Presentation by

Paul Heinbecker*

at the

Academy of Legal Studies in Business Annual Conference; Plenary Lunch

Canada, the US, the UN and International Law

Friday August 20, 2004

(check against delivery)

*Paul Heinbecker is Director of the Centre for Global Relations, Governance and Policy at Wilfrid Laurier University and Distinguished Fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation. He recently retired after 38 years with Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs, most recently serving as Ambassador to the United Nations (2000- 2003). This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the institutions above.

It is very nice to speak to an audience comprised mainly, not exclusively, of Americans because we do think that in Ottawa we have something to show you. We are always grateful to the people who come. It is a little bit like preaching to the choir. If you are here, you are already one of the people that we do not need to send the message to. But I think you will have seen that Ottawa is a rather attractive place. We think we have some things to offer. Canada is a little bit like the good son in Tennessee Williams' "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof." The dissolute son Biff is the prodigal son, married to Elizabeth Taylor, and drinks too much. But his father cares only about what happens to Biff. There is another dutiful son who has children, who is taking care of the business, who is doing all of the right things. The father pays no attention to him. That is the way Canadians feel. We are the good son.

I wondered what I could possibly tell a professional audience like this that you would find worthwhile. I will try to make four points: one is the importance of Canada to the United States; second is the significance of U.S. foreign policy to everybody, third the importance of the U.S. rejoining the international community; and finally, the importance of multilateral cooperation. You would expect me to talk about the last in light of my last job in public service as Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations

Probably you have been given background documentation, but there is no doubt that the economic relationship between Canada and the United States is unprecedented. There is no other relationship like it. More trade goes across the Ambassador Bridge, between Detroit and Windsor (that is where the Ambassador Bridge is, the Friendship Bridge is in Buffalo) than comes across the Pacific from Japan. A billion and a half dollars a day, approximately, of business is done. At a time when Americans are worrying about security about what kind of relationship you are going to have in the Middle East, it is good to know that Canada is the U.S.'s major supplier of energy. We are your first supplier of electricity, the first supplier of petroleum products – not Saudi Arabia. So if all else goes wrong, there is still Canada.

I am sure all of you remember the movie "The Invasion of the Body Snatchers. Aliens come and inhabit Americans' bodies and people cannot tell the aliens from the Americans. Well, Canadians are sort of like that. There is such cultural penetration in the U.S. – you know, Peter Jennings, Celine Dion, Shania Twain, Margaret Atwood, Jim Carrey – not John Kerry, Jim Carrey – although John Kerry has a Canadian connection also. He plays ice hockey. You play our hockey, we play your baseball; you play our football, we play your football. President Bush and Prime Minister Chretien, former Prime Minister Chretien, both used the word "family" to describe the relationship at a time when it was in such bad shape that they needed to find some way of explaining why we were so mad at each other.

A word or two about 9/11, and this is, of course, not a joking matter. I lived in New York at the time. I was there. I experienced it. It was a tremendously shocking event. The first thing I did was to gather all my staff together and count noses to be sure that nobody was missing. Seven of my junior officers had been in Windows on the World, the restaurant at the top of the Trade Centre, for dinner the night before. So, I

made sure they all phoned their parents and told them that they were ok. It was an extraordinary day. One of the most extraordinary things that happened – I do not think is well known – is that within 45 minutes of the first plane hitting the twin towers the Canadian government had decided to accept every committed trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific flight bound for the United States. There were two hundred and seventy aircraft, I think, 35,000 people. They were all guided into Canadian airports and there they stayed for a few days, in fact. In places such as Newfoundland and Nova Scotia

None of the 9/11 terrorists came from Canada. I do not know whether everybody is aware of that, but I want to make that really clear – for a variety of reasons. None came from Canada. Regrettably, it has become an urban legend in the US that some of the terrorists came from Canada. None actually did. The New York Times did not print the story of the 250 planes or 270 planes and the 35,000 people until November 17th, approximately, and they did that then only because that was part of a deal when their correspondent covering Canada quit. The correspondent was getting heat from the editorial board to find the story of the terrorists. "They must have come from Canada. Where were these people? Who were these people? What were their connections?" When she could not find it, the Times decided to get somebody who could. So finally her effective parting price was they had to print the story of the aircraft. But that just gives you an idea. I accompanied the Canadian Deputy Prime Minister to the New York Times for an editorial board meeting on the first of December 2001. Even then, the editorial board was still pressing him on the thesis that terrorists came from Canada. Senator Clinton has spoken publicly of terrorists who came from Canada. Lou Dobbs of CNN repeated this legend two years after the fact.. I just wanted you to let you know on this occasion, God save us, they did not come from Canada. Not one.

After 9/11, for the first time since the Korean War, Canadian troops went into combat together with the United States soldiers. I do not think that is well known. Further, the Canadians have been commanding the Kabul ISAF force for the last six months, and we have had about 2,500 – 3,000 soldiers committed to Afghanistan. We have spent $300 million in aid in Afghanistan. Altogether, through military contribution and aid, we have spent more than a billion dollars in Afghanistan in the past couple of years. It has become our number one foreign aid destination. A lot of Canadians might sometimes wonder why, but there are very good reasons for that, not least the importance of bringing stability to the borders of countries armed with nuclear weapons.

In Canada, we took the initiative to create a "Smart Border" with the USA. It may not have been apparent to you when you arrived here how smart it actually is. Imagine what it would be like if we had tried to go ahead with a "Stupid Border." (laughter) We spent $7 Billion to try to make sure that Canada does not become the back door to into United States for terrorists. And I think that, probably, we are succeeding. There are problems, and I would not want to leave anybody with the impression that the problems are all fixed. But we have made a lot of progress in this area in the intervening years.

It is a big relationship and big relationships have problems. There are, nevertheless, surprisingly few problems when you think about the scale. We always have trade problems, and some of you will probably know about them in detail. When I became director of U.S. Relations at the Department of Foreign Affairs, the issue that was most burning at the time was a dispute between Canada and the United States on softwood lumber. This just never goes away, no matter what the regime is that we seem to be working under. Mad cow disease is a current problem with the border being closed on beef.

When you hear me speaking, you can hear a Canadian accent. It sounds close enough to your own if I do not say "about" and "out." We are very similar. Canadians consider themselves pro-American. In fact, with one or two exceptions, we are probably the most pro-American of countries. Something like 70% of Canadians, even during the Iraq war, described themselves as pro-American, even while 70% of them were saying they did not want to get involved in the war and they thought it was a mistake.

But there are some significant differences in values. How significant and how consequential these differences time will tell. One of the biggest differences, that is statistically measurable, is on religion and the amount of attendance at church. I think something like 40 or 50% of Americans consider themselves to be church-goers. And in Canada attendance is not more than 10 or 20%. The churches – I do not want to offend any Canadians here who may be religious – but the churches are largely empty. In fact, I was at dinner last night at a restaurant called "The Church." An entrepreneur had the idea that there are a lot of churches in downtowns that are empty and he could start a chain of restaurants calls "The Church."

If you watched the Michael Moore movie, "Bowling for Columbine," (not the other one), you will realize that we have rather different gun control laws. Maybe you were even asked about it when you came across the border. We have no constitutional amendment permitting the bearing of arms. In fact, some people think that the best defense we have at the border is bears. (laughter) Our constitutional amendment allows us to arm bears. (laughter)

On social programs, you can see a sense of the collective versus the individual. Canadians are very attached to their social programs. Canada is a kind of "middle class land." There are some people who are under the poverty line and there are a few vastly rich people, but generally speaking this is a kind of middle class country.

Finally, and this is getting a little bit more pointed, Canadians do not share the American perception of the benevolence of American foreign policy in the world. I will talk a bit about foreign policy, and that will lead me inevitably to Iraq and the International Criminal Court. I do not think Americans begin to understand – and I do not mean this as a kind of condescension or arrogance – I do not think people understand the extent to which American foreign policy affects other people, other places, almost all the time. The average American is living his or her life not very much affected by foreign policy issues. But that is not the case elsewhere. When Washington wakes up on

the morning, and this is a profound difference, it asks itself what it is going to do with the world, and when the world wakes up in the morning, it asks itself what to do with Washington. U.S. foreign policy has enormous successes – too many to list. World War II, Korea, the defeat of the Soviet Union, the containment of communism, stability now in northeast Asia, the creation of the U.N., the propagation of international law – especially trade law. But it has also had its failures. Iran in the '50's, when Mossadeq was overthrown – a democratically elected leader of Iran – we are still paying for that decision. Viet Nam, Chile, Iraq, Afghanistan. There is a serious gap between the U.S. self-perception and the perception of other people of the U.S.

There are very powerful myths in the United States. Some of them are very constructive myths. But listen to what John Kerry said in his nomination speech: "The USA never goes to war because it wants to. We only go to war because we have to." President Bush said in a Memorial Day ceremony not long ago: "It is not in our nature to seek out wars and conflicts. We only get involved when adversaries have left us no alternative." But if you go down through U.S. history, that is not actually the case. There were the Barbary Wars, the Mexican War, Nicaragua (several times), Spanish American War, the Philippine War, Cuba, Panama, Haiti, Guatemala, Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Cambodia, Grenada and Iraq. Those are just the ones that one could argue were not forced on the US. So there is a gap between how Americans see themselves and how others see the Americans.

The reason I am saying this and I am being so blunt is the Robby Burns observation, that to see yourselves as others see you will save you from many a – I think he called it – foolish notion and blunder. I have been reading Clyde Prestowitz's book "Rogue Nation," because I have to deliver a paper at the American Political Science Association in a couple of weeks' time. I was reading it on the plane on the way up here today, and he goes through all of these things. From the beginning the United States has seen itself, as part of its own mythology – and we all have our mythologies – as apart and, in some important respects, above. You remember Washington and Jefferson and no entangling alliances and so on. With John Winthrop, as the Puritans were landing, he was talking about "the shining city on the hill." President Reagan, again used the term "the shining city." Here I have to say that it pains me a bit to make these observations. I grew up in southern Ontario. I grew up at a time when we watched television out of the air, with the antenna on the roof. We used to watch the American channels. The local football team in Kitchener, Ontario was the Cleveland Browns, and the local baseball team was the Cleveland Indians. Had it not been some kind of patriotic gene, probably the hockey team would have been the Detroit Redwings. It was, for a lot of people, but not for me. Toronto was my team. In any case, we grew up with the American dream, or the Canadian version of the American dream. And we really believed it when we saw the development of international law and the codification of law, the founding of the United Nations - these idealistic principles that were turned into actions.

Now we have come to the International Criminal Court, the land mines treaty, Kyoto. We are finding leadership not by example but by exception. The International Criminal Court – the prospects, the possibilities of that court harming Americans is so

remote as to be almost unimaginable. It is not completely, completely, completely in every circumstance excluded that Americans would be tried. But in any reasonable tally of the pluses and minuses the balance is vastly on the positive side it. It is intended to get at the world's monsters. It is not intended to get at American GI's. It is intended to prosecute the Milosevics and the Pol Pots and the Idi Amins, the Sadaam Husseins. These are the kind of people that the International Criminal Court is after. But we couldn't get the U.S. to join it, and indeed, the U.S. has carried out an active campaign to undermine it, I am sorry to tell you, but that is an actual fact. The U.S. effectively imposed (a very strong-arm tactic) an interpretation of the International Criminal Court statute that turned the meaning inside out. The US did that at the U.N. Security Council with a lot of arm-twisting. It then tried to negotiate exemptions that would apply not only to Americans but to anybody employed by the United States, even Canadians. Everybody would be exempt. I think that that experience – (Kyoto also) – of International Criminal Court came back to haunt the United States on Iraq, because the people who had allowed themselves to be pressed into agreeing on the ICC resolved that on Iraq they were not going to do it again. There is a lot more to it than that, but that is part of it.

There is a steady deprecation of the U.N. – steady deprecation, constant deprecation going on in Washington. I remember one show I watched – it was one of the American neo-cons – talking about these Inspector Clouseaux in the Iraqi desert, a place as big as California. What would they ever find there? And did not the U.N. have any backbone? When was it going to stand up for itself?

We now know the decision-making process on the Iraq war. We have read it now in Woodward's book, and so many other books – Richard Clarke's book. We know that the decision began to be made probably before the administration even came to office, but certainly not very long after 9/11. Here I am speaking to you, and this is going to sound a little aggressive, but I am speaking to you because you need to understand why the US is so unpopular. Ed Djerejian, who was a U.S. ambassador to Syria and a U.S. ambassador to Israel, was asked by the administration to carry out a survey on U.S. public diplomacy, particularly in the Middle East. If you look up his report, the key chapter begins with the sentence: "The bottom has indeed dropped out of support for the United States in the Moslem world." And it has. In some places positive views of the U.S. are in single digits. Secretary Powell came to the United Nations – I was sitting there – a week after he had been in Davos at the World Economic Forum where he got into a debate with the Archbishop of Canterbury, of all people, and he said the United States had earned the trust of every man and woman and child on this earth, "and all we ask is for a little bit of earth in which to bury our soldiers." A week later he went to the Security Council and talked about aluminum tubes, about botulinum toxin (by the way, that is Botox – as some wag said, I think it was Maureen Dowd, there was more Botox on the upper east side of New York than there was in Iraq), he talked about chemical weapons. He related an hour and a half of particulars, none of which have been borne out by subsequent investigations. Nothing. The Secretary of State of the United States, representing the government and people of the United States in the Security Council tried to persuade the world of the case for war. None of what he said turned out to be true.

Vice President Cheney, on March 16th, with Tim Russert on Meet the Press – you can look it up, as they say – said, "We believe that the Iraqis have reconstituted nuclear weapons." The moment that those words left his mouth, people in the White House must have known that that was not accurate. Not even the notorious national intelligence estimate said that was the case. That statement was corrected on September the 7th 2003, when he next appeared on Meet the Press. It could, and should, have been corrected by noon of the same day he said it.

The point I am trying to make is that things have gone seriously awry in US foreign relations. A lot needs to be done to get them back on track. One of the things that I am worried about, to speak very frankly, is that candidate Kerry is saying that he will be able to get the international community to cooperate in Iraq, and that will make it possible to withdraw American forces. I am not so sure. There are many countries who are saying to themselves, as Colin Powell was said to have said at the time, "you broke it, you own it." There are not very many people, even in facing the strategic situation that we are facing – the danger that Iraq is going to become a failed state run by Islamic fundamentalists – not even facing that danger are other governments willing to take their soldiers and put them in harm's way, for a decision that they thought was the wrong decision when the U.S. made it and which they warned against. The Egyptian ambassador – I was present at the time – went up to the Secretary of State on the floor of the Security Council and said, "This is going to last a hundred years if you go ahead with this. Don't think that this is going to be easy. This is going to be terrible." All Things do not get solved on the floor of the Security Council, regretfully, as we all know.

The U.N. and why it matters. I talked about the difference of view on the U.N. The U.N. was made in another age by other people for other problems, but the idea of multilateral cooperation is still indispensable. As we are seeing as a consequence of the Iraq war, you cannot get international approbation of a military act in the face of U.N. opposition. I will contrast two cases: one is the Kosovo case and one is the Iraq case.

In Kosovo, we went to war, (including Canada). The U.N. was left sitting on the sidelines, because the Russians said they were going to veto any UN decisions to go to war over Kosovo. They made it perfectly clear they would veto a resolution to authorize war. We made it perfectly clear that we would not stand by and let the ethnic cleansing continue. And we (NATO) acted. But in that case, if you had been able to take a vote in the U.N., you would have got about 150 or 160 countries out of 190 supporting military action. In fact, Canada thought about taking it to the General Assembly in something called a "Uniting for Peace" resolution. We regret, actually, that we did not. After the military action began, the Russians tabled a U.N. Security Council vote to stop the NATO action. That resolution lost twelve to three, which gives an insight into international sentiment.

When it came to the Iraq war, the sentiment was reversed. If you could have taken a vote, a free vote, in the General Assembly at that time, you probably would have had 150 countries against intervention in Iraq. People just did not think that the case for war had been made. And the difficulty is, that when the U.S. insists on acting in such

circumstances, the international opinion of the U.N. goes down. American esteem for the UN goes down because the U.N. did not support the war, and in all the rest of the world esteem goes down because the U.N. did not stop the war, or did not prevent the war.

But still, if you are looking for international approbation of a military act, if you want to get cooperation on terrorism, you have to deal with the U.N. Security Council. I think that is one of the lessons that we are seeing now. (One of the lessons of the Kosovo war was not to draw lessons too quickly.) But a lesson of the Iraq war, I think, is that absent the affirmation of the international community, you cannot expect approbation of an act of war or much assistance in the follow-up.

The U.N. is important but it is far from perfect. Certainly, negative feelings exist in Canada as well. If you have ever spent an afternoon in the Security Council, an eternity in the General Assembly, you would know why there is so much criticism of the place. There is a lot of "old think." There is a kind of diplomatic sclerosis that has come over the U.N. – or inertia. It just keeps on going, no matter what the problem, same direction. The U.N. has done some amazing things. It is actually much more effective than it is given credit for. But it has serious problems. You have to distinguish between the U.N. the member countries and the U.N. the secretariat. The UN secretariat and the UN agencies have done some extraordinarily good work. Consider the work of the International World Food Program which fed 75 million people last year. The High Commissioner for Refugees gave shelter to 22 million people last year. Vast amounts of land mines were removed around the world by the efforts of U.N. Mine Action Service. You could not take a plane here if it were not for U.N. organizations. There is a vast amount of work that the UN does that most people are unaware of. It really is a cliché, but it is true in this case, that if the U.N. did not exist we would have to invent it.

But the U.N. has some big problems. Some of the problems originate with the Iraq war, but others are absolutely inherent in the sort of "cut off your nose to spite your face" mentality of a lot of developing countries. Still, the things that matter now, the three or four really important issues, require an effective U.N. We have to draw up a system for intervening in crises like the Congo, Darfur, Burundi, Rwanda. We have to find a way of overcoming the European, the Westphalian idea of sovereignty. It is one of the great ironies, for example, that the Asians who proclaim Asian values are so attached to sovereignty and resist any kind of reform in the U.N. in this area. What they are defending is actually a semi-defunct almost 400 year old European treaty.

If you are going to deal with terrorism, the U.N. is indispensable. The U.N. already has twelve counter-terrorism agreements on issues such as hijacking and kidnapping and the "marking" of chemicals. If you are going to get international cooperation on terrorism, these treaties are indispensable. They create norms, they get absorbed into national laws, and they give everybody, including us, a possibility of holding countries to account. The U.N. Security Council has a committee that both monitors behavior on terrorism and promotes compliance. This committee is where countries including the US go to name terrorist groups and to try to cut off the sources of their financing. I think a war on terror, just as an aside, is an unfortunate concept,

because it is a war on a tactic, as the 9/11 Commission said. And while the attack on New York is heinous and terrible, I do not think the "war on terror" is winnable. I think we are maybe just being a little bit too delicate and we do not want to say what is happening. What is really at issue here is a war against Islamist extremists, specifically Al Qaeda and its allies. But if you are just going to declare a war on terrorism, and then if you are going to include Iraq in that, and the whole Middle East issue, you are giving yourself mission impossible. But one of the points that the Bush administration is absolutely right on, and I think almost every American would agree, is that the potential nexus of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction is extremely dangerous. Something has to be done about it. And this is one of the areas where the U.N. has work to do.

The other areas are poverty, health – particularly health, I would say. We are all in greater danger from a virus than we are from terrorists. This time last year, a little earlier, somebody got off a plane from Hong Kong in Toronto and cost Canada a vast amount of money and a number of people their lives. We had to close down several hospitals. There was an enormous quarantine. Thousands of people were forced to stay indoors. We are still paying the costs. I was at the Stratford Shakespeare Festival a couple of nights ago, and the place was half full, because people fear now to travel – because of the terrorism, because of SARS, for whatever reason. What the SARS experience showed is that we are not ready to deal with these kinds of issues, the world is just not ready to deal with global public health issues, such as pandemics. In fact, the Canadian government, to its discredit at the time, I would say, resisted the efforts of the World Health Organization to name Canada as a dangerous tourist place – Canada, a dangerous place? – but with our medical system, how could that be? And we actually actively resisted and put pressure on the WHO to lay off Canada. But in fact they were right. We were not doing enough about SARS. We were complacent and unprepared.

We were not the only ones., at the same time I went to a funeral in the US, of a very prominent New Yorker. His son had got out of his hospital bed to come and give his father's eulogy. It was very moving. But the son was so sick he went back to the hospital – terrible flu. So what did people do? They all flocked to the hospital to see the poor guy. Well, if he had had SARS, then the whole of New York would have had to be shut down. But nobody even thought about it. It was not in anyone's mind. The hospital did not prevent anybody from coming to see him. They did not know that he did not have SARS. This is a guy who traveled all the time.

The point I am making is that you really do need a multilateral system to deal with global problems. No country is able to survive anymore in this globalized system which we have all brought on ourselves. Nobody but the North Koreans can wall themselves off and think they are surviving. So my plea is for the United States, as I said at the very beginning, to come back into the multilateral system of cooperation, exercise the leadership that everybody has always been very willing to accord you, and let us get on with making the rest of this century a little less exciting than it has been as it started.

Thank you. (applause)

Question: (unintelligible) saying, what would you die for. And they asked various teenagers that question. (unintelligible) though I don't agree with the Bush administration's rationale for the war (unintelligible) my question for you is if the world community, in terms of the leadership, the dictators that make up most of the governing (unintelligible) throughout the world did not support (unintelligible) Canada or the United States going in (unintelligible)

Response: I will rephrase your question a little bit, if you don't mind. It's not a question of supporting the United States, it's a question of doing what you think is right. And I do not have any doubt that we would have done that in that circumstance. Another part of the premise, I think, is not quite correct. If you go to Freedom House, and you can also check this is in one of President Bush's speeches, I've taken from the Freedom House survey – the U.N. consists of 191 countries, of which about 120 are considered to be democratic or at least partially free. So the U.N. isn't really being run by dictators. The most powerful country at the U.N. by miles is the United States, without any question. The U.S. dominates the U.N. It's not a place where things happen to the U.S. Nothing happens very much there that the U.S. isn't involved in one way or another. But on the question of Kosovo, what would you die for and what would you get involved in, I think you call them as you see them. On the day the bombing began, (and the Canadian air force was doing some of the bombing) there were 495,000 Kosovars who were either refugees across the border – the definition of refugees – or internally displaced. If you go back and read the speeches of Kofi Anan, he was urging the international community to do something. What we got tangled up in was effectively a Russian attitude on sovereignty. And I think they were more concerned about the application of that principle to them in Chechnya than they were about the Serbs. There was a certain time in the negotiations at the end of the war that we thought the Serbs were more willing to end the war than the Russians were. But I digress. I do think you "have to call them as you see them."

At the same time it makes sense to try to fix the system. What we did in Canada was to launch a commission a – and I highly recommend it to you – we established a commission called the Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. We asked them to take on the question of what to do when sovereignty and humanitarian necessity conflict. The first sentence in the U.N. charter is to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," and Article 2 of the charter is about noninterference in the internal affairs of states. How do you reconcile those things when increasingly wars happen within states? You might remember the Brundtland commission in the '80's which was charged with reconciling economic growth and environmental protection. At the time they were considered to be two rather incompatible ideas, but the Brundtland commission reconciled them with the new idea of sustainable development. We asked the same thing with this commission. They have laid out some extremely good standards and tests for intervention, norms that need to be met. They reconciled national sovereignty and non-intervention with the idea of the Responsibility to Protect. If we can get the international community to adopt that as a norm, then we will have done something to get past the obstacles that sovereignty has created.

But, you know, if people are dying by the thousands or they're being slaughtered, you intervene.

Question: I had dinner with Canadian relatives last night and the dinner conversation seemed to go much along the same lines of (unintelligible) telling us some of the things that we Americans may have (unintelligible) a myopic view of our own place in the world. But everybody in this room has legal training. Part of what we are trained to do is to be able to argue the other side. And so I was curious, and the one question I posed to my family was, can you honestly say that the world would be a better place today if Saddam were still in power. Given the justification for the armed intervention in Kosovo, brutal dictators engaging in quasi-religious genocide against the predominantly Muslim Kosovars versus Saddam's brutality towards the Shiites in southern Iraq, how would you make the argument that the world is a better place with Saddam gone?

Response: I would make two arguments in response to that. In 1989, when the Iraqis gassed the Kurds, there were clear-cut grounds – crimes against humanity, genocide – clear-cut grounds for intervening. In 1991-92, when there was an uprising among the Shi'a, and Saddam put it down brutally, there were grounds for intervening at that time. Waiting twelve years to act calls into question your humanitarian impulse, I would have to say. I will cite an independent source, Human Rights Watch, which is being run by Kenneth Roth a former prosecutor in the southern district of New York, in Manhattan. Human Rights Watch has documented that there were no mass killings going on or anticipated prior to or at the time of the invasion. There was a lot of terrible brutality – everybody knows about Uday and Qusay, but no mass killings. The second part – the humanitarian impulse – has to be looked at fairly carefully. I remember the State of the Union speech, 2003. There was no talk about saving the Iraqis. The President talked about weapons of mass destruction and terrorists. That was the case that he made. Saving the Iraqis has been an *ex post facto* argument. But you said the world is better off. Are you sure? If there is a civil war in Iraq, is the world going to be better off? Are Iraqis going to be better off? If the Kurds and the Turks mix it up, if the alliance between Israel and Turkey becomes dissolved over Israeli support for the Kurds, which is what the Turks now think is going on, is the world going to be better off? If Iraq disintegrates, if that spreads into Jordan and Syria, I am not so sure you can make the judgment now that the world is better off. I think what you can say, without any fear of contradiction, is it's a damn good thing Saddam is not there. But what consequences of stirring this pot up are going to be is too soon to say. Remember the warning of President Mubarak of Egypt. You're going to create, he said to President Bush, a thousand Osama bin Ladens if you intervene in Iraq. There are 1.2 billion Moslems, and if you radicalize 1 in 1000 or even 1 in 10,000, that is a circumstance that you do not want to happen. Nobody wins that kind of a conflict by any rational definition of winning. It's too soon to say the world is better off. It's even too soon in that sense to say the Iraqis are better off. (applause)