

# **IVANOV'S UNITED NATIONS SPEECH: EXAMINING DIFFERING PERSPECTIVES ON THE IRAQ CONFLICT**

Kristina Beckman-Brito  
*University of Arizona*

## **ABSTRACT**

*This study examines the United Nations speech given by Igor Ivanov, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, in February 2003. This address was in response to Secretary of State Colin Powell's plea for international support prior to the United States' military action in Iraq. As Russia did not support such action, Ivanov's reply offers insight into opposing views held by some members of the international community. Powell's argument painted a non-aggressive stance as futile and, in doing so, adopted an 'us versus them' position.*

*Rather than juxtaposing good against evil, Ivanov's speech nullifies this 'either/or' concept and views all parties, including political leaders, weapons inspectors, ordinary citizens and the United Nations, as inherently united. By developing the notion of interdependency, Russia strengthens its case that to hurt one member of the global community only serves to weaken the greater whole. This is particularly poignant given the historical relationship between superpowers.*

*By all accounts, the war in Iraq appears long-lived; therefore, this dialogue between nations is expected to continue. This study provides insight into discourse styles used during highly charged political debates. It holds lasting importance as it provides a basis for analytical comparison for future political situations.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

These early years of the new millennium have undoubtedly been tumultuous with regard to global peace. The post September 11, 2001 era posed considerable strains on international relations as countries grappled with their assessment of recent political events. The situation in Iraq featured prominently among problematic issues. While many countries expressed support for the American government and citizens after the tragic attack, divisiveness emerged as the subsequent political events unfolded. As tensions mounted in early 2003, countries convened, at the request of the United States, in a special session of the United Nations in order to evaluate the appropriate measures to take to hold Iraq accountable for the tenants noted in Resolution 1441. Secretary of State Colin Powell spoke on behalf of the United States. In a detailed presentation lasting just over an hour, Powell systematically presented the United State's case for a military strike in Iraq. Other United Nations member countries responded to Powell's speech in the same forum. Along with France, Great Britain, China, and Germany, Russia was afforded the opportunity to address Powell's case. Representing Russia, Igor Ivanov, Minister for Foreign Affairs for the Russian Federation, expressed alternative views on the pending military strike. As will be evident in the discussion of his speech, Ivanov's approach was to construct the

international community as equals. All parties, not just the United States, have the expertise to partake in deciding how to effectively approach the situation in Iraq. This is accomplished by shifting the hierarchical positions set by Powell. Rather than assuming America is the sole decider, Ivanov draws the U.S. back into the fold of the larger international community. He reminds Powell (and others) that countries other than the United States have valuable economic, scientific, and leadership sources. These overriding messages of unity and equality will be addressed in the analysis of this speech.

The aim of any project of this nature is to unpack as much information as possible in order to understand the underlying meanings of a given communicative setting. In order to accomplish this, I draw on a number of theoretical approaches within the broad field of Discourse Analysis. First, operating under the theoretical assumption that a detailed textual analysis reveals emerging themes and patterns, a Conversational Analysis approach was used (Garfinkel, 1967, 1974; Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Johnstone, 2002; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Schiffrin, 1994; Ten Have, 1999). While this approach allows us to examine language at a highly detailed level, it does not invite discussion of any power relationships. One foci of Critical Discourse Analysis is how power is constructed between parties (Mills, 1997). Including this method allows us to see how Ivanov positions the United States as an equal partner with Russia as well as all other members of the international community, including Iraq. As Fairclough notes, Critical Discourse Analysis allows us to, “make clear social determinations and effects of discourse which are characteristically opaque to participants” (1995, p. 28). However, in such a highly complex discussion, it is essential to look at language within a historical and political context. As the field of Discourse Analysis evolved over the years, a number of scholars called for language to be viewed as broadly as possible (Duranti, 1997; Gee, 1999; Holmes, 2001; Moerman, 1988), considering such additional aspects as politeness, speech community and communicative competence (Brown & Gilman, 1960; Gumperz, 1968; Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 1982). In doing so, important features, not discussed by a single method, are captured. Looking at language as something richly complex and intertwined with the social context provides a richer understanding of the dynamics at play.

While the day’s speeches were heard around the world by attentive listeners, further detailed examination is still called for. Using these approaches, several emerging themes will be discussed. Close analysis reveals that Russia’s response, as delivered by Ivanov, systematically unites one entity with another. Entities are defined as a country, political leader, institution, or group of individuals joined by a common goal. Even when disagreement exists between the United States and Russia, Ivanov never overtly disagrees. Instead, he adopts a subtle, diplomatic style that allows him to offer alternative interpretations while not overtly contradicting Powell. This allows for continued favorable relations between the two countries. In addition, Russia remains aligned with other countries that oppose war in Iraq. This diplomatic approach has allowed Russia’s voice to be heard without harming political alignments within the international community.

The complete speech lasted seven minutes (see Appendix 1). Three excerpts will provide the basis for this analysis. The chosen excerpts demonstrate the overriding themes present in Ivanov’s speech. In doing so, this author hopes to gain an understanding of both *what* Ivanov’s position was, but also *how* he conveyed these beliefs. Understanding can be gained from hearing alternative interpretations; it is never a futile effort. Although America did eventually invade Iraq, the implications in this speech are still valid. Since there are such grave repercussions to

any military strike, it is crucial to reflect on our history and gain a deeper understanding of the myriad of dynamics at play that continue to shape history.

### ***Extending the Olive Branch***

One way in which Ivanov extended a metaphorical olive branch was in his construction of Russian and the U.S. as co-collaborators in the space program. Shortly after his perfunctory greetings to the Secretary General, the facilitator of this United Nations session, Ivanov offered condolences for the then-recent tragedy of the Columbia spaceship. He stated:

I should like, first of all, on behalf of the leadership and people of Russia to express profound condolences to the government and people of the United States of America following the tragic death of the crew of the spaceship Columbia. We share the grief of our American partners with whom we are actively cooperating in outer space...the best demonstration of shared fundamental interest of mankind and the need to bring together the intellectual, creative efforts in the name of the progress of civilization.

From a historical perspective, it is interesting to note that Ivanov defines the United States as their “American partner.” It was only recently that these two superpowers shifted roles from opposing superpowers to dual leading forces in the international community. Russia and the United States spent years loathing and fearing one another. A generation of Americans were raised to believe that the Russians were amoral, cold, and calculating. America spent billions of dollars on the arms race while citizens built underground bunkers in the event of nuclear attack. Not only did Russia possess the technology to annihilate the citizens of the United States, but were fully prepared to use such devices. Clearly, this perception was not one-sided. Such stories pervaded Russian homes as well. Although tensions have eased markedly and relations are favorable between the two countries, recalling these perceptions illuminates the progress that has been made. Few would have believed that Russia and the United States would refer to one another using such terms as ‘partner’.

Ivanov, in his representative capacity, ameliorates the image of the Russian as a foe and, instead, positions Russians as fellow mourners. When offering condolences, he uses words and phrases such as *we share the grief, shared... fundamental interests of mankind, actively cooperating, and partners*. Each of these phrases serve to portray America and Russia as united entities. The ‘we’ he refers to (*we share the grief*) entwines the citizens of both countries as the bereaved. Rather than remaining distant and fearful of one another, the people have now progressed to feeling sorrow over a shared loss. Hearing Ivanov express sympathy on behalf of the government and citizens enhances the image of Russians as a caring people. Concern for other countries becomes relevant as Ivanov reminds the United States that we are all part of a larger world community.

From a historical perspective, it is interesting to observe that Ivanov chooses the space program as a venue in which to offer sympathies. Nearly half a decade earlier, the two superpowers were engaged in heated competition for the superior scientific position. Russia’s launch of Sputnik spurred America to excel in its pursuit of space exploration. This positioned Russia and America as competitors, each seeking to outperform the other. Scientific gains were a closely guarded secret. In fact, no interchange of ideas existed for a substantial period of time. Progress for one nation meant the other now held a comparatively inferior position. Neither wished to hold the secondary role as it was considered humiliating – not only in their eyes, but indeed on a global scale.

Acknowledging the loss of the Columbia spaceship is heard early on in Ivanov's address. He opens with these remarks before moving into the discussion on Iraq. While this may serve as a cordial device, it also sets a tone of cooperation and unification throughout the address. Early on, Russia's hope for a peaceful resolution is made clear. Ivanov wishes to slow America's race to declare war, as well as to remind Iraq of its responsibilities. As he leads off with a respectful acknowledgment of America's recent loss, this alerts those listening that he is approaching this current political issue as one that can be resolved in a peaceful manner. This is crucial given the difficult past shared by Russia and the United States. If the two superpowers were able to resolve complex, long-standing issues, then certainly a resolution can be reached. This is particularly poignant since earlier friction centered on outer space. It is now used as an indicator of shared interests instead of competition.

In discussing the space program, Ivanov widens the stage from an earthly, global contextual framework and expands to include outer space. This implies that, at least proportionately, the Iraq conflict is relatively modest in comparison to other 'earthly' issues. Embedded in his reference to "actively cooperating in outer space." is the notion of scale. If prior monumental political differences can be overcome to the extent of co-sponsored flight explorations, then current events can surely be resolved. In essence, Ivanov redefines the problem in Iraq as manageable.

### ***Questioning the Evidence***

Adopting a Perry Mason-style presentation, Powell showed charts, aerial footage photographs, and audiotapes during his speech. While Powell appeared assured of the validity of the scientific evidence gathered by the Americans, Ivanov did not share his confidence. In keeping with his non-confrontational style, Ivanov indirectly questioned both the quantity and the quality of the evidence presented. Referring to the evidence presented, Ivanov stated:

Russia believed and continues to believe that the Security Council, and through it, the entire international community, must have all of the necessary information in order to answer the question of whether or not there are weapons of mass destruction. The information that was given to us today definitely will require very serious and thorough study. Experts in our countries must get down to analyzing it and drawing the appropriate conclusions.

This suggests concern on his part that not *all* of the relevant evidence was presented. Further implied in this concern is that if additional evidence exists, it may run contrary to that which was presented to the Security Council. While he does not *overtly* state that information has been withheld, it does imply that perhaps some degree of selective selection is present. He does not suppose why such actions would have been taken, but instead limits his concerns to the possibility of undisclosed evidence.

Ivanov stated that Russia "believed and continues to believe" that full disclosure by the Americans is warranted. His use of dual tenses indicates that what he believed in the past remains unchanged, despite attempts to convince him otherwise. This is further strengthened with the word *continues*. Rather than saying 'believed and believes' he adopts a term that says Russia's position remains unchanged. Using the word 'continues' implies that Russia will persevere in their pursuit of a peaceful resolution long after the hearings have concluded.

Another concern surrounds the existence of weapons of mass destruction. Ivanov stated that access to complete information was necessary in order to, "answer the question of whether or not there are remaining weapons of mass destruction." Three possible scenarios are considered

in the statement: weapons do exist, some weapons exist, or no weapons exist. Clearly, he is not in accord with Powell's belief that substantial quantities remain hidden in Iraq. The phrase *whether or not* is an overt expression of doubt. This certainly lessens concern that Iraq is a great threat to international security. In contrast to the frequent use by American political officials and the media, this is the only time Ivanov speaks of 'weapons of mass destruction'. In America, the term has been peppered throughout political speeches and has been used to instill fear in the public. Yet, in the single instance when Ivanov uses this phrase, he does so to allay fears and cast doubt on their very existence. They are no longer an imminent threat but are reduced to little more than a possible existence/circumstantial evidence.

Further complicating this issue is the problematic interpretation of the evidence, particularly the aerial photos. Convincing evidence is typically obvious even to the layperson, yet, when the evidence was presented during Powell's speech, much of it seemed incomprehensible. Even Powell admitted that, "the photos that I am about to show you are sometimes hard for the average person to interpret, hard for me." He accounts for this difficulty by explaining that experts have years of experience behind them and are able to readily interpret the photos. In doing so, he places the burden of interpretation on the audience rather than on the experts. Even though Powell justified the lack of clarity in the photos, Ivanov appears dissatisfied with this explanation. Rather than accept Powell's explanation, he calls for additional experts to examine the evidence. Ivanov stated, "The information ... will require very serious and thorough study." It does not require action, nor reflection, nor consideration. What it does require is re-examination by other experts. Instead of discounting the qualifications of the first group of experts, and thereby possibly insulting the American government, Ivanov calls for further examination in addition to the work already performed by the Americans.

Moreover, he uses the plural 'our countries' when discussing those wishing to have access to the evidence. In this phrase, he sends two messages about the evidence. First, Russia is not the sole country calling for an independent verification. Other countries want to be afforded the opportunity to examine the evidence. Further, after looking at the evidence, they are interested in drawing their own conclusions. Even though Russia wants the opportunity to examine the evidence, he does not openly state that what Powell presented was insufficient, only that others should have fair access to it. Additionally, in not referring to other countries by name, this allows interested parties to come forth at their discretion.

### ***Establishing Priorities***

Sadly, the conflict in Iraq is far from the sole concern facing global leaders. This recent era is plagued by financial crises, political turmoil, as well as newly emerging health concerns. Even though each concern is problematic in its own right, some issues have farther-reaching effects than others. In the following passage, Ivanov recognizes the current problem under assessment, but positions it as less serious than other more-pressing matters:

The current situation around Iraq unfortunately is far from the last problem whose solution we still have to work on. The international community in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is confronting new global threats and challenges requiring a unified response from all states....combating the main, the most dangerous threat of our time, international terrorism...It is perfectly obvious that we are just at the beginning of a very difficult battle with terrorism and the information provided by U.S. Secretary of State about the activities of Al-Qaida is further corroboration of this fact.

While Ivanov acknowledges the conflict in Iraq among important concerns, he moves to put it in a lower status position. Certainly, many would consider the recent terrorist attacks as being of primary concern. Ivanov identifies international terrorism as “the main, the most dangerous threat of our time.” Terrorism is placed above all other problems by the use of the superlative ‘most’. Further, since terrorism is deemed a top concern, the situation in Iraq, by default, is positioned as less pressing. This hierarchical rank is yet another device to ameliorate the threat from Iraq. The notion of terrorism as a more substantial threat is further strengthened by the inclusion of the word ‘threat’ in adjacent sentences. Ivanov expressed concern that the world is “confronting new global *threats*”; then, in the following sentence he identifies terrorism as “a dangerous *threat*.” This alarmist attitude is uncharacteristic of Ivanov’s even-handed approach. This type of strong language is rarely evidenced in the speech. Rather, it is reserved for discussion of pressing issues other than Iraq.

This technique of ordering events in a hierarchy as either more or less important was also used when discussing the evidence of al-Qaida’s activities. As noted earlier, Ivanov cast doubt on the veracity concerning Iraq’s disposal of weapons of mass destruction. In that case, the conclusiveness of the evidence was incomplete and not fully examined. However, information regarding terrorist activities was approached as irrefutable. While the information on Iraq was deemed dubious, the evidence surrounding al-Qaida’s activities was considered conclusive. Ivanov noted that “the information provided by U.S. Secretary of State about the evidence of the activities of Al-Qaida is further corroboration of this fact.” Here, links are established between what America presented and what other world governments already knew. In this case, the interpretation of the evidence is compatible. Here, information contained in the same presentation is now considered credible. Interestingly, Ivanov does not include the al-Qaida evidence as something which requires further examination by outside parties as he did earlier with the Iraq evidence. Additionally, using the term ‘corroboration’ is yet another instance of Ivanov’s attempts to restore harmony among nations. The discussion of this evidence as ‘corroboration’ is similar to the discussion of the collaborative efforts regarding the space program and is yet another attempt of Ivanov’s part to reframe countries as mutually cooperative.

Distinguishing the situations in Iraq from the problems with al-Qaida serves to identify and separate the two from one another. It breaks any inherent connection that may have been (incorrectly) formed between Iraq and al-Qaida. At times, they have been blurred into a one image of a single Middle Eastern threat. If they were conflated into one, then all the horrific actions of al-Qaida were transferred onto Iraq. Iraq then becomes guilty of far more actions than Powell originally brought forth in his accusations.

The current situation is the second time a confrontation between Iraq and the United States has erupted in a decade. As is well known, America invaded Iraq during 1990’s. It was a short-lived war with few casualties. Inherent in that is the idea that the current situation in Iraq is little more than a manageable problem that has existed for some time. Juxtaposed to this is the serious threat of terrorism. No mention is made of the first bombing of the World Trade Center, the attack on the U.S. embassy in Somalia, or other acts of terrorism, all of which have also carried into the new millennium. The actions by members of al-Qaida escalated into the tragedy Ivanov refers to in his discussion of terrorism in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. He labels terrorism as the worst problem of the twenty-first century. By dividing this brief span of time into separate eras, he identifies Iraq as ‘old news’ and insignificant in comparison to other global concerns while positioning terrorism as ‘current’, therefore far more serious.

As with the earlier mention of the long process surrounding analyzing evidence, Ivanov again pulls back the reins and reminds his audience that we are in the early stages of a long, highly complex international dilemma. He notes that, "it is perfectly obvious that we are just at the beginning of a very difficult battle with terrorism..." Several messages are embedded within his observation. When preparing for war, the leaders must first unite and create a thoughtful strategic plan. At a minimum, thoughtful and careful planning must precede any military strike. Although he classifies this as "perfectly obvious", many considered America's approach to be rushed and poorly planned. Responsible decision makers should direct all available efforts to a clear-headed and focused approach. Since terrorism is the primary focus, this part of the speech highlights the situation with terrorism, any energy directed on Iraq draws away from the primary focus. Setting a manageable pace is crucial to withstanding the grueling rigors of addressing an international problem on the scale of international terrorism. As marathon runners fully understand, setting out too briskly can cause real problems farther along in a race. Likewise, impulsive actions can create additional problems which had not been earlier realized.

## CONCLUSION

As has been demonstrated throughout this paper, Russia's approach has been one of egalitarianism, therein placing America on equal footing with other countries. This approach is carried throughout the entire speech. From his opening words, Ivanov set the tone for the speech by respectfully acknowledging America's loss of the Columbia astronauts. Additionally, he used Russia's shared interest in the space program as the backdrop for the expressing condolences. In order for one to have empathy for another, a common experience and understanding must exist. Ivanov constructs Russia as co-sufferer and in doing so, places the two superpowers side by side.

This even-mannered approach continued throughout the speech even during potentially confrontational topics such as the evidence presented by Powell. Instead of openly challenging Powell's presentation as incomplete and narrowly focused, he allows for multiple interpretations. This means that while America's interpretation is acknowledged, it is only one among many possible interpretations. This further serves to place all interested parties on equal footing. Ivanov reminds Powell that experts are available in other countries and have the expertise necessary to examine the information. In the ambiguous use of 'our countries', the invitation is extended to any and all countries that have a vested interest in conducting further analyses. The American experts are one among a broad pool of international experts and no longer hold the position of sole expert.

This egalitarian approach is again present in the discussion of international terrorism. In placing terrorism as the primary international concern, this shifts the situation in Iraq to a lower position. In a sense, this overrides Powell's construction of Iraq as a primary world threat. Although Ivanov never openly calls into doubt America's concern, he again offers an alternative interpretation to the one offered by Powell. Each of the instances serves to lessen the sense of urgency to invade Iraq and suggests that a wider, more comprehensive interpretation is possible.

In addition to an egalitarian approach, Ivanov considers the problems to stem from a lack of time and support. Powell clearly viewed the decision process to be in its final stages with war as an eminent outcome. He presented the inspection process as inadequate and failing in its mission. This meant that the only avenue remaining is a military offense. Ivanov, however, pulls in the reins and attempts to slow down the process of heading for war. In calling for additional analysis of the evidence, this means that the lengthy process of analysis by

international experts stalls further preparation for war. Sufficient time must be given in order to gather the evidence, provide it to the experts, and allow them time for both examination and reflection of the results.

Ivanov used a multitude of devices to convince the United States that going to war was premature and destructive to the international community. He reminded us that two superpowers, previously on the brink of war, had resolved their differences enough to share exploration into space. If problems of this magnitude could be resolved, surely the situation in Iraq could be resolved without going to war. It's a shame they didn't listen.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and Social Context* (pp.252-282). London: Penguin Books.
- Durnati, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. (1974). On the origins of the term "ethnomethodology". In R. Turner (ed.), *Ethnomethodology*. Hamondsworth: Penguin.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Goodwin, C. & Heritage, J. (1990) "Conversation Analysis". Bernard J. Siegel, Alan Beals & Stephen Tyler (eds.), *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 19. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews Inc., pp. 283-307.
- Gumperz, J. (1968). The speech community. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and Social Context* (pp.219-231). London: Penguin Books.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz and J. Turner, (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ivanov, I. (Speaker). (2003, February 5). [Television broadcast]. CNN.
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Moerman, M. (1988) *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Powell, C. (Speaker). (2003, February 5). [Television broadcast]. CNN.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turntaking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1982). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell,
- Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage Publications.

## APPENDIX 1

### Transcript of Russia's Response to Powel's Speech to United Nations

(Distinguished) Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, (his Excellency) Mr. Igor Ivanov

Thank you very much, Mr. President. While I am in the United States, I should like, first of all, on behalf of the leadership and the people of Russia to express profound condolences to the government and people of the United States of America following the tragic death of the crew of the spaceship Columbia. We share the grief of our American partners with whom we are actively cooperating in outer space, and primarily, in implementing the program of the international space station. The work of the astronauts is probably the best demonstration of the shared fundamental interest of mankind and the need to bring together the intellectual, creative efforts in the name of the progress of civilization. Mr. President, Russia views this meeting today through the prism of the consistent efforts of the Security Council of the United Nations to find a political settlement to the situation surrounding Iraq on the basis of complete strictest (?) compliance resolutions on it. The unanimous adoption of Resolution 1441 of the U.N. Security Council and the deployment of the international inspectors in Iraq have demonstrated the ability of the international community to act together in the interest of attaining a common goal. We are convinced that maintaining the unity of the world community primarily within the context of the U.N. Security Council and our concerted action and strict compliance with the United Nations charter and Security Council resolutions are the most reliable way to resolve the problem of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq through political means. The fact that we all want to resolve this problem, that is something that nobody should doubt. It was with that in mind that we have listened very closely to the presentation given by Secretary of State Powell. Russia believed and continues to believe that the Security Council, and through it, the entire international community, must have all of the necessary information in order to answer the question of whether or not there are remaining weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. The information that was given to us today definitely will require very serious and thorough study. Experts in our countries must immediately get down to analyzing it and drawing the appropriate conclusions. The main point is...is that this information that this information has to be immediately handed over for processing by the UNMOVIC and the IAEA including through direct onsite verification during the inspections in Iraq. Baghdad must give the inspectors answers to the questions that we have heard in the presentation given by the U.S. Secretary of State. At the same time we must once again appeal to all states immediately to hand over the international inspectors any information that can help them discharge their responsible mandate. The information provided today by U.S. Secretary of State once again convincingly indicates that the activities of the international inspectors in Iraq must be continued. They alone they provide an answer to the question to what extent is Iraq complying with the demands of the Security Council. They alone can help the Security Council work out and adopt a carefully balanced, the best possible decisions. The statements made by Dr. Blix and by Dr. ElBaradei in this very chamber on the 27<sup>th</sup> of January show that Iraq has deployed a unique inspection mechanism which has everything it needs in order to ensure compliance with Resolution 1441 and other Security Council decisions. This

powerful potential must be used fully. The Security Council of the U.N., all of its members, must do everything they can to support the inspection process. For its part, Russia intends to continue actively to promote the creation the best possible conditions for the work of the international inspectors in Iraq. In particular, we are prepared to provide an airplane for aerial monitoring and, if need be, additional inspectors, too. Russia welcomes the continuation of dialog between the Chairman of UNMOVIC and the Director General of the IAEA with Iraq on outstanding unresolved issues. We hope that this dialog will be extremely concrete and productive. I \_\_\_\_\_ this is being facilitated by the fact that work has been moved to the timetable set out in Resolution 1284 which should make the international inspections and monitoring even more systematic and effective. Primarily, when it comes to clarifying key disarmament tasks by the end of March of this year it is perfectly obvious that the work of UNMOVIC and the IAEA can be effective only if there is full cooperation in good faith by Iraq. Iraq should be the first to be concerned about providing final clarity about the question of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. That is the only way leading to a political settlement including the lifting of sanctions on Iraq. Baghdad should clearly realize how crucial this is and do everything in its power so that the international inspectors can discharge their mandate. Recently, when it comes to the Iraqi settlement, we often hear the phrase that "time is running out". Of course, Resolution 1441 is geared to speedily achieving practical results. But any concrete time frames are absent from it. The inspectors alone can recommend to the Security Council how much time they need to carry out the tasks entrusted to them. In this connection, we (must not) we cannot rule out the possibility of the Security Council ...uh...that at some stage it may need to adopt a new resolution and perhaps more than one resolution. The main point is that our efforts continue to be geared to doing everything possible to facilitate the inspection process which has proven its effectiveness and makes it possible to implement the decisions of the Security Council through peaceful means. Mr. President, the current situation around Iraq unfortunately is far from the last problem whose solution we still all have to work on. The international community in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is confronting new global threats and challenges requiring a unified response from all states. A graphic example of this approach was the creation of the broad coalition which is combating the main, the most dangerous threat of our time, international terrorism. It is precisely because of the unity of the world community that initial success has been achieved in combating this scourge. However, it is perfectly obvious that we are just at the beginning of a very difficult battle with terrorism and the information provided by U.S. Secretary of State about the activities of Al-Qaida is further corroboration of this fact. The unity of the world community will continue to be the main guarantee for the effectiveness of its action. It is precisely unity that had to be pivotal in our approach to any problems, however complicated they may be. True, tactical differences may arise and probably there will be quite a few of them given the complexity of the tasks we need to resolve. But they must not overshadow the strategic goals which are in the interest of the – of our common security and stability. Thank you, Sir.