


# IRAQ: THE DRUMS OF WAR

## *Introduction*

### **Focus**

The United States has been actively agitating for decisive action against Saddam Hussein and the Baa'th Party of Iraq for several months. The world has become polarized on this issue, leading to an impasse in the UN and in NATO. Canada has maintained a somewhat ambivalent middle position, deploring the past excesses of Saddam Hussein, yet refraining from committing to decisive military action.

 Sections marked with this symbol indicate content suitable for younger viewers.

Since September 11, 2001, U.S. President George W. Bush and the people of the United States have become acutely aware of the cost of terrorism and the price of freedom. As the last great superpower, the U.S. has taken upon itself the challenge of controlling the activities of terrorists around the world. Bush's statement condemning all terrorists and those who support them led to the attack against the Taliban in Afghanistan and also led to the current clash with Iraq. From the perspective of the U.S. president, the potential danger of allowing regimes like Saddam Hussein's to exist requires decisive and immediate action.

As an aftermath to the Gulf War of 1991, Iraq was required to destroy its weapons of mass destruction (WMD)—nuclear, biological, and chemical—and to permit regular inspections by UN-sponsored teams. Over time Saddam rebuffed the inspectors and cloaked his interior military activities in secrecy. This was unacceptable to the U.S. and eventually led to the current situation.

Unfortunately, this shroud of secrecy allowed Saddam several years to do as he pleased regarding disarmament. He claims that he did as required and destroyed his weapons of mass destruction. However, the U.S. administration believes he chose to hide these weapons and that he has the ability to use them in a future conflict.

In November 2002 the United Nations passed Resolution 1441, demanding that Iraq permit unconditional access to weapons inspectors and that Saddam disarm immediately. Failure to comply would result in serious consequences. Weapons inspectors led by

Hans Blix were permitted to begin their work. Over the next few months these inspectors were allowed to enter numerous weapons areas. They found little of consequence. They did, however, feel that they were not truly able to find what they sought. Few scientists would talk to them, and often there were delays before access to a site was given. Blix's first presentation to the UN Security Council described these difficulties, but failed to prove that Iraq was hiding anything. More recent reports from Iraq have been more encouraging.

Colin Powell, the Secretary of State for the United States, presented strong circumstantial evidence that WMDs did exist in Iraq. Much of the world was not so sure. Led by France, Germany, and Russia, a strong opposition to a U.S.-led war began to develop. Since Russia and France are members of the Security Council and have a veto, the United States has been forced to rely heavily on diplomacy to attempt to convince their detractors to change their minds. This has been a difficult task.

Bush has repeatedly declared that if the UN does not support his war against Iraq, he will unilaterally act with a "coalition of the willing." This happened before, in Kosovo. At that time NATO chose to support the U.S. and to act outside the UN. The United States has tried to get NATO to once again support military action, but to no avail this time. Now both NATO and the UN face the prospect of being ignored by the strongest country in the world, making their existence potentially irrelevant.

This crisis has led to a further polarization of the world. In February 2003,

The Security Council is the most powerful body in the UN. There are 15 members of this council, 10 are elected for two-year terms and five are permanent. Each of the five permanent members—China, France, Britain, Russia, and the U.S.— can vote against a motion and nullify it. This is the veto. For a resolution to pass, it must have nine “yes” votes and no veto.

several million people around the world, including hundreds of thousands of Canadians, participated in a series of anti-war demonstrations. Even in the United States and in Great Britain (the U.S.’s strongest ally) these demonstrations demanded that the U.S. refrain from war. Canada has indicated that it prefers to go to war only under the umbrella of the UN.

Canada’s military, already stretched beyond its capacity, would be hard-pressed to offer any substantial help to a U.S.-led war. In addition, Prime Minister Chrétien has committed Canadian forces to a future peacekeeping role in Afghanistan. This will make it virtually impossible for any significant Canadian

land force to join the U.S. in Iraq. This does not, however, eliminate the possibility that the Canadian navy might become involved. There is even the chance that a small air force could be made available.

The big questions still remain. Does Iraq illegally have weapons of mass destruction at its disposal? If they exist, is there a real danger that Saddam will use them in some way? Are there ties between Iraq and terrorist organizations? Are people in North America safe? The debate continues while massive troop concentrations gather at the borders of Iraq. In March 2003, the drums of war continued to beat louder.

### Questions for Discussion

1. Is a war between the United States with its allies and the nation of Iraq under the leadership of Saddam Hussein inevitable?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2. If a war does happen without UN approval, what should Canada’s role be? Explain.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# IRAQ: THE DRUMS OF WAR

## Video Review

An EKOS Research Associates poll in February 2003 showed that 63 per cent of Canadians would support a U.S.-led war on Iraq with the support of the UN Security Council. However, only 25 per cent of Canadians would support a war without Security Council clearance.

### Before Viewing

1. Briefly state what you know about the debate over Iraq in the past few months.

---

---

---

2. Why are some weapons called “weapons of mass destruction”?

---

---

3. List your most important questions concerning the crisis with Iraq.

---

---

### During Viewing

1. What reasons does President Bush give to indicate his concern with Iraq and Saddam Hussein?

---

---

2. What two demands does Bush make of Iraq?

---

---

3. Why are the United Nations and NATO in crisis?

---

---

4. By the end of February, what military forces did the U.S. have in the Gulf region?

---

---

5. Who is the chief UN weapons inspector? \_\_\_\_\_

6. According to Donald Rumsfeld, how many of the 19 member countries of NATO are in favour of reinforcing the defences of Turkey?

---

---

7. What evidence is there that the UN Security Council is badly divided over the issue of Iraq?

---

---

8. Millions of people protested the possibility of war in Iraq. Why did one Iraqi expatriate woman fear a war in Iraq despite her disapproval of Saddam Hussein?

---

---

9. What kind of position has Canada's Prime Minister taken regarding a possible war with Iraq?

---

---

10. What compromise position has Canada proposed to the UN Security Council regarding Iraq?

---

---

### **After Viewing**

1. What might be the possible consequences for Canada if it decides not support the United States in a non-UN-sanctioned war in Iraq?

---

---

2. How much value should a government place on the opinions of large groups of protesters? Should these informal bodies be allowed to influence foreign policy decisions? Outline your views in detail.

---

---

3. If you were prime minister of Canada, what would be your position on the issue of war with Iraq? Explain carefully.

---

---

# IRAQ: THE DRUMS OF WAR

## *March to War Timeline*

The period from the bombing of the World Trade Center to the present has been one of tremendous tension, anxiety, and war. As you view these recent milestones on the road to war in Iraq, note what you think are the three most important events and be prepared to explain your choices.

**September 11, 2001** Terrorist attacks on New York's twin towers and the Pentagon. Over 3000 are killed.

**September 12** NATO declares terrorism an attack on all 19 member states.

**September 28** UN Security council passes resolution demanding all nations take action against terrorism.

**October 5** First anthrax death in the U.S. Fear persists for some time.

**October 11** United States and allies (including Canada) begin attacks on Afghanistan to combat the Taliban government and Al Qaeda.

**November 13** Kabul taken from the Taliban.

**January 29, 2002** U.S. State of the Union address names Iraq, Iran, North Korea "axis of evil."

**April 17** Four Canadian soldiers killed in "friendly fire" incident in Afghanistan.

**September 16** Iraq agrees to allow UN weapons inspectors.

**October 10** U.S. Congress authorizes use of force against Iraq.

**October 11** First U.S. troops prepare to leave for possible Gulf conflict.

**October 12** Indonesian discotheque destroyed by terrorist bomb: 182 dead.

**November 8** UN adopts Resolution 1441 demanding compliance of Iraq.

**January 29, 2003** U.S. State of the Union address condemns Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

**February 5** Colin Powell speaks to UN Security Council. Agreement not achieved.

**February 15-16** Massive worldwide anti-war demonstrations against war with Iraq.

**February 28** Nearly 250 000 troops gather in Persian Gulf to prepare for U.S.-led war against Iraq.

**March 2** Turkey refuses to allow its ally the U.S. to launch an attack on Iraq from its soil. Iraq begins crushing some of its banned missiles.

Major Al Qaeda leader captured in Pakistan.

**March 5** France and Russia threaten to use UN veto to defeat U.S. motion for war.

### Question

For the past several months the United States and Great Britain have been pressing for a military solution to the problem of Saddam Hussein and Iraq. Noting the rhetoric during this period, consider the next six weeks and predict what will happen. Develop at least five new entries to the timeline that show the direction you think the world will take with Iraq.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# IRAQ: THE DRUMS OF WAR

## *Hawks and Doves*

### **Did You Know . . .**

A former member of Iraq's nuclear weapons program, Imad Khadduri, now lives in Toronto? Khadduri claims that Iraq simply does not have the expertise or hardware to produce a nuclear bomb.

### **Did You Know. . .**

Several Canadians are in Baghdad to protest a war and are serving as a "human shield" in the hopes of preventing a war? For more information on the Canadian peace movement, visit the site of the Canadian Council of Churches Project Ploughshares at [www.ploughshares.ca](http://www.ploughshares.ca).

### **Hawks**

Throughout the world the issue of a war against Iraq has caused great confusion and polarization. Those on the side of war claim that Saddam Hussein has hidden weapons of mass destruction throughout his country. He has shown a history of a willingness to use these weapons against Iran and against segments of his own people. He has proven that he is willing and able to act aggressively toward his neighbours and continues to maintain an army capable of further aggression. Further, he has consistently refused to accept the rulings of the United Nations following the 1991 Gulf War and remains unrepentant toward the power of the United States. The United States claims that his attitudes lead them to believe he has ties to terrorism, something the U.S. is acutely cautious about since September 11, 2001. This perspective represents the "Hawks."

### **Doves**

On the other hand, there are those who believe that Saddam Hussein is not likely to pose any sort of threat to the

world. They note that Iraq has suffered under a strict embargo since the Gulf War. The people of Iraq lack basic food and medicine; and poverty, even malnutrition, are daily aspects of Iraqi life. While many agree that Saddam is a tyrant, they believe he is well contained and poses no real threat to the outside world. His armies are smaller than 10 years ago, their equipment aging, and the air force well contained by constant allied patrols. They further believe that there is no real tie between Saddam and terrorist organizations, resulting in no real threat to the United States. Many believe that factors other than Saddam's tyranny really drive the road to war. The vast oil reserves of Iraq are a significant prize to any power able to gain control. They suspect that the United States covets these resources and that this is the real reason for their interest in Iraq. Further, they believe that a war against Iraq, with the express purpose of removing Saddam's regime, resembles the use of dynamite to kill a fly. They fear that the real casualties of any war will be the already downtrodden people of Iraq. This perspective represents the "Doves."

### **To Do**

Read each of the following quotes and identify whether it is the view of a hawk or a dove. Following this, using the information gathered, write a statement expressing your personal perspective and identify yourself as either a hawk or a dove.

"As soon as one nation takes preventive action, other countries will naturally do the same. If we go down that road, where are we going?" — French President Jacques Chirac, CBC News Online, September 9, 2002

"The problem here is that there will always be some uncertainty about how quickly he (Saddam) can acquire nuclear weapons. But we don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud." — U.S. National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, CBC News Online, September 9, 2002

“If we have reason to believe someone is preparing an attack against the U. S., has developed that capability, harbours those aspirations, then I think the U. S. is justified in dealing with that, if necessary, by military force.” — U.S. Vice-President Dick Cheney, CBC News Online, September 9, 2002

“The game is over. Saddam Hussein will be stopped. Saddam Hussein was given a final chance. He is throwing that chance away. The dictator of Iraq is making his choice. Now the nations of the Security Council must make their own. And the United States, along with a growing coalition of nations, is resolved to take whatever action is necessary to defend ourselves and disarm the Iraqi regime. Saddam Hussein will be stopped.” — President George W. Bush, in a *Toronto Star* column by William Walker, February 7, 2003

“The position of Russia is well known. We believe it is unacceptable to adopt a resolution which would automatically grant the right for the start of a war.” — Russian President Vladimir Putin, Reuters, February 28, 2003

“If we show weakness now, if we allow the plea for more time to become just an excuse for prevarication, until the moment for action passes . . . the menace, and not just from Saddam, will grow.

The authority of the UN will be lost, and the conflict, when it comes, will be more bloody.” — British Prime Minister Tony Blair, in a *Toronto Star* column by Olivia Ward, February 16, 2003

“This body (UN) places itself in danger of irrelevance if it allows Iraq to continue to defy its will without responding effectively and immediately. The issue before the U.S. is not how much time we are willing to give the inspectors to be frustrated by Iraqi obstruction, but how much longer we are willing to put up with Iraq’s non-compliance before we as a council, we as a United Nations, say enough, enough.” — U.S. Secretary of State, Colin Powell, *MacLean’s*, February 17, 2003

“‘Holding talks brings positions closer together. . . . We are ready to talk to our colleagues, but we are not ready to fight. We believe that is a bad solution’ (German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder). Schroeder said that the joint stand (with Putin) was a product of ‘our bitter experience of just what war means.’ He believed the standoff could be resolved peacefully. . . . ‘I don’t want to speculate on the percentage odds, but I still hope and expect that given goodwill on the part of all sides involved in this process, a peaceful solution can be found.’” — Reuters, February 28, 2003

## Your Personal Perspective

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# IRAQ: THE DRUMS OF WAR

## *Weapons of War*

### Definition

*Asset*, when used in military terms, refers to military personnel and weaponry.

### Did You Know . . .

Although Canada is known as a peaceful nation, it is also a country that has a large arms industry that exported over \$592-million to 66 different countries in 2001? This does not include shipments to the U.S., for which statistics are unknown.

The “coalition of the willing” currently has military assets in the Persian Gulf region from three main countries: the United States, Great Britain, and Australia. These forces are gathering in preparation for a possible war. Some predict this war will commence as early as mid-March. As of March 3, 2003, these forces include the following:

### United States

- 215 000 troops and marines. 100 000 are currently in Kuwait. Ground forces include two armoured divisions equipped with M1A2 Abram tanks.
- Approximately 750 aircraft of all types. Several squadrons of aircraft; fighters, fighter-bombers, ground support aircraft, tankers, supply air transports, B-52 and B-1 bombers.
- Numerous naval forces, including five aircraft carrier task forces with Tomahawk missiles. Currently these are being used to patrol Iraq’s frontier.

### Great Britain

- 26 000 troops of the First UK Armoured Division.
- 7000 aircrew; over 100 fixed-wing aircraft.
- Aircraft carrier task force in Mediterranean Sea.

### To Consider

What appear to be the major strengths and weaknesses of each side in this conflict?

---

---

---

---

---

### Australia

- Small force of highly trained Special Forces troops C/W helicopter transport facilities.
- Approximately 20 aircraft, primarily F/A-18 fighters.
- Two frigates and a transport ship. The frigates are currently serving in the established naval force in the Persian Gulf.

### Iraq

Iraqi forces include the following:

- 375 000 troops divided into two Republican Guard and five regular corps.
- 2 200 main battle tanks (including 900 T-72) and numerous armoured vehicles.
- Supporting these are 350 helicopters for transport and fire support. Anti-aircraft defences include numerous SAM missiles.
- 316 aircraft of all types. Approximately 50% - 60% are serviceable.
- There is no real naval force.
- Scud missiles (quantity unknown).

# IRAQ: THE DRUMS OF WAR

## *The "Arab Street"*

### Further Research

If you speak Arabic, consult newspapers and Web sites covering the Iraq crisis and report your findings back to your class. If you have a friend or family member who can read Arabic, ask them to help you understand points of view expressed in this language.

### Further Research

In order to learn more about Arab views, consider visiting [www.arabicnews.com](http://www.arabicnews.com) or, for the official Iraqi position, try [www.uruklink.net/eindex.htm](http://www.uruklink.net/eindex.htm).

The looming war between the U.S. and its allies and Iraq is seen by some to be more than just another war. Some observers fear the conflict will spread throughout the region and become, as Prime Minister Chrétien warned, a "clash of civilizations." In this scenario, conflict spreads across the world as "Western" and "Muslim" nations take sides. The flame of terrorism, rather than being snuffed out by international effort, may burn brighter as more and more people are drawn into the conflict. It is clear that there is a growing division between the Western and Muslim communities of the world.

News shows now carry commentary

about the "Arab street." This is a term used to identify what is being thought and said in nations with large Muslim populations in and far beyond the borders of Iraq. While many of these nations do not have the same freedom of expression as Canadians enjoy, there is still ample opportunity to listen to the range of opinions expressed on the growing struggle with Iraq. Review the following quotations and indicate whether you agree or disagree with each quote. State the key point for each quote. When completed, write a carefully constructed paragraph noting what you have discovered about the voices from the "Arab street."

### Voices

"America's acting wild. Their leader's comments are the statements of a madman."  
— Syafi Marif, Head of the Muhammadiyah Muslim group in Indonesia, *Toronto Star*, January 31, 2003

Agree \_\_\_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_\_\_ Key Point \_\_\_\_\_

"We are no longer afraid. We are right. It's better to die once and for all after living in humiliation daily from America. We can't take this anymore. We die every day."  
— Khairya Al Enezi, Iraqi woman, *Toronto Star*, December 31, 2002

Agree \_\_\_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_\_\_ Key Point \_\_\_\_\_

"We will die here. We will die in this country and we will maintain our honour, the honour that is required, in front of our people. — Saddam Hussein, President of Iraq, in televised interview with CBS anchor Dan Rather, February 26, 2003

Agree \_\_\_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_\_\_ Key Point \_\_\_\_\_

"Destroy their planes. Burn their tanks. Turn their cannons back upon them." — Imam Thaer Ibrahim Al-Shomari, prayer leader at Iraq's Mother of All Battles mosque, *Toronto Star*, December 31, 2002

Agree \_\_\_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_\_\_ Key Point \_\_\_\_\_

"I have no dreams." — Iraqi girl in film *Generation of Hate*, first screened on CBC's *Witness*, January 23, 2003

Agree \_\_\_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_\_\_ Key Point \_\_\_\_\_

“Programs for weapons of mass destruction are not like an aspirin pill, easily hidden. They require huge facilities, starting from research and development facilities to factories to weaponization, then deployment. Such things cannot be concealed. Inspectors have criss-crossed all of Iraq and have found none of that.”  
— Mohammed Aldouri, Iraqi Ambassador to the UN, February 5, 2003

**Agree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Disagree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Key Point** \_\_\_\_\_

“Weigh all options to save the people of Iraq from death and destruction on an unprecedented scale. To avert a disaster and tragedy for the Iraqi people, Pakistan calls upon President Saddam Hussein to do his utmost, to put the Iraq people first.”  
— Zafarullah Khan Jamali, Prime Minister of Pakistan, *Toronto Star*, February 6, 2003

**Agree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Disagree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Key Point** \_\_\_\_\_

“Let us all work for peace because we are capable of realizing peace if we have the good faith, the determination and the political will. — Mikhail Wehbe, Syrian Ambassador to UN, *Toronto Star*, February 6, 2003

**Agree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Disagree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Key Point** \_\_\_\_\_

“The United States is determined to get rid of weapons of mass destruction at any price.” — Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in *Al-Ittihad*, United Arab Emirates newspaper, Wednesday, January 29, 2003

**Agree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Disagree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Key Point** \_\_\_\_\_

“Fighting should be for Allah only, not to support nationalism or pagan regimes in all the Arab countries, including Iraq.” — Purported tape by Osama bin Laden broadcast on Al-Jazeera television station, February 12, 2003

**Agree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Disagree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Key Point** \_\_\_\_\_

“The enemy has exposed its fangs and is fighting our religion and is doing its best to drive Muslims away from their religion.” — Sheik Abdul-Aziz bin Abdullah Al-al Sheik, leading cleric in Saudi Arabia, *Toronto Star*, February 11, 2003

**Agree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Disagree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Key Point** \_\_\_\_\_

“Among the greatest dangers we face from the war that is expected is foreign domination of Iraq. We affirm our rejection of occupation, hegemony, and domination.” — Abdelaziz al-Hakim-Supreme Council for the Islamic revolution in Iraq, *National Post*, February 27, 2003

**Agree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Disagree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Key Point** \_\_\_\_\_

# IRAQ: THE DRUMS OF WAR

## Document Study

For more information on the current stand Canada's federal political parties have taken on war with Iraq visit their official Web sites at: Bloc Québécois, [www.blocquebecois.org](http://www.blocquebecois.org); Canadian Alliance [www.canadianalliance.ca](http://www.canadianalliance.ca); Liberal Party of Canada, [www.liberal.ca](http://www.liberal.ca); New Democratic Party of Canada, [www.ndp.ca](http://www.ndp.ca); Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, [www.pcparty.ca](http://www.pcparty.ca). The Prime Minister has a Web site at [www.pm.gc.ca](http://www.pm.gc.ca).

### Writing to the Prime Minister of Canada:

E-mail: [pm@pm.gc.ca](mailto:pm@pm.gc.ca)  
Fax: 613-941-6900  
Mail: Office of the Prime Minister, 80 Wellington Street, Ottawa, K1A 0A2

The current crisis with Iraq has been divisive and confusing for Canadians. Most Canadians support the United Nations and reject the leadership of Saddam Hussein. Additionally, most Canadians see the United States as a valued ally and oppose international terrorism. However when it comes to war with Iraq, Canadians appear divided. Should Canada support a U.S.-led war if the Security Council does not? Is Iraq truly a threat to world peace? Is war ever acceptable? These are some of the questions that concern the citizens of Canada. Recently, Prime Minister Chrétien delivered an important speech to Americans.

### Activity

Read the excerpts that follow and then write a letter as your response to the Prime Minister, noting your reactions to his speech.

### NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY PRIME MINISTER JEAN CHRÉTIEN to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations

February 13, 2003  
Chicago, Illinois

I am delighted to be here with you this evening. I want to reflect with you on shared challenges. On how, in a dangerous time, we can advance values cherished by our societies and admired by so many in the rest of the world.

Specifically, I will address three themes underpinning the Canada-United States relationship: being *strong at home*; being *strong in partnership*; and being *strong internationally*.

In my view, the long-term security of our democracies requires us to succeed on each of these fronts.

Note: The following excerpt comes from the third section of the speech. For the full text of the Prime Minister's remarks visit [www.pm.gc.ca](http://www.pm.gc.ca).

### Strong Internationally

This brings me to my third theme: Strong Internationally.

Canadians, like Americans, care about our role in the world. We, like you, faced great dangers in the last century when we came of age, and developed our own perspective and distinctive international personality.

That perspective finds its roots in our history. A G8 country that has never been a colonial power or a superpower. A country that has been an effective broker in the world. A country whose unique perspective allows us to complement you as you exercise your enormous responsibilities in today's world.

We have developed a strong belief in the value of a multilateral approach to global problems. An approach which we believe is more than ever necessary as we face the threats of global terrorism, crime and corruption, environmental damage on a vast scale, and other challenges which cannot be successfully met by one nation, however powerful, acting alone.

Multilateral institutions are essential to managing our evermore integrated world—the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the OAS, NATO, to name a few. The views of Canada and the United States usually converge in these institutions because we share com-

mon values.

This is particularly true as we face a common danger, the danger posed by Saddam Hussein. We see him as a threat to peace in his region. We participated in the Gulf War. We have steadfastly supported UN sanctions.

We recognize and respect the leadership that the United States is showing in forcing Saddam Hussein to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations.

Tomorrow Dr. Blix will tell the world whether Iraq is in compliance with Resolution 1441.

The whole world hopes that Saddam Hussein will act even at this late hour in a way that will spare his people untold suffering. That he will finally act in a manner that demonstrates full compliance with Resolution 1441 of the United Nations. If Saddam Hussein refuses to comply with the wishes of the world community, then the world will respond.

War must always be the last resort, not only because of the human suffering it produces but also because of the inevitable unforeseen consequences. But if it must come to war, I argue that the world should respond through the United Nations. This is the best way to give legitimacy to the use of force in these circumstances.

We must all be concerned about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. And we all fully understand why action is required before it is too late. I argue, however, that the long-term interests of the United States will be better served by acting through the United Nations than by acting alone. Indeed it was the United States which was the prime mover in the creation of the United Nations. And it did so for its own security.

The price of being the world's only

superpower is that its motives are sometimes questioned by others. Great strength is not always perceived by others as benign. Not everyone around the world is prepared to take the word of the United States on faith.

Canada firmly supports the objectives of the United States. We have been close friends and allies for a long, long time. It is essential that the United States can count on support from around the world.

Therefore it is imperative to avoid the perception of a "clash of civilizations." Maximum use of the United Nations will minimize that risk.

And so how the United States acts in the days ahead will have profound consequences for the future. I am convinced that working through the United Nations, if at all possible, as difficult and as frustrating as it sometimes can be, will not only immeasurably strengthen the hand of the United States but also of those around the world who want to support it.

Canada welcomed President Bush's leadership in going to the UN General Assembly. We welcomed the determination shown by the United States in pressing the Security Council to adopt Resolution 1441. We strongly supported a measure that imposed obligations on Iraq where non-compliance would be accompanied by serious consequences.

The world learned a terrible lesson when the League of Nations failed to act against aggression in the 1930s. But we must also remember that the League of Nations was mortally wounded because the United States was not a member.

This is a testing time for the United Nations. A United Nations where the United States is a key player. Where the United States can be very persuasive. I am convinced

that, given a proper chance, the United Nations will fulfil its obligations to the world community. That it will back up its principles with resolve. But it must be given this proper chance. Today's United Nations needs a committed United States. And I would strongly argue the world needs an effective United Nations.

NATO is also an essential player in the current situation. Democratic member countries of NATO have been friends and allies in a common cause for over 50 years. We must continue to come together and work well together in moments of

stress and crisis. This is a difficult time for all countries. I call tonight on our allies not to allow disagreements over means to divide us. All members of NATO must reaffirm our fundamental commitments to the multilateral institutions which have served the world so well since the end of World War Two.

Canada supports prudent planning for contingencies, and supports Turkey's need to take some preparations in case there is a war. This is a reasonable request by a fellow member of NATO, and we encourage other members to unite together behind Turkey.

### Notes

Copy this organizer into your notebook to help you prepare your letter.

Key Point in Speech	Agree/ Disagree	My Reaction/Comments