego poparcia dla ataku na Irak, zastanawiał się 11.4.04 nad celowością dalszego pobytu wojsk brytyjskich w tym kraju (‘What the hell are we doing there and how the hell can we get out?’).

Do Iraku swego przedstawiciela wysłał również dziennik Times. Przybywszy do Basry rozklekotanym pociągiem z Bagdadu Matthew Parris, który w Timesie ma

stałą popularną rubrykę, zdumiał się zastaną sytuacją.

„Między bajki można włożyć – pisze Parris – opowieści jakimi karmią nas media o pełnej kontroli w brytyjskiej strefie okupacyjnej. Względny spokój, który może w każdej chwili prysnąć, to wynik chwiejnego porozumienia z miejscowymi przywódcami szyickimi, a żołnierze brytyjscy siedzą cicho schowani za wysokimi umocnieniami z worków z piaskiem”. [Okazało się, że Parris miał dobre wycucie sytuacji, którą relacjonował uczciwie. Już 2 tygodnie później w strefie brytyjskiej wybuchły krwawe walki.]

Przy odlocie ostrzegano go, że z uwagi na liczne posterunki wokół lotniska, przyjdzie mu czekać około trzech godzin na dotarcie do terminalu. Ale kierowca iracki bez wahania ominął warty i kolejki i niezatrzymywany przez

nikogo wjechał przez bramę z napisem „Tylko dla wojskowych”.

I kiedy nieoznakowany samolot Fokker Jordańskich Linii Lotniczych, jedynych linii utrzymujących regularne połączenie z Bagdadem, stromym korkociągiem wzbijał się w górę i dopiero na wysokości 5 tysięcy stóp, gdzie nie groziło mu już zestrzelenie, wyszedł poza obręb lotniska i skierował się w stronę Ammanu, dziennikarz angielski zaczął wspominać poznaną w pociągu iracką rodzinę, której nie będzie mógł wystać zdjęć, bo w Iraku nie działa poczta, i powtarzał sobie pytanie, jakie widział na twarzach brytyjskich żołnierzy.

Pytanie, z którego redakcja Timesa zrobiła wielki tytuł biegnący przez pełne dwie strony: „Co my tu robimy do k**** nędzy?” („What the f*** are we doing here?”). (t,dt,m) ■

MONITOR is an independent international news monthly published by Elamco Limited, 71 Avalon Road, London W13 0BB. Archive copies in Adobe Acrobat 5.0 PDF format are available free of charge from our website at: www.elamco.strayduck.com

Subscribers receive their copies by email on the day of publication. Archive copies are available a week later. A single copy by subscription is £1 or €1.50 or \$1.50. Please order your subscription in 10-issue intervals (min 20 issues) and make your cheques payable to Elamco Ltd. Remember: Monitor is YOUR paper. It cannot exist without YOUR support.

our email address



elamco@dsl.pipex.com



nasz adres email

MONITOR to niezależny miesięcznik informacyjny poświęcony sprawom międzynarodowym w polskim kontekście i wydawany przez spółkę prawa angielskiego Elamco Ltd, 71 Avalon Road, London W13 0BB. Kopie archiwalne dostępne są bezpłatnie z naszej witryny internetowej pod adresem:

www.elamco.strayduck.com

Prenumeratory otrzymują swój egzemplarz emailem w dniu publikacji (zwykle w niedzielę), zaś kopie archiwalne umieszczane są na naszej witrynie internetowej tydzień później. Pojedynczy egzemplarz w subskrypcji kosztuje £1 lub €1,50 lub \$1,50. Prosimy składać zamówienia na prenumeratę czekiem wystawionym na Elamco Ltd w odcinkach co 10 numerów (min. 20 numerów). Pamiętaj: Monitor to TWOJE pismo. Bez TWEGO wsparcia istnieć nie będzie.