

**UN SECURITY COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS
REGARDING IRAQ**

FEBRUARY 14, 2003 THROUGH MARCH 26, 2003

July 2003

Authors: Uchenna Emeagwali and Jeannie Gonzalez, Interns
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
211 E. 43d St., Suite 1204
New York, NY 10017
tel 212 818 1861; fax 212 818 1857
lcnp@lcnp.org; www.lcnp.org

INTRODUCTION

The following report describes certain open Security Council meetings held in February through March of 2003 concerning the Iraq situation and the inspections process in search of weapons of mass destruction. This paper is based on observation of the meetings as well as UN press releases. At the meetings on February 14, 18, 19 and March 26, non-Security Council member states were invited to speak and voice their views concerning Iraqi compliance with various UN resolutions based on the reports given by the weapons inspectors and concerning possible or actual military action led by the United States and United Kingdom. The meeting on March 7 concerned the reports by the weapons inspectors and the responses of Security Council member states to those reports. Also included is a report on a panel discussion on Iraq, organized by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security held at the UN on March 12, 2003.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Date and Subject of Governmental and Non-Governmental Meetings at the United Nations	Pages in which the Meetings Appear
U.N.M.O.V.I.C. and the I.A.E.A. presented inspections reports to member states of the Security Council and non-member states re: Iraqi compliance with resolution 1441 and previous UN resolutions; responses of both the member and non-member states. These meetings occurred on 2/14/03, 2/18/03, and 2/19/03.	4 – 20
U.N.M.O.V.I.C. and the I.A.E.A. presented inspections reports on 3/7/03 to member states of the Security Council and non-member states re Iraqi compliance with resolution 1441 and previous UN resolutions; responses of both the member and non-member states.	21 – 31
Panel discussion re Iraq organized by the NGO Committee on Disarmament with a German representative, a U.S. representative, and civil society representatives Randall Caroline Forsberg and Ambassador (retired) Jonathan Dean.	32 – 33
On March 26, 2003 the Security Council held its 4726 th meeting in which non-number states were allowed to comment on the U.S. /U.K. led invasion of Iraq commented on the impending war.	34 – 57

Statement to the Security Council on 2/14/03, 2/18/03 and 2/19/03
Regarding Iraq's Situation.
Includes Non-Security Council Members;
Covers 58 of 60 Government Officials that made statements

Point #1: Peaceful resolutions of conflicts required – The U.N. Charter and customary international law require States to seek peaceful resolutions to their disputes. The use of force is only permissible in the case of an armed attack or imminent attack or under Security Council authorization when a threat to the peace has been declared and non-military measures have been determined to be inadequate.

Algeria –

- We should spare no effort to peacefully settle any crisis that we face, so that we can maintain the foundations of international peace and security.

Brazil –

- A peaceful solution to this crisis is possible. As there is still hope for peace, we must insist on it.

Chile –

- The inspections process must be considered and strengthened in order to arrive at an accurate conclusion.

China –

- The inspections process is working and inspectors should be given more time.

Cuba –

- The new doctrine of pre-emptive attack that some seek to impose advocates the right to use or threaten to use force in international relations and the right to take unilateral military action against other states, in advance and in the face of indeterminate and vague threats. This is a flagrant violation of the spirit and the letter of the charter of the United Nations and seeks to turn the inherent right of legitimate self-defense into a blank check.

Fiji –

- The effects of war will be felt globally.
- Use preventive diplomacy – disarmament by force is counter-productive.

France –

- Option of inspectors has not been taken to the end.
- War should only be a last resort, if not it would destroy the stability of the international community.
- Give inspectors more time.
- Take the necessary time to reach the broadest consensus.

- Must exhaust all peaceful means of settlement, the use of force only after everything else fails.
- Use all possible means to avert war.

Georgia –

- Peace should be given a chance.

Greece – (on behalf of European Union [EU]) –

- The EU's objective for Iraq remains the full and effective disarmament from Weapons of Mass Destruction in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, in particular resolution 1441. We want to achieve this peacefully. It is clear this is what the people of Europe want.
- War is not inevitable.
- Force should only be used as a last resort.

Holy See –

- All peaceful means measures must be exhausted.
- War should be the very last option, and we cannot ignore the human consequences of the civilian population.

Iceland –

- More time for inspectors.

Iraq –

- The use of force without the sanction by the Security Council threatens the credibility of the UN and exposes international and regional peace and security to grave dangers.

Jordan –

- Given the current situation, the Jordan government believes that all State Members of the United Nations should work together to achieve a peaceful solution through all available means and to avoid any measures that would breach the peace and further exacerbate the situation in the Middle East.

Kuwait –

- Supports all efforts made to reach a peaceful resolution in the Iraqi situation.
- Hopes that the use of military force will be a last resort and will take place under international legality.

League of Arab States –

- To date the inspectors have found no Weapons of Mass Destruction and in light of the conclusion reached by the inspectors, who are the only legitimate authority entrusted with verification and submission of evidence submitted to the Security Council, there is no justification for waging war against Iraq.

Lebanon –

- Give inspectors more time.

Libya –

- The inspections process must run its full course.

Malaysia –

- Emphasizes the need for inspectors to continue their work.
- Convinced the crisis can be solved by peaceful means and opposes the use of force.
- The use of force will undermine international peace.
- There is no precedent for international war ().
- There is no indication that Iraq will attack another country.

Mauritius –

- Give the inspectors more time.

Morocco –

- Wants to see peace prevail in the region and wants to see this crisis overcome by peaceful means in order to avert more tragedies in the region.....Believes the progress achieved is encouraging.

New Zealand –

- The New Zealand government has a very strong preference for a diplomatic solution to this crisis.
- We place considerable weight on the inspection and disarmament process. We believe that it should run its full course.
- We do not support military action against Iraq without a mandate from the Security Council, and we do not believe the Council would be justified in giving that mandate at this time.

Nigeria –

- Patience is the key ingredient of peace.

Norway –

- We must do everything in our power to achieve a peaceful resolution.

Oman –

- It behooves the international community to maintain international peace and stability...The U.S. and U.K. are crucial partners in the Middle East, so they must work together to avoid war in this region.

Paraguay –

- All necessary measures should be exhausted for a peaceful resolution before war.

Peru –

- The government of Peru takes the view that the crisis must be resolved within the framework of the United Nations, in particular in the context of the decisions taken by the Security Council, and that as a matter of priority, all possibilities for a peaceful solution must be exhausted.

Russia –

- Inspectors must continue their inspections
- Force should be used only when all other remedies have been exhausted and we have not yet reached that point.

Saudi Arabia –

- Believes that there's a possibility to achieve international resolution by peaceful means.
- The same reasons for justifying a war with Iraq should be the same reasons we resist a war with Iraq.
- The possible presence of weapons of Mass Destruction is the best reason for inspectors to continue their inspections.

South Africa –

- We believe that resorting to war without fully exhausting all other options represents an admission of failure by the Security Council in carrying out its mandate of maintaining international peace and security.

Thailand –

- War threatens international peace.
- Wants the UN to press forward by peaceful measures.

Uruguay –

- Give inspectors more time to complete the task at hand.
- Exhaust all possible means before subjecting humans to the most devastating effects on people.

Vietnam –

- We would like to take this opportunity to express our view that all peaceful means must be exhausted to find a peaceful solution to the Iraqi issue in conformity with the UN charter and international law.

Zimbabwe –

- It is the duty of the Security Council to support the inspectors.

Point #2: With more time, inspectors should report regularly to the Security Council.

Algeria –

- It has become clear to us that the tasks undertaken by the United Nations Monitoring, Verification, and Inspection Committee (UNMOVIC) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have yielded positive results. What is required now is to allow the inspectors more time to complete such tasks.

France –

- Give the inspectors the time they need and have Mr. Blix and the IAEA give regular reports to the council. Proposed another meeting on 3/14/03

Jordan –

- Inspection system is proving to be effective, as such it should continue and if necessary enhanced as its failure would constitute a threat to international peace and security.

Malaysia –

- Give inspectors more time and supports another Security Council meeting on 3/14/03 in response to update on how inspections are going.

Morocco –

- Favorable climate must prevail and sufficient and necessary means must be provided to facilitate the work of the inspectors and enable them to discharge their duties with greatest possible efficiency.

Ukraine –

- It is imperative that the United Nations inspectors continue their work in order to be able to clarify the unresolved questions of the disarmament of Iraq.

Point #3: Action to ensure the elimination of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction should be done in conjunction with similar actions to ensure elimination of other weapons of mass destruction in the region – including Israel's nuclear arsenal and in the world – including the nuclear weapons of China, France, India, Pakistan, Russia, United Kingdom and the United States.

Algeria –

- It is extremely important to emphasize that the decision taken by the international community to make the Middle East a zone free of Weapons of Mass Destruction contained in paragraph 14 of Security Council Resolution 687, must not be limited to Iraq. It is equally applicable to Israel, which has arrogated itself the right to be the sole nuclear power in the region in defiance of international legality.

Bahrain –

- Israel is a party that owns destructive and lethal nuclear arsenal which should be held accountable by the international community.

League of Arab States –

- The imminent threat to the peace and stability of the Arab nation is Israel's arsenal of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and their delivery systems.
- For the past 22 years Israel has rejected the implementation of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which calls on Israel to submit its nuclear programs and facilities to IAEA safeguards and regime.
- For the past 12 years, it has rejected the implementation of paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991), which calls for a zone free of Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East.
- Why do we condone Israel's behavior and why do inspector teams not head there to eliminate Israel's Weapons of Mass Destruction? Why are there double standards?

Libya –

- Without any credible or concrete evidence the UN shows a complete bias and double standard for the Arab people.
- The Council is turning the other eye in respect to Israel even though Israel possesses Weapons of Mass Destruction and has not allowed itself to be subjected to the IAEA.
- Double standards with policies to Arab nations will lead to more violence and possibly threaten international peace.

Saudi Arabia –

- Israel refuses to accede to the NPT and they justify their possession of nuclear weapons on the contention that they have never used nuclear weapons in the past.

Singapore –

- Threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction threatens international security.
- It is important for other nations to disarm.

United Arab Emirates –

- Israel possesses both biological and chemical weapons.

Yemen –

- My country calls for all members of the Council to act with a sense of responsibility so that the Council cannot be accused of selectivity or double standards with regards to such resolutions. Paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991), concerning the elimination of all Weapons of Mass Destruction from all states in the region, including Israel must be implemented.
- Legally binding international resolutions concerning the Palestinian question must be implemented with the same zeal that is shown in the implementation of the resolution concerning Iraq.

Point #4: Maintaining pressure on Saddam, Iraqi compliance, & time is running out.

Albania –

- Iraq is still in breach and has failed to comply with resolution 1441.
- Inspections can't continue endlessly.
- The interim report made to the Security Council by Mr. Hans Blix and Mr. Mohamed El-Baradei clearly highlighted the cooperation of Iraqi authorities with respect to freedom of movement and action of inspections teams, which it should be recalled, is one of the strongest demands laid down in resolution 1441.

Australia –

- Iraq is still in breach and has failed to comply with resolution 1441. (As cited in the 2/18/03 Press Release of the 4709th Security Council Meeting [SC 7665]).
- Inspections can't continue endlessly.
- The Council should not wait forever to confront the issue and it should move quickly to consider a further resolution that dealt decisively with Iraq's failure to comply with resolution 1441 (As cited in the 2/18/03 Press Release of the 4709th Security Council Meeting [SC 7665]).

Brazil –

- Brazil calls for Iraq's full compliance with relevant Security Council resolutions in particular 1441, to ensure complete elimination of all Weapons of Mass Destruction and supports peaceful efforts in the context of the organization working towards these ends.

Canada –

- More time for inspectors will only be useful, only if Iraq cooperates.
- Iraq must cooperate beginning now.

Chile –

- Maintaining pressure on Saddam is the only thing which is bringing about change. Pressure must be intensified and must remain in order to bring about change.

Gambia –

- My delegation strongly urges the Iraqi authorities to cooperate fully and unconditionally with the Security Council and to comply with all the requirements put before it, not only in resolution 1441, but also in all other resolutions that relate to the situation between Iraq and Kuwait.

Honduras –

Iraq should cooperate and destroy all Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Iraq –

- Security Council Resolutions 1284 paragraph 2 entrusts U.N.M.O.V.I.C. with the establishment and operation of a reinforced monitoring system that would resolve the remaining disarmament issues.

- Iraq has submitted a full and comprehensive declaration of its previous program of its Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- Iraq has submitted new documents covering the period of 1998 through 2002 regarding its Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- Inspectors have been granted access to all the sites they wanted to visit.
- Iraq has established two special commissions to search for documents or materials related to previous proscribed programs in order to expedite the work of the inspectors.
- Iraq has allowed inspectors to use helicopters and other aerial surveillance.
- Has allowed inspectors to interview scientists.
- In 1991 through 1992 Iraq along with UN Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the IAEA destroyed all sites, facilities and materials related to its previous program of Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- In 1992 through 1998, Iraq again cooperates with UNSCOM and the IAEA to ascertain that Iraq was free of any of its proscribed Weapons of Mass Destruction program.
- In 1998, the U.S. asked the Executive Chairman of UNSCOM to withdraw inspectors for “Operation Desert Fox” in which Iraq was bombed by hundreds of missiles in which the U.S. government confirmed that all Weapons of Mass Destruction were destroyed.

Japan –

- In order to resolve this issue peacefully, Japan has been making its own diplomatic efforts, by urging Iraq to proactively dispel every suspicion, to abide by all relevant Security Council resolutions and to abandon its Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Kuwait –

- Kuwait calls for compliance from the Iraqi government with the Security Council.
- Iraq has made no progress in response to Kuwait’s inquiries about Kuwaiti prisoners and other missing Kuwaiti people.
- We believe that the Iraqi government alone can spare the Iraqi people and other good people of the region the negative repercussions and dangers of military action by modifying its conduct as soon as possible and by cooperating with inspectors on substance.

Macedonia –

- Iraq must immediately and fully cooperate with the IAEA and UNMOVIC.
- Believes the threat of force must be maintained even though it believes that all peaceful means should and must be exhausted.
- Time is running out.

Marshall Islands –

- Best hope for Security lies in Iraq’s full cooperation.

Mexico –

- Iraq continues to evade its responsibilities.

New Zealand –

- The New Zealand government calls on Iraq to move rapidly to provide information and the cooperation requested of it to avert the catastrophe war would bring on its people.

Nicaragua –

- Disarmament of Iraq is the goal.
- Immobility and inaction will threaten the council's ability among nations.
- Immediate response for Iraq's unwillingness to comply.
- Iraq must present credible evidence of the existence or the destruction of Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- Iraq falls short of its obligations and it can't continue another decade of non-compliance.

Norway –

- Iraq must fully cooperate with inspectors.
- We will only see progress if pressure is upheld.
- Iraq must recognize the consequences of non-compliance with resolution 1441.
- What happened to Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction? They must provide an accurate account of those weapons.

Paraguay –

- Iraq is taken an ambivalent attitude towards inspections.
- Iraqi government must comply with 1441.

Peru –

- The government of Iraq must understand once and for all that the only possibility that it has for normalizing its relations with the international community is by immediate disarmament in addition to unconditional compliance with the Security Council resolutions.

Serbia –

- Iraq must disarm comprehensively and cooperatively.

Singapore –

- If Iraq doesn't comply with 1441, it will lead to a result that we are all trying to avoid.
- The threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction threatens international security and it's important for nations to disarm.

Spain –

- Long lists of unresolved issues and non-compliance (what happened to the missing VX nerve gas and missing anthrax?)
- We don't need more inspections.
- We are sending a message of weakness to the rest of the world, the more non-compliance there is the more radical the international community would be.
- Peace and security is ensured through respect for and compliance with the Security Council.
- Questions Iraq's motivation for compliance – is Iraq's cooperation voluntarily, or is it doing so because time is pressing and there is going to be a review on Iraq's compliance by the Security Council?

South Africa –

- Iraq accepting offer from South Africa's experts which led our country to destroy nuclear, chemical, and biological Weapons and Mass Destruction

Thailand

- Pleads to Iraq to fulfill its international obligation under resolution 1441.

Turkey –

- It was incumbent upon the Iraqi leadership to do everything in its power to help United Nations inspectors to absolve them, once and for all, of the charge of continuing to produce Weapons of Mass Destruction and of continuing to conceal

Ukraine –

- The position of the Ukraine is well known and clear: Iraq must fulfill all its obligations under respective Security Council resolutions, including resolution 1441.

United Kingdom –

- We must back the diplomatic process with a credible threat of force. If we back away now, disarmament will only get harder.

United States –

- **1441** is not about inspections, it's about disarmament.
- Iraq is in material breach of its obligations.
- Iraq has not accounted for anthrax or VX nerve gas; therefore we must continue to put pressure on Iraq.
- Central problem is that Iraq has failed to comply with 1441.
- Inspections can't go on endlessly.

Uzbekistan –

- Solution lies not in the change in the number of inspectors but a change in the attitude of the Iraqi government.

Point #5: Humanitarian effects of a war must be considered.

Algeria –

- Military operation against Iraq would have disastrous impact on the Iraqi people – who for 12 years have been subjected to sanctions, which in many respects are inhumane.

Bahrain –

- We cannot ignore the humanitarian aspect of the situation in Iraq...For when it is all said and done those who will suffer are the Iraqi people.
- The Iraqi people have suffered the scourges of many wars during the last decade and international sanctions have only exacerbated the situation.

Brazil –

- There's no doubt that an armed conflict will entail great costs in human, political, and economic terms.

Canada –

- A war with Iraq would adversely affect the Oil for Food Program which 60% of the Iraqi population is dependent upon.

Cuba –

- The consequences of an unnecessary and unjustified military action in Iraq would be extremely grave. As foreseen the humanitarian catastrophe could be massive and terrible.
- The deaths and destruction would be unpredictable.

Holy See –

- War should be the very last option, but we cannot ignore the human consequences for the civilian population.

Iran –

- The Iranian people are concerned first and foremost about the humanitarian catastrophe that would undoubtedly befall the Iraqi people in the event of war, including the influx of displaced persons and refugees.

Malaysia –

- War would lead to more suffering on the Iraqi people and it would have a devastating effect on the people of Iraq.

Saudi Arabia –

- War if it solves one problem, creates several others.
- Seeks to spare Iraq a war which would have dreadful consequences.
- War would only cause additional suffering on the Iraqi people who have suffered as a result of the sanctions imposed on Iraq.

Singapore –

- Humanitarian concerns if a war happens with Iraq.

Thailand-

- A war would have devastating humanitarian effects on the Iraqi people. Women and children would be the first to suffer under armed conflict.

Turkey –

- The first of our concerns is the plight of the Iraqi people.....We are cognizant of their difficult situation and dire humanitarian conditions under the duress of harsh economic sanctions coupled with the abuse of resources, which have both gone unabated for years now.

Uruguay –

- By not allowing more time to inspectors we are subjecting the Iraqi people to the most devastating effects on the people.

Vietnam –

- We advocate a peaceful solution instead of military action also because we understand the consequences of a war, especially in terms of untold human suffering and material destruction for the ordinary people of the parties concerned, as well as the multifaceted impact on the region and the world over (cited from the report of Kenzo Oshima, Under-Secretary for Humanitarian Affairs at his 2/13/03 briefing states under medium case scenario 10 million people may require food assistance during and after the start of the conflict, while up to half the Iraqi population may be without access to potable water).

Point# 6: Some interesting points made by countries.

Algeria –

- The future of the system of collective security, carefully crafted, depends on equal treatment afforded to all in the international community, which for us, nations large and small, constitutes the guarantee that law will prevail in any and all circumstances.

Cuba –

- Cuba defends international law, because we consider it to be the only viable guarantee of international peace and security.

Holy See –

- 1441 deals with disarmament of Iraq and has nothing to do with a regime change.

Iran –

- The extent of destabilization in the region and uncertainty in Iraq in the event of a war might go far beyond anything we can imagine today.
- It is important that the Security Council, the legally competent forum entrusted with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, remain at the center of the decision making process on how to deal with the Iraqi issues and all members of the international community should genuinely abide by its decisions.

IRAQ'S RESPONSE

- In November of last year Iraq agreed to the return of inspectors on two conditions spelled out in a letter to the Security Council...#1 the return of inspectors as a step towards the comprehensive review of the issues with the view of lifting the embargo #2 respecting Iraq's sovereignty and independence.
- There are no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.
- Iraq has handed over documents and evidence indicating that there are no weapons of mass destruction or all weapons of mass destruction has been destroyed.
- Some countries wish to exploit the disarmament of Iraq.
- Iraq will continue to cooperate with inspectors.
- The US' & UK's aims are to change the national government of Iraq and impose American hegemony over the region and its resources, as a first step towards world domination by the use of force.
- Iraq has lost close to 2 million people over UN sanctions over the last 12 years.
- An attack by the US and the UK is proof of failure of the entire international system...The system must rely on the UN charter for a point of reference for maintaining international peace and security.....Attack on Iraq undermines the credibility of the Security Council.

Statement to the Security Council on 3/7/03
Regarding U.N.M.O.V.I.C.'S & I.A.E.A's
Iraqi Inspection Reports and Some
Member's Responses

Presentation of Inspection Report by Han's Blix

- **U.N.M.O.V.I.C.'s Findings**
 - In today's briefing Mr. Blix stated that while cooperation could and was to be immediate, disarmament could not be instant.
 - U.N.M.O.V.I.C. is presently finalizing an internal list of unresolved disarmament issues and of measures Iraq could take to resolve them, this could serve as a yardstick against which Iraq's disarmament actions under 1441 may be measured.
 - Initial difficulties raised by the Iraqi side about helicopters and aerial surveillance planes operating in the no-fly zones had been overcome. Inspectors were now able to perform professional no-notice inspections all over Iraq and to increase aerial surveillance.
 - Intelligence authorities suggested that weapons of mass destruction were moved around Iraq and that they were mobile production units for biological weapons. No evidence of proscribed activities had been found so far.
 - U.N.M.O.V.I.C. has identified and started the destruction of approximately 50 liters of mustard gas declared by Iraq.
 - To date, 34 Al Samoud 2 missiles, including four training missiles, two combat warheads, one launcher and five engines had been destroyed under U.N.M.O.V.I.C. supervision. Two "reconstituted" casting chambers had also been destroyed.
 - At the 2/8 and 2/9 meetings, the Iraqi side addressed some of the important outstanding disarmament issues...Papers were handed over regarding unresolved issues in all three disarmament fields, but they did not contain new evidence nor resolve any of the open issues.
 - During the review period U.N.M.O.V.I.C. has requested 28 individuals to present themselves for interviews in Baghdad without the presence of observers. None of them agreed. During the January meeting the Iraqi side committed itself to encourage persons to accept interviews in private. U.N.M.O.V.I.C. is examining the practical modalities for conducting interviews outside Iraq.
 - Although the Iraqi response at the end of December to a request, to provide names of all personnel currently or formerly associated with programs of Weapons of Mass Destruction and ballistic missiles, was deemed to be inadequate, Iraq has since supplemented its list of participants in the missile program and is ready to do the same in other disciplines.
 - Mr. Blix reported that after a period of somewhat reluctant cooperation, there had been an acceleration of initiatives since the end of January.
 - Resolution 1284 instructed U.N.M.O.V.I.C. to "address unresolved disarmament issues" and to identify "key remaining disarmament tasks". A draft work program in that regard would be submitted this month.

- Mr. Blix said that he would disclose a list of clustered issues regarding key remaining disarmament tasks to Council members upon request.
- In conclusion, while cooperation could and was said to be immediate, disarmament and its verification could not be instant.....Even with a proactive Iraqi attitude, induced by continued outside pressure, it would still take some time to verify sites and items, analyze documents, interview relevant persons and draw conclusions. That would not take years, or weeks but months.

Presentation of Inspection Report by Dr. El-Baradei

- **I.A.E.A.'s Findings -**
 - During the past four years, at a majority of Iraqi sites, industrial capacity has deteriorated substantially and due to the lack of foreign support which was in the late 80's...Departure of many skilled workers in the past decade along with their lack of consistent maintenance of sophisticated equipment. The overall deterioration of industrial capacity is relevant to Iraq's overall capability of resuming a nuclear weapons program.
 - Interviews had continued with relevant Iraqi personnel.
 - In the last few weeks, Dr. El-Baradei noted that Iraq had provided a considerable volume of documentation containing information about Iraq's efforts to procure aluminum tubes, its attempted procurement of magnets and magnet-production capabilities, and its reported attempt to import uranium.
 - The I.A.E.A. conducted a thorough investigation of Iraq's attempts to purchase large quantities of high-strength aluminum tubes. Iraq had maintained that those aluminum tubes were for rocket production and after extensive field investigations and document analysis the I.A.E.A. has failed to uncover any evidence that Iraq intended to use those 81mm tubes for any project other than reverse engineering of rockets.
 - The I.A.E.A. concluded that Iraq's efforts to import those aluminum tubes were not likely to have been related to manufacturing centrifuges, nor could they have achieved the considerable redesign to use them in a revive centrifuge program.
 - With the issue of magnets, the I.A.E.A. had conducted visits to research and production sites, reviewed engineering drawings and analyses of sample magnets. I.A.E.A. experts, familiar with the use of such magnet in centrifuge enrichment, verified that none of the magnets that Iraq declared could be used directly for centrifuge magnetic bearing.
 - In reference to Iraq's flow-forming capabilities, Iraq's lack of experience and expertise in that field made it highly unlikely that it was currently able to produce aluminum cylinders consistently to the tolerance required for centrifuge enrichment.
 - The I.A.E.A. investigated reports that Iraq sought to buy uranium from Niger in recent years. The investigation was centered on documents provided by a number of states that pointed to an agreement between Niger and Iraq for the sale of uranium between 1999 and 2001. Based on a thorough analysis, the I.A.E.A. concluded along with the concurrence of outside experts, those documents which formed the basis for the reports of recent uranium transactions between Niger and Iraq were not authentic.
 - In the area of nuclear weapons, inspections in Iraq were moving forward. Since the resumption of inspections a little over three months ago, and particularly in the three weeks since the last briefing, the I.A.E.A. had made important progress in identifying what nuclear-related capabilities remained in Iraq, and its assessment as to whether Iraq had made any efforts to revive its past nuclear programs during the past four years in which inspections were halted.

- **I.A.E.A.'s Results**
 - No indication of resumed nuclear activities in the buildings identified by satellite as being new buildings since 1998.

- No indication of nuclear-related prohibited activities at any inspection sites.
- No indication that Iraq attempted to import uranium since 1990.
- No indication Iraq intended to import aluminum tubes for centrifuge enrichment because if they pursued this course of action, it would have encountered practical difficulties in manufacturing centrifuges out of the aluminum tubes.
- No indication Iraq intended to import magnets for centrifuge enrichment.
- After three months of intrusive inspections, he stated that the I.A.E.A. had found no evidence of plausible indication of a revival of a nuclear program in Iraq.

Responses from: Angola, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, U.K. and U.S.

Angola -

- With today's report there are some welcomed developments with respect to Iraq's cooperation to comply with resolution 1441...including the destruction of the Al Samoud 2 missiles.... Yet Iraq's cooperation was insufficient.

Angola -

- Iraqi progress usually occurred when specific deadlines were imposed on it, which might make for strengthening the inspections process.
- The manner and resolve of the Security Council in dealing with the Iraqi issue of disarmament would set the standard for which the council would be held for resolving future conflicts and maintaining international peace and security.
- The Iraqi government must take a more proactive role in disarmament by giving inspectors unimpeded, unconditional and unrestricted access to sites and information in the disarmament process.
- Angola believes that it's legitimate to debate the political, economic, and humanitarian consequences of the use of force, but that should not be interpreted as an unwillingness to act.

Bulgaria -

- Iraq had cooperated on procedural aspects but cooperation on substance left a lot to be desired.
- After three months no breakthrough had been seen regarding anthrax and VX gas.
- The partial success achieved by the inspections had been achieved by constant pressure from the international community.....To that end, it was the threat of the use of military force and the pressure of a large number of British and American soldiers in the region which made the pressure credible.
- On 2/5/03 we felt that Iraq was in material breach of resolution 1441 as well as other resolutions and we reiterate that same sentiment today.
- We feel that war is not inevitable and the use of force was only a last resort once all diplomatic means has been exhausted.
- Unity of the Security Council remained an objective to achieve both credibility of the United Nations as well as the disarmament of Iraq.
- Feels that the credibility of the United Nations and the Security Council was at stake and peace will only have a final chance through regained unity.

Cameroon -

- Resolution 1441 set up the road map for disarmament and it did not contain a deadline but did set up a process for disarmament which should be carried out in a short period of time...but it can't go on endlessly.

- From the reports given by the inspectors it is clear that real progress has been made on process and procedure but it feels like the results were modest.
- Better cooperation from the Iraqi government would allow for more rapid progress...The effectiveness of the inspections relied on cooperation from the Iraqi government.
- In favor of inspections to continue which would allow the Security Council to achieve the objectives set out in 1441, yet inspections cannot continue indefinitely.
- Feels that a credible alternative to war must be sought.

Chile -

- The reports contained detailed accounts of inspections carried out and enabled the Council to infer that Iraq's attitude of collaboration; even at this late stage was insufficient.
- The objective is the full and effective disarmament of Iraq.
- Chile had made every effort to contribute to an agreed position....It had advocated continuation of rigorous inspections, but limited in time.
- Chile had also pointed out that the use of force, as authorized under the Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, could only be invoked after every other option has been exhausted.
- Statements given today indicated that peaceful disarmament is still possible through strengthening inspections with clear deadlines and demands.
- Iraqi regime had the political and moral responsibility to achieve total disarmament.

China –

- Judging from the reports of the two inspections bodies, resolutions 1441 had been implemented smoothly on the whole with progress made and results achieved.
- There had been difficulties and problems in the inspections, which was why it was necessary for them to continue.
- The Security Council should provide support and guidance to the two inspections bodies in their work, let them continue inspections and find out the truth to complete their mandate.
- Urged the Iraqi government to strengthen its cooperation on substance in earnest and create the condition necessary for political settlement.
- The questions which remain over Iraq and its disarmament issues are the same reasons why inspections should continue.
- With the progress and the results the inspectors are getting, there is no reason to close the door to peace.
- We need to consider long term interests of human development and shared interests of all nations.
- All countries desperately need a stable and peaceful environment.
- The Chinese government appeals to the Security Council to do all it can to avoid war.

France –

- Some are calling for a rush to war, yet Iraq represents less of a danger than it did in 1991.
- – (Proposed suggestion #1) – The inspectors should be asked to establish a hierarchy of tasks for disarmament.
- (Proposed suggestion #2) – On the basis of the hierarchy the inspectors establish, they should present as soon as possible a work program in accordance with resolution 1284 so we can know what priority issues would constitute key disarmament tasks to be carried out by Iraq.

- (Proposed suggestion #3) – The inspectors should provide a progress report to the Security Council every three weeks which would make the Iraqi authorities understand that under no circumstances should inspections efforts be interrupted.
- We cannot allow a military agenda to determine our schedule.....We will agree to a timetable, but we will not give an ultimatum.
- France will not allow any resolution to pass which authorizes the use of force.
- Use of force will arouse resentment and hatred and fuel a clash of cultures, which is not the best way to bring about democracy.
- War would only increase terrorism.
- Our choice is to disarm Iraq by force or disarm Iraq by peace.
- We can't accept a choice in which the conflict will weaken what resolution 1441 was intended to do, bring about peace and preserving international security.
- The way we handle the Iraqi crisis will depict the international community's ability to resolve other future crisis.
- The stake goes beyond Iraq we are choosing how to define the world we want our children to live in.

Germany –

- The aim of the international community remained for the complete disarmament of Iraq and the elimination of the international threat posed by Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- In briefings today, it is clear that Iraq's cooperation with U.N.M.O.V.I.C. and the I.A.E.A. had not met United Nations demands, and emphasized that Baghdad could have taken many of the recent steps earlier but nevertheless cooperation had improved.
- There has been real progress in the implementation of the resolutions. In the field of missile technology, Iraq had begun to destroy the missiles within the prescribe time frame which showed peaceful disarmament is possible and that there's a real alternative to war.
- It also showed that Mr. Blix's approach of giving the Iraqi regime concrete time frames were successful and should be used for other unresolved problems.
- Inspections should be stepped up and accelerated and each remaining problem should be given a time frame....Drs. Blix and El-Baradei should present the Council with a detailed, comprehensive work program that clarifies how their teams intend to tackle Iraq's complete disarmament.
- Inspections can't go on forever, but given the current situation, there's no need for a second resolution.
- All peaceful means have not been exhausted.
- There is a good reason that the war would make the region unstable along with terrorists groups being strengthened by the war.
- Resolutions 1441 and 1284 must remain the basis for Security Council Action.

Guinea -

- Says significant progress has been seen in the implementation of resolution 1441, and he hoped that it would continue.
- Chance for a peaceful resolution still exists, but that can only happen if Iraq does what it's required in respects to resolution 1441.
- Iraq must provide accurate responses to issues which are still pending; give proof of the unilateral destruction of certain biological and chemical weapons and encourage scientists to give interviews; give an updated list of the names of scientists and expand the scope of their legislation on the import and export of Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- The International community would not understand if Iraq continued its past procrastination.

- We're in favor of inspections but we recognize that inspections can't go on forever.
- Feels that if the council managed this crisis in an effective manner then its credibility would be enhanced.

Iraq –

- War with Iraq seemed imminent despite the fact that there was no vote authorizing the use of force by the Security Council, nor were the public and international communities in favor of the war, in fact the aforementioned were all calling for a peaceful solution to the crisis.
- The French, German, Russian, and Chinese positions indicated that there was no need for a second resolution.
- The French, German, Russian, and Chinese positions also indicated that the inspectors should be given enough time to complete their tasks and bring about the disarmament of Iraq peacefully.
- Stated that the Non-Allied Movement also condemned the threat of the use of military action and considered that a flagrant violation of the principle of non-interference.
- The heads of state and representatives of 57 Islamic countries, recently meeting in Al-Duha, declared their absolute rejection of any aggression against Iraq because that constituted a threat to the security of all Islamic states.
- Claims that Iraq possesses no Weapons of Mass Destruction, nor has the inspections proved anything contrary to that point.....Also asserts that Iraq had destroyed all Weapons of Mass Destruction unilaterally during the summer of 1991 which included all banned biological materials.
- Iraq has no VX weapons to declare.
- Points out that Dr. Blix does not think that Iraq currently represented a threat now, and Iraq has very limited military capabilities in comparison to 1991.
- Asserts the real objective of the war in Iraq is: the complete takeover of Iraq's oil, domination of the entire Arab region, both politically and economically, and the remapping of the Middle East region.

Mexico –

- Regrettably Iraq reacted promptly to political pressure and the threat of the use of force and not to the continuous demands of the international community...Even more regrettably their cooperation was in small doses.
- We can be firm with Iraq but through peaceful means.
- Convinced that we must explore all possible ways and take advantage of all opportunities to arrive at a peaceful solution.

Pakistan –

- If war is to be avoided the Security Council must emphasize to Iraq that it must cooperate fully and unconditionally with the council's resolutions.
- The Iraqi leadership must be proactive and extend immediate and unconditional cooperation in the inspections process in order to prevent the suffering that would befall the Iraqi people as a result of the conflict.
- From the reports we get mixed results, Iraq had cooperated on process but not on substance...Reports also noted that disarmament results had been very limited and wondered why the number of measures currently being undertaken could not have been initiated earlier.
- The best way of bringing about the peaceful disarmament of Iraq was through the unity of the Security Council.

- The Security Council must hold Iraq to its resolutions but it must hold the international community to the same standards in addressing other problems and disputes...there can be no double standards.

Russian Federation –

- Success at the joint effort at resolving the crisis would have a positive effect on other conflicts and would become an important step towards a new and secure world order.
- Purpose of 1441 is to achieve full and effective disarmament of Iraq.
- The submitted reports indicate that thanks to pressure on Baghdad through military build-up progress has been achieved in implementing resolution 1441.
- Enhanced inspections were underway...Inspectors have been given immediate and unconditional access to all sites and on a whole the level of cooperation was thoroughly different from the practice U.N.S.C.O.M had encountered.
- We must resolve the Iraqi crisis on the basis of international law and pursuant to the U.N. charter; this would be an important step for a new and just world order.
- Two choices for the international community #1- genuine interest of the international community to continue the inspectors work or #2 - resort to force, which would result in the loss of several million lives and destabilize the international community.
- **Proposed resolutions** – long term monitoring of Weapons of Mass Destruction as a safeguard that Iraq should not produce Weapons of Mass Destruction in the future.

Spain –

- Saddam has not actively and unconditionally complied with resolution 1441.
- 12 years and the scenario, the threat, and Saddam's attitude is still the same as it was in 1991.
- Resolution 1441 was the last chance for Iraq to comply.
- Saddam has managed to shift the burden of proof to our shoulders.

Syrian Arab Republic –

- The U.N. charter should remain the main instrument of peace and international security.
- A war against Iraq would be illegal and unjust since Iraq has cooperated in both process and substance.
- How does the U.S. justify its cooperation with Israel in developing missiles when it denies that right to Arab states which needs to defend themselves?
- How come the US turns the other way in regards to Israel's possession of Weapons of Mass Destruction when Israel continues to threaten its neighbors with Weapons of Mass Destruction while they occupy Palestinian territories?
- What logic could explain the cooperation of the United States with Israel in developing advanced missiles and what logic allowed Israel to possess all kinds of weapons or weapons of mass destruction?

United Kingdom –

- Evidence for all to see was that Iraq had been and remained in material breach of resolution 1441.
- All had voted to give the Iraqi regime one last opportunity to comply with its obligations.
- No one had said that Iraq was now actively and immediately in compliance with resolution 1441.
- U.N.M.O.V.I.C. had not been able to resolve any outstanding issues.

- Iraq had refused to admit inspectors for three years and only agreed to them after forceful pressure.
- Defied all experience to continue inspections with no end date, as suggested by France, Germany, and the Russian Federation, would achieve complete disarmament, unless Iraq's full and active cooperation was immediately forthcoming.

United States (Colin Powell) –

- Iraq should not be allowed to shift the burden of proof onto the inspectors nor could the world return to the failed bargain of resolution 1284 which offered partial relief for partial disclosure.
- Iraqi initiatives were small steps which had not come forward willingly and freely, but had been pulled out by the possibility of military force and the political will of the Security Council.
- If Iraq really wanted to cooperate sincerely, we should not have to look for biological weapons.
- If Iraq had made a strategic plan to disarm, cooperation would be enthusiastic and not coerced or pressured
- Iraq wants to shift the burden of proof to the inspectors to prove to them that they possess Weapons of Mass Destruction when Iraq should present these weapons to the inspectors.
- The steps that the Iraqi government is taking are neither compliance nor are they initiatives. The slight change and progress are a result of the military buildup and the threat of using military force if necessary it is not one of compliance.
- The intent of the Iraqi government is to keep from turning over Weapons of Mass Destruction which is not consistent with resolution 1441.
- On the bombs capable of carrying chemical and biological warfare agents, the report said that during 1991 Iraq had changed its declaration on the number of bombs it had produced, saying that I had produced a total of 1200. That number was changed to 1550 in 1992.
- Iraq's current behavior is revealed a strategic decision to delay, deceive and throw us off the trail, leading to a fracturing of the international community.
- There are old questions which keep coming up that could have been resolved if Iraq came forward to do what 1441 requires it to do. Then confronted with the facts Iraq keeps changing their answers instead of giving us the truth.

Panel Discussion Re: Iraq Held on 3/12/03

Michael Von Stornberg, German representative

Memorandum

- Memorandum brought about by Germany, France, Russia, and supported by China indicating that inspections are yielding positive results so we should continue with inspections and strengthen the inspections process.
- Germany, France, and Russia would like the inspectors to come up with a work program quickly outlining the key disarmament tasks, which would be able to allow the countries to better judge whether Saddam is in compliance with resolution 1441. However, this does not mean that inspections would continue endlessly.

Thinking behind the Memorandum

- Utmost aim for resolution 1441 is peaceful disarmament.
- Number of possibilities should be explored before military force should be used.
- Military force should only be used as a last resort.
- The aim is not regime change, military force should be proportional to the aim.
- We cannot orient our policy of disarmament according to the military plan.

Kayle Western, advisor to US Mission

- Was the final opportunity for Iraq to disarm taken advantage of?
- Can we have full cooperation from Iraq if we have to keep returning?
- If Iraq has not taken advantage of its final opportunity to disarm then the Security Council needs to make the appropriate measures.

Randall Caroline Forsberg -Director of Institute of Defense and Disarmament Studies

- A war with Iraq is dangerous to the security of the U.S. and harmful to the world in many ways. We have to look at other possibilities than war. We need the support of the Security Council.
- U.S. undermine the rule of law. It would be catastrophic if the U.S. violates the U.N. charter since they would be setting a dangerous precedent. This will be hard for the U.N. to recover from.
- We need to set limits on unilateral action of the U.S. in the international community.
- We need consistent application of previous rules and regulations in the international community.
- The U.S. claims that Iraq supports terrorists, but there are other countries that support terrorists, yet the U.S. has not taken steps towards going after these countries.
- Iraq is not alone in their possessions of chemical and biological weapons; in fact there are 25 countries who have not signed any treaties dealing with disarmament of nuclear and chemical weapons.
- A war with Iraq could fuel Islamic radicals and increase the risk of terrorism.

Ms. Forsberg's Suggestions

- We could have continued surveillance of Iraq and monitor its activities. If suspect sites are not opened to the U.S., Iraq will be given a warning. If they still fail to cooperate, the sites will be bombed after evacuation.
- If Iraq interferes with the surveillance, all defense systems will be destroyed.
- U.S. should keep forces in the Middle East to continue threat of military force.

- Supports military backed inspections only if Iraq does not comply with process.
- If armed force is going to be used, then it should be proportional for disarming only; where selected sights of Weapons of Mass Destruction could be destroyed.

Former Ambassador Jonathan Dean – Union of Concerned Scientists

- A new Security Council resolution should call for a resolution approving a UN disarmament force which would enter Iraq by 6/11/03.
- Iraq should be asked to open its borders to UN disarmament force.
- The task force would leave Iraq when the disarmament task completed to the full satisfaction of all countries of the Security Council.
- This approach does not ask for regime change in Iraq.
- If the U.S. blocks this, the real intent of U.S. for war would be regime change not disarmament.
- Post Iraq, North Korea, and Iran pose proliferation challenges. The ensemble of nonproliferation/disarmament regimes - nuclear, chemical, biological- is on verge of collapse. Preventive war doctrine undermines nonproliferation and could contribute to terrorist attacks

Post Iraq

- Nonproliferation regime on its verge of collapse.
- Armed forces is a positive factor to getting results in respect to Iraq's arms change.
- The U.S. can't do the job alone without the permanent members consent.

Preventative Steps

- Universal appointment of I.A.E.A. to all N.P.T.
- End rapid production of materials for procurement of weapons.
- Non-Violent disarming of Iraq.
- Try to open a bilateral dialogue between the U.S. and North Korea.

On March 26, 2003 4726th the Security Council held its 4726th meeting, concerning Iraq, upon the requests of the Arab Group and the Non-Aligned Movement. The meeting began at 3:25 p.m. and was suspended at 8:31 p.m.

The following is an annotated version of the press release with additions, indicated in bold, from notes taken by LCNP observers.

SECURITY COUNCIL HOLDS FIRST DEBATE ON WAR IN IRAQ

The Security Council, holding its first debate on Iraq since hostilities began on the 19th of March. This debate was called to end the illegal aggression and demand the immediate withdrawal of invading forces, by an overwhelming majority of this afternoon's 45 speakers.

Expressing regret that diplomacy had failed to resolve the question of Iraq's disarmament, speakers emphasized that the current war, carried out without Council authorization, was a violation of international law and the United Nations Charter. Many stressed they could not understand how the Council could remain silent in the face of the aggression by two of its permanent members against another United Nations Member State.

Meeting at the request of the League of Arab States and the Non-Aligned Movement, the Council also heard speakers urge the international community to ensure that the sovereignty and integrity of Iraq were fully preserved. The right of the Iraqi people to determine their political future and exercise control over their natural resources should also be fully respected, they said. Concern was also expressed about the provision of humanitarian assistance, in light of the suspension of the "oil-for-food" program, which allowed Baghdad to use part of its petroleum sales to buy relief supplies and on which 60 per cent of Iraqis depend. The program was suspended on 17 March when Secretary-General Kofi Annan withdrew all United Nations personnel from Iraq.

Iraq's representative called on the Council to act to ensure that the rules of international law were observed. While the aggressors said that their goal was the disarmament of Iraq, everybody knew that they were not the ones tasked with that mandate. The inspections during several months had found no evidence of weapons of mass destruction or proscribed activities within Iraq. The real reason for the attack was occupation of the country, its re-colonization and control of its oil wealth.

He hoped the Council would stand up to the aggressors, he added. It was peculiar that, instead of considering the aggression itself, the Council had been busy discussing the humanitarian aspects of the problem. Shouldn't the Council pay attention to the cessation of the aggression first?

Malaysia's representative, speaking as the Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-aligned Movement, said it was highly regrettable that the parties concerned had chosen to cast aside multilateral diplomacy and taken the path of war, while efforts to avert conflict were continuing in earnest. The war against Iraq should never have started in the first place, and should end immediately. He called on the Council to use its power and authority to revert to the multilateral process in a common effort to resolve the issue.

The United States and the United Kingdom had waged war, stated the Observer for the League of Arab States, at a time when Iraq was positively cooperating with United

Nations inspectors, who had stated that they only needed a few more months to discharge their tasks.□The only party authorized to disarm Iraq was the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC).

Kuwait's representative said that resolution 1441 (2002) had proclaimed Iraq in material breach of its obligations in the field of disarmament, as well as its obligations related to the return of Kuwaiti nationals and property.□The Iraqi Government was fully responsible for the situation it was in now.□He called on the Council to focus on the future of the Iraqi population, especially to avert any humanitarian catastrophe in the country, and supported the proposals being considered by the Council to amend the oil-for-food program.

The representative of Australia, a member of the coalition that has taken military action against Iraq, said it was time for Council members to go beyond the acrimony, narrow political ambitions and separate agendas which had hamstrung the Council in recent months, and seize the opportunity to make good on their responsibilities.□It was time that the Council focused on what was at stake, and provided the guidance the international community was waiting for on humanitarian needs, long-term reconstruction, and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

Statements were also made this afternoon by the representatives of Algeria, Egypt, Yemen, Libya, Greece (on behalf of the European Union and associated States), Indonesia, South Africa, Cuba, New Zealand, India, Poland, Singapore, Brazil, Turkey, Switzerland, Sudan, Viet Nam, Jamaica, Iran, Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Tunisia, Argentina, Mauritius, Belarus, Japan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Colombia, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Latvia, Nicaragua, Norway, Morocco, Albania, Venezuela, Iceland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia and Guatemala.

Statements

KOFI ANNAN, "Those in control of any territory are responsible for humanitarian needs we need to be in contact with international organizations. Conflict creates new humanitarian needs which oil for food program doesn't cover." He noted that the "oil-for-food" program had now come to a halt, with some \$2.4 billion of supplies, mainly food, in the pipeline.□The Council needed to determine how it would adjust the program to make it possible for those supplies to reach the Iraqi people under present conditions, and to ensure that food, medicine and other essential life-sustaining supplies continued to be provided.□Humanitarian needs of people fall on the shoulders of those who occupy those territories. The Council needs to determine the many needs of the Iraq people.

Secretary -General said that "all of us must regret that our intense efforts to achieve a peaceful solution, through the Council, did not succeed".□Many asked why the Iraqi Government did not take full advantage of the last chance they were given by the Council, but, at the same time, many seriously questioned whether it was legitimate for Member States to take such a fateful action now.□

The Geneva Conventions and all other instruments of international humanitarian law must be scrupulously obeyed.

Faith in the United Nations could only be restored if the Council was able to identify and work constructively towards specific goals, he said.□He urged the five permanent members, in particular, to show leadership by making a concrete effort to overcome their differences.□He emphasized two guiding principles, which should underpin all the Council's future decisions on Iraq.□The first principle was respect for Iraq's sovereignty,

territorial integrity and independence. □ **“The second, which flowed logically from the first, was respect for Iraqi people in determining their own political future and control of their own natural resources.”**

He concluded by saying that the world was living through a moment of deep divisions, which, if not healed, could have grave consequences for the international system and relations between States. □ By your interventions in this debate, you have it in your power to deepen those divisions, or to begin to heal them. □ He appealed to all to choose the latter course, and to reunite around a new resolve to uphold the principles of the Charter. □

MOHAMMED A. ALDOURI (Iraq) said that his country -- a founding Member of the United Nations -- was being subjected to **“barbaric U.S. and U.K. military aggression, which was killing innocent women, children and the elderly.”** Sanctions, which have lasted for almost 13 years, were also having a terrible effect on the country. □ **“The goal of aggression is to change the political landscape of Middle East.”** This is a blatant violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. □ The humanitarian effect of the war was devastating. □ The lack of water in Basra, for example, was likely to lead to outbreaks of disease. □ A mosque in Baghdad had been destroyed. □ In an attempt to terrorize Iraq, the United States and the United Kingdom conducted some 2,000 bombing sorties a day. □ The forces of the Iraqi army and the people of the country were fighting a heroic battle against the aggression, however.

The Council must take action to make sure that the rules of international law were observed, he continued. □ While the aggressors said that their goal was disarmament of Iraq, everybody knew that they were not the ones tasked with that mandate. □ The inspections during several months had found no evidence of weapons of mass destruction or proscribed activities within Iraq. □ The real reason was occupation of the country, its re-colonization and controlling its oil wealth.

The international community was also well aware that the Security Council had not authorized the use of force by the United States and the United Kingdom, he said. □ Despite the position of the majority of the members of the Council and Iraq’s cooperation, the two countries had launched their aggressive war, which constituted a blatant material breach of international law and the United Nations Charter. □ It was also a material breach of relevant Security Council resolutions, which, without exception, called for respect for Iraq’s sovereignty and territorial integrity. □ The Council must impose respect for its resolutions, particularly those relating to unjustified embargo against his country. □ He was still hopeful that the international community would be able to impose its will on those who had broken the international law. □ A failure to do so would mean the end of the United Nations system.

It was also peculiar that instead of considering the aggression itself, the Council had been busy discussing the humanitarian aspects of the problem, he added. □ Shouldn’t the Council pay attention to the cessation of the aggression was first? □ Wasn’t that putting the cart in front of the horse? □ The oil-for-food program had been stopped, and the inspectors had been withdrawn from Iraq, with the Council’s blessing. □ How had the Council allowed itself to be manipulated into such a situation? □ It was his hope that the Council would be able to stand up to the aggressors.

RASTAM MOHD ISA (Malaysia), speaking as the Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-aligned Movement, said the Movement strongly believed that Member States of the United Nations should observe and abide by the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law in dealing with problems among nations. □ The Movement opposed all unilateral military actions or use of force, including those made without

proper authorization from the Council. It deplored any unilateral action against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Member States.

The war against Iraq violated the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter, he continued. It was highly regrettable that the parties concerned had chosen to cast aside multilateral diplomacy and taken the path of war, while efforts to avert conflict were continuing in earnest. The unilateral military action was an illegitimate act of aggression. The war against Iraq should never have started in the first place, and should end immediately. The problem of Iraq should and could be resolved peacefully through the United Nations. He called on the Council to use its power and authority to revert to the multilateral process in a common effort to resolve the issue.

YAHYA MAHMASSANI, (Observer for the League of Arab States), said that the resolution adopted at the end of the Ministerial Council meeting of the League on 23 March had stated that the “**Anglo-American aggression against Iraq was a violation of the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, as well as a threat to international peace and security.**” The League had called for the unconditional withdrawal of United States and British forces from Iraq and held them responsible for all the repercussions of the aggression. It had also called on the Council to adopt a resolution calling for an immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of forces. In addition, the League had called for a reaffirmation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq.

The United States and the United Kingdom had waged war at a time when Iraq was positively cooperating with United Nations *inspectors*, who needed only a few months to discharge their tasks, he said. The only party authorized to *disarm* Iraq was the *United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC)*. Wouldn't it have been better to wait a few months to avoid a war, which would lead to grave consequences for the country and the region? The war was taking place despite the Council's refusal to approve and despite international pressure. The waging of war against Iraq had led him to believe that the question of Iraq was not one of *weapons of mass destruction*, but of the imposition of absolute power, plans and schemes. He reaffirmed that the shape of the Arab political regimes must be decided by the peoples of the region themselves. Any attempt to impose changes in the region or control its resources was totally unacceptable.

At a time when there was hope for the end of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, he was stunned to see the invasion and occupation of Iraq. Instead of one occupation, there were now two to deal with. The threat to the security of Arab nations was *the possession by Israel of weapons of mass destruction*. The other threat was the continued Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories. He called on the Council to shoulder its responsibility as the organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. How could the Council remain silent while an unjust war was being waged? He called on the Council to put an end to the war and call for the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces.

ABDALLAH BAALI (Algeria) said that it had taken hundreds of thousands of people “crying tears of blood” in the face of the horrors of war for the Council to assume its responsibility for protecting those in danger. To do nothing today would be tantamount to compliance in leaving a nation in peril. The war in Iraq had started at a time when there was no immediate danger to international peace and security and when the inspection process was proceeding peacefully. It was hard to characterize the terror of millions of children already robbed of their childhood as a result of sanctions, who were

awakened by the bombings. Thousands all over the world had demonstrated against war in Iraq.

Since the beginning of the crisis, Algeria had called for a peaceful settlement of the crisis, based on the inspection process, he continued. It had warned of the dangers of the armed conflict and expressed its great concern over the fate of the Iraqi people. Civilian populations always paid the highest price at the time of war. The images of suffering women and children appeared on television despite the censorship imposed on the stations. The use of force against Iraq had not been duly authorized and did not meet the criteria of international legitimacy. Those who acted outside the Council were acting in violation of its norms.

The real objectives of the war were, in fact, different from the proclaimed goal of disarming Iraq, he said. His country endorsed the resolution adopted this month by the League of Arab States, which called for an immediate cessation of war and immediate and unconditional withdrawal of foreign forces from Iraq. He called for strict respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq and supported the people of Iraq in its ordeal. He also called for strict compliance with the Geneva Conventions on the treatment of the prisoners of war.

The United Nations must meet the many challenges that humanity was facing, he said. Otherwise, it would lose its soul. Today, it was truly at a crossroads, its very existence challenged. Its responsibility was great, for the use of force had not been authorized. It must call for an immediate cessation of the conflict. Was that too much to ask of the Council, which remained the hope of the international community?

AHMED ABOUL GHEIT (Egypt) said the international community must consider collective action to bring fighting in Iraq to an end and initiate political action to achieve a peaceful settlement to the crisis. Those actions would spare the people of the Middle East and elsewhere a war that threatened to assume grave dimensions and repercussions that would reach far and wide.

Had sufficient opportunity been given to the international regime, it would have been possible for humanity to avoid watching the painful picture it saw in Iraq today, he continued. The fall of a single victim was a loss to humanity, and every casualty would continue to haunt succeeding generations. The Council represented the conscience of the international community, and it could send a clear message calling for the immediate cessation of fighting in Iraq, as well as call for a peaceful settlement. It must insist that the sovereignty of Iraq be maintained and urge all parties to respect the principles of international law. The resort to war was the result of a failure of the political action means of resolving disputes. The Council should not shirk its responsibility in that regard under the Charter. **“International community demands that the council take action to preserve UN Charter. Peace should be built on a solid foundation in accordance with law.”**

ABDULLAH M. ALSAIDI (Yemen) said that he was deeply concerned by the impact the war would have -- the death of thousands of civilians and the destruction not only sown in Iraq, but in the region as a whole. Even before the first missile was launched, a division could be seen in the Council between a majority, which favored the continuation of inspections, and a minority, which wished to halt all efforts towards peace. The Council had been marginalized and paralyzed in its role as the organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. The military invasion of Iraq foreshadowed a tragedy for Iraq and the region. The invasion was also highly dangerous for the future of international relations.

“Military invasion of Iraq foreshadows tragedy for Iraq and it is highly dangerous for international relations.” “Republic of Iraq feels military invasion is in no way justified”, particularly given Iraq’s devotion to implementing resolutions on disarmament, especially 1441 (2002), as confirmed by the reports of the heads of UNMOVIC and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The utilization of force constituted a flagrant violation of international law and the Charter. Also, the coalition countries had said that they were determined to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction. They were doing so without having been given a mandate by the Council to do so. They were also overlooking the chemical, biological and nuclear arsenal of Israel, and thereby reflecting a policy of “two weights and two measures”.

The policy of regime change was an act of aggression against a Member of the United Nations and constituted interference in its internal affairs. He reaffirmed the need to ensure the territorial integrity of Iraq. Despite the precarious situation, he was heartened by the international consensus against the war. However, that consensus must be crystallized into a policy, and that was the responsibility of the United Nations.

MOHAMMAD A. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) said that on 24 March the League of Arab States had adopted its resolution, with reservation from the State of Kuwait, for it did not mention the aggression by Iraq against his country. It was with profound sadness that his country was learning about the innocent victims among the brotherly Iraqi people and the coalition forces, as a result of ongoing hostilities. War should be the last resort, which could be used only after exhausting all other means. His people fully realized the effects of the military operations in Iraq, which had come about as a result of Iraq’s persistence in rejecting Security Council resolutions concerning elimination of weapons of mass destruction. It was important to remember that in 1991 Kuwait had been subjected to occupation by Iraq for seven months.

He urged the coalition forces to continue taking all precautionary measures to avoid unnecessary losses and exposing civilians to danger. His country had not and would not participate in any military operations against Iraq, but it was taking measures to protect its sovereignty and territorial integrity. Since 20 March, Iraq had launched several missiles against the targets on the territory of Kuwait. He called on the Security Council to demand that Iraq stop hostile actions against his country. The Iraqi Government was trying to draw Kuwait into the war, but his country was resisting such attempts. The missiles, which Iraq was aiming against civilian areas in Kuwait, exceeded the range of 150 kilometers. That proved the invalidity of Iraq’s allegations that it did not possess such weapons.

Resolution 1441 had proclaimed Iraq in material breach of its obligations in the field of disarmament, as well as its obligations related to the return of Kuwaiti nationals and property, he continued. The Iraqi Government was fully responsible for the situation it was in now. Having seen disturbing images of prisoners of war in Iraq, he called on the Security Council and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to intervene and demand that Iraq respect the principles of international law concerning the humane treatment of prisoners of war. Kuwait also called on the Council to focus on the future of the Iraqi population, especially to avert any humanitarian catastrophe in the country. He supported the proposals being considered by the Council to amend the oil-for-food program. The Secretary-General should be granted the authority to lead humanitarian efforts in the country. Kuwait wanted to preserve the wealth and national resources of Iraq and thwart the desperate attempts by the Iraqi Government to create an environmental crisis in the area.

AHMED OWN (Libya), expressed regret that Iraq had been targeted by air, ground and sea attacks on a scale without precedent by conventional weapons of mass destruction. □ There had been continuous bombings on Iraq's cities and infrastructure, which had resulted in civilian casualties. □ Those casualties had been seen on all television stations except those of the aggressor State, which had hid behind its actions. □ The international community was going through a sad day, when one of the major States of the United Nations violated its fundamental spirit. □ The United Nations had been marginalized, although it was an institution where disputes should be settled through peaceful means. □ As a consequence, it had weathered extensive damage, which would affect it for some time.

The war against Iraq was a flagrant violation of all international standards and laws, as well as the objectives of the United Nations Charter. □ The aggressor had marginalized all the efforts of institutions responsible for maintaining international peace and security. □ The war violated resolution 1441 (2002), which did not authorize the use of force against Iraq. □ When that resolution was adopted, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom had stated that it did not authorize the use of force. □ Those two States had declared that regime change and establishing freedom, democracy and human rights were the objectives of the war. □ But how could freedom and democracy occur with missiles and bombs, which destroyed Iraqi institutions and affected innocent civilians? □ Was it not just to demand withdrawal of all forces from Iraq territory and to compensate its people?

ADAMANTIOS TH. VASSILAKIS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the European Union and associated States, said the Union was committed to the territorial integrity, sovereignty, political stability and full and effective disarmament of Iraq. □ It also respected the rights of the Iraqi people, including all persons belonging to minorities. □ The Union believed the United Nations must continue to play a central role during and after the current crisis, and that the Council should give the United Nations a strong mandate for that mission.

The international community urgently needed to address the major humanitarian needs that would arise from the conflict, he continued. □ He supported efforts based on proposals made by the Secretary-General to adapt the "oil-for-food" program to changing circumstances, so that it would continue to meet the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people. □ On the regional front, the Union expressed solidarity with, and stood ready to assist, countries faced with problems and risks as a result of conflict, including possible refugee flows.

MOHAMAD SLAMET HIDAYAT (Indonesia) said that the aggression must be immediately stopped. □ For some weeks now, the countries had been agonizing about the very future of the United Nations system, sidelined by the willful unilateral action of the powerful. □ The United Nations' authority had been undermined. □ Another question concerned the multidimensional consequences of the war to the Middle East region, and beyond. □ The Member States' shared commitment to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war demanded that the United Nations not stand idle. □ It was for those reasons that Indonesia had joined the countries that had asked for the convening of today's meeting.

Indonesia strongly deplored the unilateral action by the United States and its allies, which had decided to launch military attack against Iraq in contravention of international law, he continued. □ His country was witnessing with profound sadness the humanitarian toll, the intolerable sufferings, which had been inflicted upon thousands of innocent and vulnerable civilians in Iraq, as well as rising casualties among the

combatants on the ground. Today, there was an alarming prospect that the fighting would spiral out of control. A grave humanitarian crisis was already under way.

He went on to say that, in its justified concern to immediately and collectively address the grave humanitarian situation in Iraq, the international community should not lose sight of the fact that the countries that had chosen the path of war, in disregard of the process within the Security Council, bore special responsibility to address the unfolding humanitarian suffering resulting from their actions. His Government had also consistently underlined that any solution to the question of Iraq should respect the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of that country. Resolution 1441 provided a clear road map to effectively address the issue of Iraq's disarmament through the inspections regime. Diplomacy, combined with judicious pressure, had been yielding results. The Council's silence in calling for immediate cessation of the aggression was deafening, indeed. Indonesia hoped the Council would not fail to shoulder its Charter-mandated responsibilities to maintain international peace and security. It must unite and join the clarion calls of nations and peoples all over the world for an end to the war.

DUMISANI KUMALO (South Africa) said the United Nations must play a central role in securing an end to the war in Iraq. It was the primary institution that gave legality and legitimacy to collective efforts to secure peace and security in the world. The war could result in unwanted occupation that would further complicate the achievement of peace and stability in the entire region. The war in Iraq must not be allowed to lead to the erosion of the principles and values that were contained in the United Nations Charter. **"We agree with the Secretary General, if we would have persevered longer Iraq would have been disarmed. No state should possess weapons of mass destruction. We agree with weapons inspectors that it would have taken months not years to assure world that Iraq is free of weapons of mass destruction."** He cautioned the Council from being drawn into drafting a resolution that would provide tacit or implied approval for military operations currently under way in Iraq.

"We cannot ignore war casualties. The Security Council has the obligation to secure humanitarian assistance." The Council had a role to play, he continued, in ensuring that provisions were in place to assist with the delivery of humanitarian relief to the Iraqi people. It must pass a resolution on humanitarian assistance that upheld the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, and ensured that the natural resources of Iraq remained in the hands of its people. The open-ended and punitive sanctions the Iraqi people had been forced to endure for more than 12 years must come to an end. The oil-for-food program could be adjusted to ensure that humanitarian goods that had been ordered by the Iraqi Government were delivered. **"War in Iraq should not destroy collective security that UN provides us."**

BRUNO RODRIGUEZ PARRILLA (Cuba) said that the aggression of the United States and the United Kingdom against Iraq deserved strong condemnation and should be stopped immediately. The Council should comply with its primary responsibility in the restoration of international peace and security, shattered by that act of aggression. The inspections were suspended when tangible progress was being achieved. Iraq had been sentenced a long time ago. Iraq did not constitute, nor could it constitute, the slightest risk to United States national security or that of its allies. Some analysts had submitted evidence that the attack against Iraq had even been planned before the 11 September attacks on the United States.

The priority now, he stated, was to stop the bombardments and aggression against Iraq. It was also a priority to protect civilians and provide humanitarian assistance. The Council and the Secretary-General should be careful in their mandates and responsibilities.

Nothing should be done against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq. The aim of the United Nations now must be to achieve a ceasefire and stop the aggression.

DON MACKAY (New Zealand) said the Council's common objective must be to end hostilities in Iraq as quickly as possible, so that risks to the Iraqi people were minimized and their humanitarian needs met. Those involved in initiating military action appeared to have acknowledged their responsibilities in that respect, but the broader international community must respond urgently to the United Nations call for humanitarian relief funds. The Council must move to resolve practical issues related to the oil-for-food program, which must continue to operate effectively. The Secretary-General had made proposals for its continuing effectiveness, and the Council should work quickly to reach agreement on that.

The Council had undergone an extremely divisive and difficult period, he said, but it must now set aside those differences and focus on the welfare of the Iraqi people. A challenging period of reconstruction in Iraq lay ahead, and it would be in the long-term interest of all to see the United Nations fully engaged. The United Nations had the experience to contribute and help define the international architecture for the delivery of humanitarian and reconstruction assistance.

V.K. NAMBIAR (India) said that securing Iraq's cooperation with the inspections process and compliance with all relevant Council resolutions should have been the main focus of the Council's efforts. That, unfortunately, did not happen. Thus, some members had decided to proceed unilaterally. He hoped that the military campaign, which was avoidable, would be short-lived, and strongly urged that all possible efforts be made to bring hostilities to an early end. He also called on all parties involved in the war to meet their obligations towards civilians under international humanitarian law. The international community should ensure that the sovereignty and integrity of Iraq were fully preserved, as well as its secular traditions. The right of the Iraqi people to determine their political future and exercise control over their natural resources should also be fully respected.

Regarding the oil-for-food program, he believed that approved contracts for supplies to Iraq under the program would be the logical priority for delivering immediate assistance to the Iraqi people. The international community must quickly get involved in restoring peace in Iraq in the eventual reconstruction of the country and in alleviating the plight of its long-suffering people. He urged the Council to display the required unity and collective will to be able to assist the Iraqi people in that endeavor. India had already announced its willingness to fully participate in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Iraq and its people, which would be inevitable as a result of the current conflict.

JANUSZ STANCZYK (Poland) said the conclusion had to be reached that the peaceful means for resolving the Iraqi crisis had been exhausted and the use of force remained the only option. The exclusive responsibility for that state of affairs rested with the Iraqi leadership. The intervention of the international coalition to force implementation by Iraq of relevant Council resolutions was not directed against the Iraqi people. It had been undertaken to eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, which threatened international peace and security. Failure to take action to effectively disarm Saddam Hussein's regime would be a serious political and military mistake, tantamount to tolerating breaches of the law and persistent disregard of obligations towards the United Nations. It would lead to further undermining the authority of the United Nations. The main aim of the international coalition was to destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and establish the rule of law in Iraq, he said. The military operation would be terminated immediately after attaining the set objectives. The Iraqi people would be able

to benefit from the country's resources, of which they were the rightful owners. The entire nation would enjoy full rights and would be able to undertake the construction of a new State, based on the principles of self-determination and liberty, without distinction as to political or ethnic background, and thus be able to determine their own future.

KISHORE MAHBUBANI (Singapore), expressed deep regret that the **“government of Iraq had chosen not to take the final opportunity to fully comply with resolution 1441.”** The people of Iraq, who had already suffered greatly from the Government's failure to comply with its disarmament obligations over the past 12 years, would suffer the most from the conflict. Like many Members, his country would have preferred that the Council had again explicitly authorized military action to disarm Iraq, but the onus had always been on that country to avoid war. Given Iraq's long history of flouting Security Council resolutions, the inability of the Council to reach a new consensus could not be taken as a reason for inaction to disarm Iraq.

Looking ahead, the international community needed to address the immediate challenges in Iraq, he continued, and it had to look for lasting solutions. The oil-for-food program needed to be restarted as soon as possible, as 60 per cent of the Iraqi population was dependent on food rations procured under the auspices of that program. Now, over 2 million people required assistance. If the conflict became protracted, the number of people needing assistance would undoubtedly rise. Therefore, he supported the Secretary-General's proposals and hoped that the Council would be able to reach agreement soon on a resolution allowing the resumption of the program.

Emergency relief must begin immediately, he stressed, with priority given to the worst affected areas. He was particularly concerned about reports from the ICRC that civilians in Basra could be facing a humanitarian disaster. Urgent measures were needed to restore basic utilities to the population there as soon as possible. He also supported the Secretary-General's call for both sides involved to respect humanitarian law.

While encouraged by the pledges already made in support of an international reconstruction program in Iraq, he believed that a more pressing concern was the provision of funding for humanitarian relief operations. The United Nations appeal for funds currently faced a shortfall of nearly \$90 million. Singapore was prepared to do its part, within its limited means, to contribute to any international humanitarian relief effort. His Government had contributed almost half a million Singapore dollars to provide a quick jump-start to a fund to help refugees and victims of the war in Iraq. He hoped that, as soon as the war was over, the international community would come together again to relieve the suffering of the Iraqi people.

JOHN DAUTH (Australia), It was time that the Council looked to the future for Iraq and the Iraqi people. **“The Security Council failed the international community. It failed to enforce its own resolution.”** It was time that the Council focused on what was at stake, and provided the guidance the international community was waiting for on humanitarian needs, long-term reconstruction, and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

Australia was part of the coalition to disarm Iraq, he said, because it believed an Iraq with weapons of mass destruction represented a grave threat to its own and international security. Its participation in the coalition was in complete accordance with international law. Existing Council resolutions, including 687, 678 and 1441, provided authority for the use of force to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and to restore international peace and security to the region.

It was also positioned to play its part in longer-term reconstruction work to help Iraq return to its rightful place in the international community. □ But, it was Australia's strong preference that the Council played its part. □ He urged Council members to agree on tools which would allow rapid and effective delivery of immediate humanitarian assistance to Iraq, and help in longer-term rehabilitation and reconstruction. □ That applied most immediately to resolutions on restoring the oil-for-food program, and on longer-term reconstruction. **“We hope that Iraq can be disarmed soon. Our role provides us the role to disarm Iraq. If Iraq is being disarmed militarily it is because the Security Council failed to disarm Iraq.”**

RONALDO MOTA SARDENBERG (Brazil) said his country profoundly deplored the initiation of military action in Iraq, especially since it had occurred without the express authorization of the Council. □ **“This war brings suffering to people.”** His Government called for the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of peace and respect for Iraqi territorial integrity and sovereignty. □ It also stressed the need for strict observance of all principles of international humanitarian law, in particular, those referring to the protection of the civilian population, of refugees and the treatment of war prisoners.

The immediate question before the Council was how to extend humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people. □ Even before military intervention, more than 60 per cent of the Iraqi population was dependent on the oil-for-food program for its basic provisions. □ Since the conflict had begun, the situation had deteriorated, and suspension of the program had exacerbated the situation. Military action without the express authorization of the Council had profound, sensitive legal and political implications, which must be carefully weighed as the Council worked towards re-establishing urgent forms of humanitarian assistance. The United Nations agencies' humanitarian relief work should be promptly resumed and the coordination of all humanitarian efforts should remain the Secretary-General's responsibility. **“The Council must be preserved and strengthened.”**

UMUT PAMIR (Turkey) said that the Turkish people prayed for an early end of the war in Iraq. □ He continued to hope that the loss of life would be minimal. □ Now, on the carcass of aborted diplomacy, the international community had reason to deeply regret the division that had reigned over the Council at the critical moment in history. □ **“We are left with a call to parties to uphold the principles of international humanitarian law. □ We appeal to them to act in accordance with the established practices thereof”**, he said.

Continuing, he said that the statement by the representative of Greece on behalf of the European Union embodied the principles and outlook that would serve well at the time of profound change and uncertainty. □ It was with that understanding that Turkey had aligned itself with the Union's position. □ Turkey valued its cultural and historical ties with Iraq and its people. □ It was, first and foremost, a time-honored tradition that friends were called upon to be candid and straightforward at times like these. □ Had Iraq provided the necessary cooperation in 1991, the current situation could have been avoided. □ There was much to regret, much to ponder with a sense of loss and dismay. □ While the conflict was under way, the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people was of paramount importance, and the oil-for-food program should continue uninterrupted.

Turning to the “vast amount of sheer disinformation with regard to Turkey” in northern Iraq, he said that Turkey upheld the territorial integrity, political sovereignty and national unity of Iraq. □ It would support the decisions by the Iraqi people through democratic processes. □ It supported attempts to put a fully representative system in place in Iraq. □ It also believed that the natural resources of Iraq belonged to all Iraqis. □ Not a sliver of scheming above and below those basic parameters could be ascribed to Turkey. □ His

country was profoundly hurt by the cynical, self-righteous and at times insulting barrage of rhetoric emanating from certain quarters.□

The country could not allow another influx of refugees as it did in 1991, however, he said.□Any refugee movement should be met inside Iraq and the people in distress should be provided with shelter, food and security.□Turkey could not allow the PKK/KADEK terrorists marauding through parts of northern Iraq to abuse conditions of stability.□At any rate, it was common knowledge that elements of the Turkish armed forces were stationed in northern Iraq.□They had not been sent there yesterday, but years ago in the context of “Operation Northern Watch” in the aftermath of the Gulf War.□Thanks to that operation, the Kurds living in northern Iraq received protection and humanitarian relief.□Turkey had no intention of entering Iraq.□Should it need to, Turkey would not enter Iraq to fight, but to monitor a refugee crisis that might unfold and to respond to immediate security concerns.

JENO C.A. STAEHELIN (Switzerland), “Military intervention has been launched without UN approval. Switzerland supports UN to allow humanitarian aid to Iraq. UN needs to resume central role. UN has essential role to restore Iraq’s sovereignty, political and economical development.”

In the immediate future, it was incumbent on the States directly involved in the war effort, in conformity with their obligations as set out in the Geneva Conventions, to take responsibility for the urgent needs of civilians.□He underlined the importance of a clear separation between military and humanitarian activities.□It was imperative that the latter be guided by the principles of humanity, impartiality and neutrality.□He also stressed that efficient coordination must be ensured between the coalition forces and humanitarian organizations.

He appealed to the parties to the conflict to ensure access by the ICRC to people in need.□The impartial activities of the ICRC must be facilitated in all circumstances.□He was concerned about the direct consequences of the conflict on supplies to civilians and encouraged the Council to reactivate the oil-for-food program without delay in a form that took due account of the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people.□The United Nations must assume its indispensable role in reaching, without delay, a settlement to the Iraq crisis that was acceptable to the entire international community.□He appealed to Council members to overcome their differences and to reassume their principal responsibility — to maintain international peace and security.

ELFATIH MOHAMED AHMED ERWA (Sudan) said that he wanted to pay tribute to the members of the Council who had opposed war.□Of course, their efforts had not prevented the outbreak of hostilities, but their stand would remain in history.□He supported the recent declaration of the League of Arab States, which called the aggression against Iraq a violation of the principles of international law and demanded immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces.□The aggressors should bear all legal and financial responsibility for their actions.

It now appeared that the war would take a long time, he continued, and now it seemed that the suffering of innocent civilians in Iraq would be even worse than expected.□He expected the Council to take action to restore peace and security in Iraq and to take the full burden of its responsibility to protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq.□He appealed for a cessation of hostilities in that country, after which the inspectors should resume and conclude their tasks.□He called on the international community to rise above its differences.□A tremendous world solidarity had been manifested through massive protest demonstrations all over the world.□That should lead to an international

consensus, based on the principles of the United Nations Charter. That document should not be allowed to turn into yet another blue booklet, which could be selectively quoted or ignored.

NGUYEN THANH CHAU (Viet Nam) said it was deeply deplorable that worldwide protests, as well as Council efforts, had failed to find a solution that might have helped to avoid the tragedy. The use of force against an independent sovereign State and Member of the United Nations was a gross violation of the United Nations Charter and fundamental principles of international law. It also rendered the United Nations ineffective and created an extremely dangerous precedent. The preventive actions against Iraq would not help to ensure the world's security; rather, it ran the risk of spreading misunderstanding and causing violence in the Middle East to spiral.

War was always a death sentence to peace, he said. Viet Nam added its voice to others in calling for an immediate end to military action in Iraq. As supplies of essential necessities, which 60 per cent of Iraqis were depending on, ran low, the oil-for-food program should be reconstituted. Viet Nam was eager to take an active part in the collective endeavor to assist the Iraqi people in its time of crisis.

STAFFORD NEIL (Jamaica) said peaceful disarmament through an inspections process was a viable alternative to war that had not been exhausted. Regrettably, force had been used, and the international community was now seeing the harsh realities -- death and destruction caused by military conflict. It had seen in vivid detail the powerful demonstration of sophisticated technology and destructive power of modern weaponry. The aerial bombardment of Baghdad, the wailing sirens and the thunder of explosions had no doubt succeeded in producing fear and trepidation, especially among civilians in Baghdad. The scars of war were deep and generations of Iraqis would bear them, as would generations of United States and other citizens of the international community.

The nations that had undertaken military action in Iraq were countries with which Jamaica was bound by ties of history and shared values of freedom. That very friendship obliged Jamaica to make heard today its small voice for peace. Now was the time for a sincere, bold and unequivocal search for peace to save the lives of combatants and the innocent, to stop the possible spread of war, and to secure mankind's future in a troubled world. Beyond what was happening in Iraq and transcending the specific circumstances was the challenge of ensuring that the collective wisdom of the United Nations, and the Council in particular, not be eroded by the will of the mighty.

JAVAD ZARIF (Iran) "Unilateral war against Iraq doesn't have legitimacy. War wasn't authorized by Security Council. It was for the Security Council to decide proper course of action. The United States is the major culprit for Iraq's acquisition of weapons."

He said that his country deplored the fact that diplomatic efforts to implement Security Council resolutions on the disarmament of Iraq had been prematurely and arbitrarily aborted, and a sovereign Member of the Organization had become subject of an outright invasion. The unilateral war against Iraq did not meet any standards of international legitimacy. It was not waged in self-defense against any armed attack. Not even by a stretch of imagination could Iraq, after 12 years of comprehensive sanctions, be considered an imminent threat against the national security of the belligerent Powers.

It was also evident that the war was in no way authorized by the Council, he said. Quite to the contrary, the latest round of diplomacy in the Council had clearly demonstrated that the majority of its members were either opposed or unwilling to support the draft

resolution authorizing war. While it was true that 12 years had elapsed since the Council had set out the obligations of the Iraqi Government with respect to disarmament and that Iraq had yet to clarify a number of relevant outstanding issues, it was up to the Council to make that determination. Moreover, the stated goal of regime change in Iraq ran counter to the norms of international law. The Iraqi people may resent their Government, but as they had shown in the past days, they did not accept their liberation through foreign occupation.

His country, which shared long borders with Iraq and was dangerously close to the theatre of hostilities, had not only received refugees, but also rockets and missiles from both sides, he continued. In that connection, he registered his Government's strongest protests and underlined the imperative of taking remedial and preventive measures by the belligerents. The provisions of international law should be promoted and enforced in their entirety. Selectivity was not only unacceptable, but, in fact, dangerously impractical.

Turning to the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, he said that his Government had made preparations to assist Iraqi civilians in cooperation with multilateral institutions. However, under the Fourth Geneva Convention, the countries that had resorted to war had to shoulder the full burden of meeting the humanitarian and protection requirements of Iraqi civilians and must be accountable for the welfare and safety of the people. At the same time, it was imperative that those issues not be decided unilaterally outside the United Nations. The guiding principle should be respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity of Iraq, as well as the right of its people for self-determination. It was necessary to tackle the unfolding humanitarian crisis in Iraq, but it was not acceptable that the Council had failed to consider the conflict itself. The Council had the obligation to address the breach of peace in Iraq.

SUN JOUN-VUNG (Republic of Korea) said Iraq had been given more than enough time and opportunity to disarm. Since it had failed to comply with its disarmament obligations for the past 12 years, it must be concluded that Iraq had had no genuine intention in disarming. If the country today faced the "serious consequences" mentioned in resolution 1441, it had no one but itself to blame. The coalition action by the international community should be construed as an inevitable measure taken after the exhaustion of all possible diplomatic efforts to resolve the issue peacefully.

With the hostilities now occurring, he was deeply concerned about the plight of innocent Iraqi people who would suffer from the deteriorating humanitarian situation. The international community must take necessary measures to meet the acute humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people, expeditiously providing key humanitarian supplies, in particular, food and medicines.

HOUSSAM ASAAD DIAB (Lebanon) said that the foreign ministers of Arab States had, on 24 March, adopted a resolution condemning the United States-United Kingdom aggression against Iraq. That unilateral military act lacked any moral or legal ground. **Iraq was cooperating with the I.A.E.A.** The overwhelming majority of Council members, during the debate on 19 March, had stated that peaceful means for Iraq's disarmament had not been exhausted yet, based on the reports of the IAEA and UNMOVIC, which had not been allowed enough time to complete their tasks.

Also, resolution 1441 did not permit the automatic use of force. In addition, using the objective of regime change to justify the act was not only a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, but also a violation of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter Art. 4 section 2. Art. 51 states state right to defend itself. Attempting to

impose changes on the region and interfering in the internal affairs of States were unacceptable, he stated. □ The UNMOVIC had declared that it had not found any weapons of mass destruction or evidence of prohibited activities during the past four months. □ The military act undertaken by the United States and the United Kingdom was beginning to cause humanitarian and environmental catastrophes, which would threaten the entire Middle East. □ **This unilateral war lacks legal and moral grounds. Peaceful disarmament of Iraq has not been exhausted. The inspectors were discharged without completing the mandate that was given to them.** The Council was called on today to do its utmost to control the current crisis and guarantee the return to a peaceful approach to disarm Iraq. □ The Council must also take measures to put an end to the current military action and call for the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom forces, in order to preserve the territorial integrity of Iraq.

ALI HACHANI (Tunisia) said that the conflict in Iraq had erupted despite numerous calls for a peaceful settlement there. □ His country had sided with many Arab nations in their search for a settlement within the framework of international legitimacy, in keeping with the principles of the unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Iraq. □ Since the conflict had now become a fait accompli, his country was seriously concerned over its serious impact on the people of Iraq and the region overall, he continued. □ Tunisia called upon all the parties to return to peaceful means in dealing with the issues involved, in order to avoid a further escalation of the conflict in the country and a negative impact on the region, in particular, the deterioration of the situation in Palestine, because of Israeli policies in the occupied territories.

ARNOLDO LISTRE (Argentina) “**Regrets that it wasn’t possible for peaceful disarmament. A divided Security Council wasn’t able to find tool to bring about peaceful solution. The use of force should have been a last resort. Legal decisions of war further divide and divert the council.**”

The United Nations, particularly the Council, must now be directed at facilitating the work of humanitarian organizations, providing medical, food and other assistance. □ That was why Argentina supported the proposals of the Secretary-General to adapt the oil-for-food program to the present situation on the ground. In the eyes of world opinion, he continued, the Council had been unable to prevent the armed conflict in Iraq, but it could not now allow itself to be perceived as the obstacle to humanitarian assistance. □ If, in the light of the daily tragedy of millions of innocent Iraqis, the Council was paralyzed or did not act with the determination demanded by the circumstances, the public opinion might wonder what the use of the United Nations and the Council was. □ That would undoubtedly deal a new and heavy blow to an already weakened Organization.

JAGDISH KOONJUL (Mauritius) said that, had Iraq respected all its obligations regarding implementation of the relevant Council resolutions, war could have been avoided. □ At the same time, it must be recognized that Iraq had shown increased cooperation over recent months, as stated by the heads of UNMOVIC and the IAEA. □ War was avoidable and more time should have been allowed to the inspectors. □ Also, any military action against Iraq required the authorization of the Council. **“These events showed U.N. inability in preventing war.”**

ALEG IVANOU (Belarus) said “history only teaches us that it teaches nothing”. □ Today, the international community was witnessing an armed aggression against a sovereign Member State of the United Nations. □ That aggression had been planned well in advance and launched in circumvention of the authority of the Security Council under the United Nations Charter. □ The efforts undertaken by the peace-loving nations had

proven to be insufficient to avert war. **“Position of international community is being completely ignored.”**

The President and people of Belarus condemned the aggression against Iraq, he said, and resolutely opposed any unilateral attempts to enforce systems of administration and governance upon peoples of the world. **“Bombers could not serve as a means for delivery of humanitarian aid. Belarus was very aware of the horrible toll carried by war. The use of force as the last resort constituted an exclusive prerogative of the Security Council, and the disregard of that body led to undermining the existing world order.**

His country called upon the Council to immediately stop the aggression and prevent further unjustified civilian casualties. **“An adequate assessment should be given to the military action, and he urged the Organization to reassert its direct responsibility for the maintenance of peace and the rule of law. The resolution of the Iraqi issue in conformity with the objectives of the United Nations could only be attained through peaceful means based on respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, as well as its people’s right to independently choose its own path.**

KOICHI HARAGUCHI (Japan) said Iraq had repeatedly violated 17 Council resolutions, and failed 1441 Resolution. **“The best solution would be to dismantle weapons of mass destruction without an armed conflict. That was impossible, however, and Japan had decided, as a responsible member of the international community, to support the actions taken by the United States and its coalition partners. “We will give 112.53 million dollars to help humanitarian efforts.”**

SRGJAN KERIM (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) said that, unfortunately, the Iraqi regime did not comprehend the seriousness of the situation and had failed to fulfill its disarmament obligations. **“If Iraq had made a real effort to cooperate in substance in the past 12 years, and seized the final opportunity given to it in resolution 1441, it would have been possible to avoid the current situation. The action that was being led by the coalition represented a last resort and was in accordance with relevant United Nations resolutions.**

All the energy of the Council must now be focused on the humanitarian aspect of the Iraqi crisis, he said. **“The current divisions and disagreements among Council members must be resolved immediately in order to meet the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi population. He supported the plan for continuing and adapting the oil-for-food program, in a manner consistent with the Secretary-General’s proposals. He added that the territorial integrity of Iraq must be fully preserved and its sovereignty restored as soon as possible to the people of Iraq. The help and support of the international community would be essential for Iraq in the period to come. The United Nations sanctions had to be lifted as soon as possible and an international reconstruction program must follow.**

LUIS GUILLERMO GIRALDO (Colombia) said that his Government considered it essential today to try to prevent the past from distorting the international community’s obligations to make the conditions of the people of Iraq less difficult and work on the reconstruction of that nation. **“It was important to provide the Iraqi people with opportunities for development and progress in a democratic context and with full respect for human rights. It was indispensable for the Council to take up the item of Iraq and provide the assistance required. It was necessary to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe, for hunger and starvation could happen in the next few weeks.**

The Council members must overcome their difference and provide humanitarian assistance, and secure the operation of the oil-for-food program. **“It was essential that the**

proposed draft resolution be adopted to make such assistance a reality. □The Council could, and should, later on discuss all the legal implications of the issue, but today the main concern must be to rise to the level of the moral requirements of the situation. □‘We must act and we must act fast’, he said.

GUEORGUI VOLSKI (Georgia) expressed his country’s deep concern over the current situation in Iraq, in particular, its humanitarian implications. □He was saddened that the coalition had been compelled to use force as a last resort to address Iraq’s non-compliance with relevant Council resolutions, which had resulted in serious consequences, including those of a humanitarian nature. □By the same virtue, that was one more example of the consequences that could be brought about by ignoring resolutions aimed at maintaining regional or international peace and security.

Today, the international community was confronted with the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, he continued. □Notwithstanding differences in approaches within the Council, the emerging situation in Iraq required the Council to display its resolve, in particular, endorsing the proposals presented by the Secretary-General and relieving millions of Iraqis from suffering. □The Secretary-General should be provided with the necessary authority and flexibility to meet the humanitarian needs in Iraq, using existing and new resources. □The Iraqi people had to know that the international community was ready to make far-reaching steps in that respect. □It was also vitally important to restore the effectiveness and unity within the Council.

ALISHER VOHIDOV (Uzbekistan) noted with regret that the non-compliance of the Iraqi regime had led to the current conflict situation. □Under the current circumstances, he hoped that the conflict would end as soon as possible with minimum loss of life. □He was in favor of the disarmament of Iraq. □Unfortunately, the latest events in Iraq had destroyed the consensus in the Council. □However, differences should not blind the Council to the tasks at hand, namely, the disarmament of Iraq. □

The humanitarian situation in Iraq was worsening every day, he continued. The international community should take speedy measures, including supplying the population with water, food and other necessities. □He called on the Council to continue the oil-for-food program to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. □The humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people should be met as soon as possible. □He fully supported the Secretary-General’s proposal that he be given authorization to give urgent humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi population. □He supported the efforts directed at restoring the effectiveness and unity of the Council.

GINTS JEGERMANIS (Latvia) said his country believed that everything possible must be done to avoid civilian casualties in the course of the military operation in Iraq. □Latvia would offer humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people, take part in the rebuilding of the country, and work to eliminate the legacy of totalitarianism. □It supported the Secretary-General’s proposal to exploit the oil-for-food program by adjusting it to the new situation.

The United Nations must become involved in rebuilding and establishing a democratic Iraq that was at peace with its neighbors and not in possession of weapons of mass destruction. □He was convinced that the active involvement of the United Nations during and after the current crisis in Iraq would secure the authority of the United Nations in the international community.

EDUARDO J. SEVILLA SOMOZA (Nicaragua) said it was important for the Security Council to shoulder its collective responsibility for the maintenance of international

peace and security. Today, he wanted to reiterate his Government's resolute commitment to international unity. The present situation was the outcome of Iraqi's non-compliance with Council resolutions, which expressed the will of the United Nations. He agreed with the Secretary-General that the time had come for the Council to regain its unity. Action was needed on the humanitarian situation affecting the innocent people in Iraq.

Continuing, he expressed concern about the lack of food, medicine and water, as well as necessary services in Iraq. It was important for the Council to adjust the oil-for-food program, so that the humanitarian assistance for Iraq could be brought about in an efficient way. The people of Nicaragua could bear witness to the importance of the United Nations as an instrument of international peace and security. It had helped his area to come out of one of the deepest crises in history. Since its creation, the Organization had been essential to confronting the challenges facing the international community. It was important for the Organization to play its role now. Nicaragua had been a victim of war, and it was prepared to provide post-conflict humanitarian assistance to Iraq, including sending experts on de-mining. Building the peace was a task for all, and there should be no selfishness.

OLE PETER KOLBY (Norway) said that he had hoped that disarming Iraq could have been done peacefully through a united approach in the Council. Unfortunately, that was not the case. A major task now was protecting the civilian population. Iraq and the Middle East must be ensured a stable future, based on peace and prosperity. As the war was unfolding, the international community must be prepared to meet the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people. Norway would increase its humanitarian assistance and participate in the reconstruction of the country. It would also support Norwegian non-governmental organizations already active in the region.

There were considerable resources invested in the oil-for-food program, he said. He urged the Council to keep that program running to meet the most immediate humanitarian needs of the population. It should be used for alleviating the suffering of the Iraqi people and for long-term reconstruction. It was important that the overall coordination of humanitarian assistance and reconstruction be done by the United Nations. If the Council was to play its role for maintaining international peace and security, it was imperative to maintain its unity. That must be the lesson learned.

MOHAMED BENNOUNA (Morocco) noted that the war raging today in Iraq was being broadcast live, in real time, and was being experienced by all. They could see families being felled by bullets, and innocent people being arrested, injured or killed. War was the bitter reality that made us all doubt whether the world was truly progressing in terms of values and civilization.

Force should be a last resort after all other means had been exhausted, he said. The philosophy underpinning the United Nations renounced the unilateral use of force in its efforts to maintain international peace and security. Those who had founded the United Nations believed that collective security was the best method against the return of expansionism. All international and regional groups had spoken out about the Iraqi crisis and the present hostilities. The peoples of the United Nations expected the Council to protect them from the scourge of war and suffering. The Council could not just throw up its hands, let death strike down the innocent, and allow a land to be destroyed. Deliberations in the Council today were indispensable, because the fate of the United Nations depended on them.

AGIM NESHO (Albania) said that his delegation was very concerned about the difficult humanitarian situation in Iraq, which was a result of the dictatorial policy and action of a

regime which even in its last days was showing that it was able to sacrifice everything, including its own people, in order to stay in power.□As a member of the coalition of the free countries for the liberation of Iraq, Albania requested that regime to step aside now, to spare the people of Iraq further suffering.

Albania welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative to take the necessary measures to reactivate the oil-for-food program, he said, and asked the members of the Council to fully support the Secretary-General by providing him with the necessary authority and flexibility to meet the humanitarian needs of the people of Iraq.□Adoption by the Council of a humanitarian resolution on Iraq would serve to restore the efficiency and unity of the Council.□That was imperative, taking into account the latest events.□Now, it was time for the nations and the Council to focus on the challenges of the future, with the will and the necessary pragmatism, which would make cooperation possible.

The new Iraq would be democratic, he continued, it would live in peace and would no longer be a threat to its neighbors and the world.□By endorsing that responsibility, by fighting for a free world unthreatened by the weapons of mass destruction and terrorism, members of the coalition only remained faithful to the vision of the founders of the Organization and accomplished its goals.□As Winston Churchill once said, it was necessary to "make sure that the force of right will ultimately be protected by the right of force".

MILOS ALCALAY (Venezuela) said that the majority of the people in the world had rejected the use of force against Iraq.□They hoped that the Council and the United Nations would take the right decisions to overcome the conflict.□Today, it was necessary to give special consideration to the humanitarian situation of the Iraqi people.□Last Sunday, President Chavez had added his voice to the rejection of the war and had advocated peace.

During the Council debate on 13 March, his delegation had stated that the Iraqi crisis had to be handled peaceful and diplomatically, and that it should be achieved through dialogue, which was the appropriate way to resolve disputes.□That implied the full implementation of resolutions already adopted and compliance with forthcoming resolutions.□There was still time to avoid worse evils and room to find peace.□The Council must shoulder its responsibility in maintaining international peace and security, and reject the use of force.□Efforts now must focus on achieving an immediate ceasefire.

The best humanitarian assistance that could be provided today was to cease the use of force and return to diplomacy, he said.□The United Nations as a whole and the Council in particular, must play its role to find a solution to the conflict.□The Council should reaffirm its commitment to international law, ensure that its decisions were respected, urge all parties to pursue diplomacy, and adopt decisions to urgently provide humanitarian assistance, coordinated through the United Nations.

THORSTEINN INGOLFSSON (Iceland) said he regretted that Iraq had had to face the serious consequences of military action.□That would not have been necessary had the Iraqi regime decided to change its attitude and cooperate immediately, actively and fully, as it was obliged to by resolution 1441 (2002).□His country had supported the coalition for the immediate disarmament of Iraq, due to its conviction that action was necessary to ensure the implementation of all relevant United Nations resolutions on the disarmament of Iraq.

He urged Members States to unite in the work ahead, and secure a full United Nations role in providing humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people and post-war reconstruction of their country.□The Iraqi people needed the full support of the international community,

so that it could achieve once again prosperity, democracy, dignity and peaceful coexistence with their neighbors, after decades of dictatorship and aggression.

ALOUNKEO KITTIKHOUN (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that his country, like the overwhelming majority of peoples all over the world, had advocated a peaceful solution to the crisis in Iraq. It shared the deep conviction of all those who had cautioned against the unpredictable consequences of the use of force there, including the huge loss of life and the impact on the stability of the whole region. With the beginning of a large-scale attack on Iraq, a sovereign country and a Member of the United Nations, the peaceful path had been abandoned. That act of unjustified aggression, which had not been mandated by the United Nations, was a breach of international law.

According to the latest information, the number of civilian victims continued to grow, he continued. If the war went on, it was possible to expect a large humanitarian crisis, the consequences of which would be catastrophic. To avoid dire consequences, the international community was called upon to take urgent action in order to put an immediate end to the war.

After the end of the bipolar era, he added, many had expressed hope that it would be possible to build a better world, promoting cooperation among States. All countries and people of the world could only welcome that. War, on the other hand, only brought about hatred and destruction. Countries should allow dialogue and cooperation to prevail in their relations.

BAATAR CHOISUREN (Mongolia) said the international community must now look forward in taking immediate and resolute action to resume humanitarian relief for the Iraqi people. He had been informed that over 1.7 million people had been without water supplies for several days in the southern Iraqi city of Basra. It had also been stated that epidemics could soon spread because of hot weather in the region. Mongolia joined the concern expressed about the welfare of civilians caught in the conflict, especially children. Urgent efforts should be made to meet the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people.

The United Nations had undertaken major contingency planning and would be able to start its implementation as soon as possible, he said. Under those circumstances, the Council should take the lead and give the Secretary-General the mandate for whatever measures he might need to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe in Iraq. He urged members of the Council to support the Secretary-General by providing him with authority and flexibility to deal with the emerging crisis. The single-mindedness and resolve of the Council on that issue would hopefully be a step towards the restoration of its effectiveness and unity.

GERT ROSENTHAL (Guatemala) was extremely concerned about the humanitarian situation that had arisen in Iraq and in neighboring countries. He would prefer humanitarian assistance to be administered by the United Nations and supported the Secretary-General on how to organize the provision of assistance to the Iraqi population. For now, the oil-for-food program should continue. He also subscribed to the appeal by the Secretary-General to the parties to the conflict to respect international humanitarian law. Also, the international agencies, particularly the United Nations, must play a fundamental role in helping bring about a situation where the Iraqi people themselves would take decisions regarding their future. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq must not be impaired.

He reiterated his faith in the multilateral agencies and the unique role of the Council.□He did not agree with those who believed that the debate within the Council in past weeks had dealt a mortal blow to that body.□It was not the first time, nor would it be the last, when members of the Council had failed to reach agreement.□Nevertheless, it would be naïve to think that the debate had not left behind wounds, even deep ones, which would require an effort by all Council members to overcome.□

* * * * *