

## THE INVASION OF IRAQ 2003 AND CANADIAN NON-INTERVENTIONIST APPROACH

IRAK'IN İřGALİ 2003 VE KANADA'NIN MÜDAHALECİ OLMAYAN YAKLAřIMI

Melih DİNÇER<sup>i</sup>

### Abstract

*The invasion of Iraq in 2003 was an important milestone in international relations. Bush<sup>2</sup> administration wanted to topple Saddam regime. He put forward that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. According to him, Saddam regime was very dangerous for peace and security of the world. Some countries didn't support this opinion while others were endorsing this point of view. At the time of the invasion, Canada and its government were hesitating about claims of Bush administration. Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his government didn't send military forces to invading Iraq on 20 March 2003. Which factors caused Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his government to take the decision not to go to the war? This is our research question. Although Canada and the US had strong relations, Canadian foreign policy didn't support the invasion of Iraq under Chrétien government at the time of the occupation. This article argued that there were four reasons of this decision. The first reason is that Canadian public opinion didn't support the occupation of Iraq by Canadian military forces. 63 percent of Canadian people were opposed to military attack on Iraq by Canadian troops. The second reason is that according to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, weapons of mass destruction of Iraq should be analyzed thoroughly. The United Nations inspection teams should do more research. There was no strong evidence that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. The third reason is that Prime Minister Jean Chrétien didn't want to make action without endorsement of the UN Security Council. He stressed that Canada would not join the war unless the Security Council adopts a new resolution authorizing military intervention. The fourth reason is to show political independence of Canada in constructing its own foreign policy. Prime Minister Jean Chrétien criticized that some people perceived Canada as the 51<sup>st</sup> state of the US. He stated that this non-interventionist decision consolidated political independence of Canada in foreign policy.*  
**Keywords:** Jean Chrétien, Invasion of Iraq, Canada, the United States of America.

### Öz

*2003'de Irak'ın işgali uluslararası ilişkilerde önemli bir kilometre taşıdır. Bush yönetimi Saddam rejimini devirmek istemiştir. Irak'ın kitle imha silahları olduğunu öne sürmüştür. Ona göre Saddam rejimi dünyanın barış ve güvenliği için çok tehlikeliydi. Bazı ülkeler bu fikri desteklemiyorken başkaları bu bakış açısını desteklemiştir. İşgal zamanında Kanada ve hükümeti Bush yönetiminin iddiaları hakkında tereddüt etmekteydi. Kanada Başbakanı Jean Chrétien ve hükümeti askeri güçleri 20 Mart 2003'de Irak'ı işgale göndermemiştir. Hangi faktörler Başbakan Jean Chrétien'in ve hükümetinin savaşa gitmeme kararını almasına yol açmıştır? Bu bizim araştırma sorumuzdur. Kanada ve ABD güçlü ilişkilere sahip olmasına*

Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 12.10.2019

Makale Kabul Tarihi: 21.05.2020

<sup>i</sup> PhD Candidate, Istanbul Medeniyet University, Institute of Graduate Studies, Department of International Relations, melihdincerr@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3079-1512>

<sup>2</sup> In all of this article, we refer to George W. Bush by the words Bush, Bush administration and Bush Doctrine.

*rağmen, Kanada dış politikası Chrétien hükümeti altında işgal zamanında Irak'ın istilasını desteklememiştir. Bu makale bu kararın dört sebebi olduğunu savunmuştur. Birinci sebep Kanada kamuoyu Irak'ın Kanada askeri güçleri tarafından işgalini desteklememiştir. Kanada halkının %63'ü Irak'a Kanada ordularının askeri saldırısına karşıydı. İkinci sebep Başbakan Jean Chrétien'a göre Irak'ın kitle imha silahları tamamen analiz edilmelidir. Birleşmiş Milletler'in denetim takımları daha çok araştırma yapmak zorundadır. Irak'ın kitle imha silahlarına sahip olduğuna dair hiçbir güçlü kanıt yoktur. Üçüncü sebep Başbakan Jean Chrétien BM Güvenlik Konseyi desteği olmaksızın aksiyon almak istememiştir. Kanada'nın Güvenlik Konseyi askeri müdahale yetkisi veren yeni bir karar almazsa savaşa katılmayacağını vurgulamıştır. Dördüncü sebep Kanada'nın kendi dış politikasını inşa etmedeki siyasal bağımsızlığını göstermektir. Başbakan Jean Chrétien bazı insanların Kanada'yı ABD'nin 51.eyaleti olarak algılamasını eleştirmiştir. Bu müdahaleci olmayan kararın Kanada'nın dış politikadaki siyasal bağımsızlığını güçlendirdiğini vurgulamıştır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Jean Chrétien, Irak'ın İşgali, Kanada, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

American war in Iraq cast a shadow over relations between Canada and the United States of America during Chrétien – Bush years. Bush and his administrators were not satisfied with Canadian approach to Iraq War. Jean Chrétien, Prime Minister of Canada 1993 – 2003, had deep doubts about weapons of mass destruction of Iraq. He wanted to see evidence of weapons of mass destruction. He searched for assistance of the UN. This article is putting forward that the approach of Jean Chrétien to Iraq war was appropriate to international law. Without decisions of the United Nations, it's not legitimate to eliminate Saddam Hussein regime by military operations, that's why this approach is highly suitable for a sovereign state according to international law and system of the UN. It is important to say that the U.S. – Canada relations worsened after post-2000 events. There are two noteworthy reasons that changed the route of relations (Barry, 2005, p.215).

The first reason is that after the Cold War, Canadian people became in the social sense more liberal, full of doubts against traditional Cold War perspective, and ardent supporters for peaceful solution of universal problems. On the contrary, American nation became conservative, docile and easily controllable, and disposed to view of survival of the fittest especially because of their national economic system. This kind of separation of values caused American and Canadians to perceive international issues differently. While American view is more power and national interest oriented, Canadian perspective is focusing more on multilateral relations and peaceful cooperation. The second reason is the September 11 attacks. The attacks closely connected with al-Qaeda developed a deep feeling of weakness between American people. This situation made security concerns the most important agenda of American national politics (Barry, 2005, p.216). In this political environment, Bush administration forced other states to cooperate against terrorism in American conditions and desires. President Bush made a speech to a joint session of Congress on 20 September 2001. He said, "we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation in every region now has a decision to make: Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists. (CNN)" President Bush created an environment in which politicians of other nations should make a choice between American point of view and putting forward their own perspectives against international terrorism.

Despite political disagreements on military operation against Iraq, Canada gave importance to cooperation with the United States of America. Two states signed Smart Border Declaration in December 2001 to boost border security and trade. This included border security, infrastructure for flow of people and goods and information sharing. Also, two countries will share information with each other about asylum seekers (The U.S. Department of State Archive). Despite disagreements on Iraq, Canada contributed to Afghanistan military operation on American side. After terrorist attacks against the U.S. on 11 September 2001, the United Nations Security Council approved the resolution 1368 condemning 11 September attacks and expressing readiness to take all measures against terrorism on 12 September 2001 (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1368). The United Kingdom and the United States started Operation Enduring Freedom to eliminate al – Qaeda and Taliban regime from Afghanistan on 7 October 2001. With Operation Apollo, Canadian forces officially took part in Afghanistan military operation. Since the commencement of Canadian military mission, more than 40,000 members of Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) have participated in Afghanistan military operation (The Government of Canada). It is absolutely crucial to policies of the United States that Canada deployed its own troops as an international partner to support their efforts in Afghanistan.

The U.S.-led occupation of Iraq increased anti-American and anti-western sentiments in the Islamic world (Ismael and Ismael, 2005, p.615). At that time, Canadian politicians were very cautious about taking part in the occupation of Iraq. Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien wasn't convinced that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. According to him, renewed inspection program scheduled by the UN was necessary. Also, the subject of weapons of mass destruction was just a speculation. The occupation of Iraq by coalition forces will just cause chaos in which new terrorists can arise considerably. In addition to this, Jean Chrétien wasn't convinced that Saddam regime had weapons of mass destruction due to failure of Bush and his officials to show enough evidence. Additionally, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the UN arm inspection groups under the authority of Mohamed ElBaradei and Hans Blix reported no evidence of weapons of mass destruction and a revived nuclear program process. It should be highlighted that deploying forces and troops in Iraq was not reasonable for Jean Chrétien due to apparent lack of proof and Security Council support. In the light of the information mentioned above, Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien didn't approve military involvement in coalition forces. It is true to say that decision taken by Chrétien government to not participate in the occupation of Iraq caused Bush administration to feel bitter about Canadian approach. However, the failure to show evidence of weapons of mass destruction, to forge a relation between Saddam regime and terrorists, and finally political instability showed us that Canadian approach was true when the occupation of Iraq is analyzed. Bush administration focused much excessively on international terrorism and foreign security threats (Barry, 2005, p.234-236).

There is one dependent variable. This is the decision of Canada not to go to the war. Also, there are two independent variables. The first independent variable is Canadian national public opinion. The second independent variable is Jean Chrétien government. This article argues that there are four important reasons of Canadian decision to not go to the occupation of Iraq by active military involvement. The first reason is that Canadian public opinion didn't support the occupation of Iraq by Canadian military forces. 63 percent of Canadian people were opposed to military attack on Iraq by Canadian troops. The second reason is that the UN inspection

program didn't show enough evidence that Saddam regime had weapons of mass destruction. Also, this topic was manufactured by American speculation. Weapons of mass destruction were a gossip manufactured by Bush administration. The third reason is national public opinion and humanitarian worries. Guy Lachapelle accentuates that generally Canadian nation and especially Québécois people were against the occupation of Iraq. According to Lachapelle, opinions of Québécois people and demonstrations in Montreal impacted upon political decision to not go to war (2003, p.925). On 15 February 2003, 150,000 people in the center of Montreal demonstrated against the occupation of Iraq (Le Devoir). Additionally, Jean Chrétien had humanitarian concerns about going to war. *'I had to send troops in many places when I was prime minister and it's always a worry you have because you're asking young Canadians to go abroad and some will not come back,'* he said. He was concerned about sending the young of Canada to the war. Absolutely, deaths of the young in the war will be a disadvantage for his political career, but it should be highlighted that there was an emotional and humanitarian feeling in his perspective. The fourth reason is political independence in constructing foreign policy. Jean Chrétien said that decision to not go to war was a movement which showed and consolidated very strongly the independence of Canada in foreign policy (CTV News). This opinion of independence is coming from liberal traditional discourse of Canadian liberal politicians.

In the rest of the article, these four reasons will be analyzed. Also, next chapter will be about the literature of Canadian foreign policy in Iraq war. *Which factors caused Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his government to take the decision not to go to the war?* In the article, this is the research question. After literature review, the four reasons will be examined separately. Jean Chrétien was a liberal in his political standing, so he didn't support the invasion of Iraq. The aim of the article is to show the reasons of not going to Iraq war. Every factor is written in separate chapters, so clearly reasons of Chrétien decision can be verified.

## **2. WHAT DOES LITERATURE SAY?**

In this part of the article, we will see the literature about reasons of Canadian foreign policy in Iraq war. *Which factors caused Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his government to take the decision not to go to the war?* This is our research question for this article. Clarkson and Lachapelle underscored that weapons of mass destruction were top of the American agenda. However, Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien didn't see any threat coming from Iraqi government and its politics. Bush doctrine was promoting regime change while Jean Chrétien was supporting non-interventionist view. Bush administration was not persuasive because of lack of evidence for weapons of mass destruction that Iraqi government had. Moreover, Washington couldn't develop convincing arguments about links between Saddam regime and Al-Qaeda. Liberating Iraqi people and nation was not proved beyond reasonable doubt, that's to say, it wasn't a verified aim. Additionally, desire of Bush administration to change Iraqi regime by interventionist policies increased the gap between Canadian and American foreign policies. Canadian foreign policy under Chrétien administration had respect for international law, so it differed greatly from American interventionist foreign policy (2005, p.75-76).

According to Rick Fawn, Chrétien government would have been affected by the public opinion of Québec. Québec elections were going to be made in the spring. Therefore, Canadian

government would have been worried about triumph of separatists because Québec people mostly didn't support the occupation of Iraq. Going to war would have been a negative effect on voters. However, it can be said that public opinion of Québec wasn't the sole reason. In addition to this, Jean Chrétien's party, Liberal Party of Canada, didn't support the war (2008, p.527). Rick Fawn explicitly stated that regional public opinion of Québec was important to avoid participating in the occupation of Iraq. Also, members of parliament from Liberal Party didn't support the invasion.

Brendon O'Connor and Srdjan Vucetic explained that there were three reasons of saying 'no' to Bush administration for participation in the occupation of Iraq. They accept a long formal tradition that ideological structures of governments and public opinion of nation are main factors to determine foreign policy. Leadership and political party, public opinion and strategic culture were three main factors determining foreign policy of Canada. When we talk about leadership and political party, it can be said that Liberal Party of Canada is the left of center while Conservative Party of Canada is at the center – right. In historical process, there has been a tradition that Canadian liberals have hesitated about sending military forces to American wars. This tradition has been coming from the decision of Liberal Prime Minister Lester Pearson (1963-1968) not to send Canadian military forces to Vietnam. At that time, Conservative Prime Minister John Diefenbaker (1957-1963) supported American politics and strategy in Vietnam. Vietnam policy of Canadian liberals was a milestone in constructing modern foreign policy. Canadian liberals continued to criticize American policies in Vietnam and the route of these two states in foreign policy bifurcated. Prime Ministers Lester Pearson and Pierre Trudeau criticized American foreign policy in Vietnam. In the light of the information mentioned above, it can be stated that while Canadian liberals say 'no' to participation in American wars, Canadian conservatives generally support American aims in foreign policy. For example, former Canadian Prime Minister and conservative Stephen Harper endorsed Canada's participation in coalition of the willing. Second reason was public opinion. This reason was more important in Jean Chrétien's decision. Québec province showed low endorsement for the occupation of Iraq. Mostly people didn't support this invasion. This was very significant in Chrétien's decision not to participate in military occupation. Decision making process of Jean Chrétien was affected by Québec provincial election. On 14 April 2003, the election was done and Quebec Liberal Party (Le Parti libéral du Québec) won the majority of votes. Parti Québécois was second and as a result of elections, liberals won a victory against Parti Québécois. Brendon O'Connor and Srdjan Vucetic stated that the decision of Jean Chrétien not to send Canadian troops to Iraq paved the way for public opinion that got Quebec Liberal Party to win the election. They thought that Québec people supported Quebec Liberal Party due to the fact that Liberal Party of Canada didn't send troops to Iraq. Additionally, general public opinion of Canada was against the occupation of Iraq by the United States (2010, p.526-539). In February 2003, Gallup conducted a survey about opinions of Canadian people for the occupation of Iraq. The survey was completed between 3-9 February. Gallup asked 1,000 Canadian adults its own questions. The survey showed that majority of people in Canada were against participation in the invasion. They didn't support Canadian military involvement in the invasion of Iraq. Also, they were opposed to the invasion of Iraq by the United States. According to results of the survey, 62 percent of survey participants were against the invasion of Iraq by the United States. Moreover, 63 percent of survey participants were opposed to

Canadian military involvement in the invasion (Gallup). It goes without saying that general public opinion of Canada was opposed to military invasion of Iraq by the United States and Canada Armed Forces. Finally, Brendon O'Connor and Srdjan Vucetic emphasized that strategic culture was an important factor that determined the decision of Jean Chrétien. Strategic culture can be defined as a national point of view fed by historical, ideological, and legendary structure of a country. This point of view is highly effective to determine defense and foreign policies. Strategic culture of a nation is about historical experiences, its own technological development, philosophy, politics, societal institutions, values, and demography. Canada had important values for international relations and systems. After the World War II, the nation of Canada has adopted the policy of conforming to international law and its institutions. In the twentieth century, Canada accepted the North Atlantic line which later created ideological divides of the Cold War. The North Atlantic Line created a strong relation between Britain, the United States and Canada. Also since the second half of the twentieth century, it has been ideological structure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. However, in this political environment Canada searched for independence when constructing its own foreign policy decisions. Chrétien supported this idea and sought to differ from the United States in foreign policy. Basic tenets of Chrétien's foreign policy were multilateralism, internationalism, and collective security. Chrétien wanted to conform to international law and be a responsible member of international organizations. For example, Canada is a member of the International Criminal Court, an international institution that the United States didn't accept officially. The United States didn't ratify the Rome Statute. On the contrary, after the Cold War Canada saw itself as a peacemaker in the world. Furthermore, use of military power is an alternative that Chrétien didn't support in Iraq. Canadian strategic culture perceived use of military power as a last resort in foreign policy (2010, p.539-542).

According to Srdjan Vucetic, while analyzing reasons why Prime Minister Chrétien didn't send troops to the occupation of Iraq, a more-actor based structure should be used. There were some personal reasons to make this decision. In 2000 the United States presidential election, Chrétien supported democratic opponent of Bush. Moreover, Chrétien thought that political aims of American foreign policy should be questioned. The basic reason of this thinking is that Chrétien was a member of Liberal Party. Canadian liberals are generally supporting country's independence over relations with the United States of America. Srdjan Vucetic stressed that Chrétien believed the independence of Canada and importance of multilateralism in foreign policy even if Canada had strong relations with its superpower neighbor. American unilateralism and its military action against Iraq without the UN resolution authorizing military intervention prevented Chrétien from becoming a member of military coalition. The second reason is Canadian liberal traditional discourse. This liberal discourse states that Canada belongs to liberal values and if necessary, the country can differ from superpowers in foreign policy. According to liberal discourse, Canadian governments should conform to international law and its institutions. This liberal discourse belongs to Canadian liberal tradition. Today, Liberal Party of Canada continues keeping this tradition alive (2006, p.133-147).

According to the literature, there were some strong reasons for Chrétien not to participate in Iraq war. The first reason is that Bush administration didn't provide enough evidence for Iraqi weapons of mass destructions. The second reason is that Canadian national public opinion was against this occupation. The third important reason is the liberal traditional discourse of Liberal

Party of Canada. This party has a tradition which is opposite to Conservative Party of Canada. Liberal Party didn't support Iraqi invasion. According to liberal tradition, Canada has liberal values, so the country differs from superpowers in international relations. In the light of the information mentioned above, it can be added that one more reason is important for Chrétien not to go to the war, this is the desire to show full independence of Canada against its superpower, the United States. Canada is generally criticized for its close relations with the US. In this environment, sometimes Canada is perceived as the 51<sup>st</sup> state of the US. Chrétien wanted to show that Canada has full independence in its foreign policy decisions. With this information, in the next chapter the UN weapon inspection program in Iraq and shortage of evidence of mass destruction weapons will be analyzed.

### **3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE UN WEAPON INSPECTION PROGRAM IN IRAQ AND SHORTAGE OF EVIDENCE OF MASS DESTRUCTION WEAPONS**

Political environment, which paves the way for the occupation of Iraq, dates from the beginning of 1990s. On August 2, 1990, Saddam regime occupied Kuwait, after the occupation it was condemned by the Security Council. The same day, the Security Council adopted the resolution 660 that condemned Iraqi government. The resolution 660 showed that there was a breach of international peace and security. It demanded that Iraqi government withdraws its troops to locations in which they were situated on 1 August 1990. Also, it demanded that Iraq and Kuwait make negotiations to solve their problems (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 660). On 6 August 1990, the Security Council adopted the resolution 661. It stated that all states will prevent the importation of products coming from Iraq and Kuwait. Furthermore, sale or supply of any commodity including military weapons will be prevented universally. However, this doesn't include foodstuffs in humanitarian cases and products for medical problems (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 661). It is seen that sale and supply of weapons to Iraq were prohibited. There are fifteen Security Council resolutions adopted in 1990 about Iraq. It can be said that the most important resolution amongst them was the resolution 678 adopted on 29 November 1990. It stated that states can use all necessary means to realize what the resolution 660 dictates to warring parties, that's to say, Saddam government shall withdraw its forces on or before 15 January 1991 (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 678). Unless he doesn't obey this decision, states can use all essential ways to prevent Iraqi forces from staying in Kuwait.

The U.S.-led coalition made heavy aerial bombardment systematically because of the fact that Saddam Hussein regime didn't withdraw Iraqi troops out of Kuwait on or before 15 January 1991. This coalition was military cooperation formed on an ad hoc basis to pull Iraqi forces out of Kuwait (Patrick, 2003, p.40). Coalition forces defeated Iraqi army in short time and on 28 February 1991 the Gulf War ended with ceasefire declared by George H. W. Bush. The Security Council adopted the resolution 687 on 3 April 1991. It stated that Iraq will unconditionally agree to destroy totally all chemical and biological weapons. Also, all Iraqi ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers will be destroyed. Additionally, the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) was established to carry out inspection of removal of Iraqi chemical and biological weapons. Moreover, the resolution stated that Iraq will not use or improve nuclear weapon and its subsystems. The resolution requests the

assistance and cooperation of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). This resolution started the inspection program for Iraqi weapons and its facilities (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 687).

The Iraqi government formally agreed to the resolution 687 on 6 April 1991. On 9 June 1991, UNSCOM started first chemical weapon inspection. In June 23-28, nuclear equipment was destroyed under UNSCOM examination. On 15 August 1991, the Security Council adopted the resolution 707 and stated that Iraq must give details about its program to produce weapons of mass destruction (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 707). On 6 September 1991, UNSCOM group that wanted to use helicopters was prevented. On 18 February 1992, UNSCOM stated that Iraqi government doesn't fulfill its obligations and refuse responsibilities. In June 1992, Iraq gave detail information about its chemical weapon program. After this disclosure, in July UNSCOM started destruction of chemical weapons and its facilities. However, after the destruction Iraqi officials prevented some people who were going to inspect some sites. This situation worsened relations between Iraqi government and inspection officials. In 1993, France, the United States, and the United Kingdom made air strikes in Iraq to make Iraqi government obey inspection rules and the Security Council resolutions. In March 1996, the Security Council stated that inspection teams should be permitted to carry out examination. In May-June 1996, UNSCOM conducted inspection to see destruction of Al-Hakam, factory of biological weapons. Iraqi government could fulfill sometimes its responsibility coming from the UN Security Council resolutions, but it didn't obey the rules every time during inspection period. On 12 June 1996, the Security Council adopted the resolution 1060 stating that Iraqi government will allow inspectors unconditional access to all fields and areas that UNSCOM groups want to examine (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1060).

UNSCOM withdrew its personnel from Iraq due to uncompromising behavior of Iraqi government on 16 December 1998 (the United Nations). After this action, the United States and the United Kingdom started Operation Desert Fox and attacked Iraqi targets in December 16-19. It was a military bombing campaign to get Iraqi government to obey the Security Council resolutions and UNSCOM inspection. Defense Secretary William Cohen and Gen. Hugh Shelton said for the operation that the mission was extremely successful and the result was satisfactory. According to William Cohen and Hugh Shelton, approximately 100 targets were destroyed. These included some presidential sites of Saddam Hussein and headquarters of Baath party. 650 strike sorties were done by the British and American air forces. Approximately 415 Tomahawk and cruise missiles were utilized. Main aims of Americans here were to contain Iraq in the Middle East (CNN).

On 11 September 2001, there were sudden attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon. Nearly 3,000 people were killed and this was a historic moment for international relations. Bush administration wanted to change Iraqi regime. According to Bush, Saddam Hussein created a regime that supported terrorists. Also, Iraqi government had relations with terrorists who planned these attacks against Americans. The speech, which Bush delivered on 29 January 2002, showed that Bush targeted Iraq and North Korea for regime change. According to Bush, regimes of Iraq and North Korea were full of politicians who supported terrorism. He said that regimes, which supported terrorism, should be prevented. For instance, North Korea had weapons of mass destruction. In the Middle East, Iran supported and exported terrorism around other countries. Iraq supported terrorism against the United States. Saddam regime wanted to



develop biological and chemical weapons. Iraqi regime has hidden something from civilized world. Bush said that these states and their allies composed an axis of evil. They threatened peace and security of international politics. They were very dangerous due to the fact that they searched for alternatives to peace and security of international politics and weapons of mass destruction. They could give terrorists these weapons so that terrorists could have necessary means to incite hatred. They could strike our allies with these weapons. We must deploy missile defenses to protect our nation and allies. The United States shall make essential things to protect peace and security (the Washington Post). Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien didn't support regime change of Iraq designed by the United States. Regime change of a country like this was very dangerous for security and peace of the world. Chrétien supported disarmament of Iraq, but he thought that foreign intervention to change regime was dangerous. *"If you start changing regimes, where do you stop, this is the problem. Who is next? Give me the list, the priorities,"* he said while visiting Mexico City on 28 February 2003 Friday.

On 8 November 2002, the Security Council had adopted the resolution 1441 stating that Iraqi government shall obey the disarmament rules determined by the Security Council resolutions (The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441). *"I think that if I read 1441, it's talking about disarmament of the government of Saddam Hussein. That is the resolution that we are working on. If you read it, it is not talking about a regime change,"* Chrétien explained (CNN). It can be said that Chrétien was against regime change in Iraq. Also, he didn't support military intervention without the UN endorsement. He said that regime change was an endless process and that's the problem. Who is coming next? Is there a list to complete? These questions were very important that Chrétien asked. At that time, the truth about weapons of mass destruction and disarmament were significant for Chrétien.

Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his government wanted to see a new Security Council resolution authorizing military intervention in Iraq. As we know, the Security Council resolution 678 authorized all states to use necessary means to uphold the resolution 660. It was about withdrawing Iraqi troops from Kuwait. In 2003, a new resolution was required to make a military operation against Iraq, so Chrétien didn't send military forces to the invasion of Iraq without endorsement and authorization of the Security Council. On 7 March 2003, chief UN weapons inspector Hans Blix reported on disarmament of Iraq in the United Nations that there were no proscribed activities of armament, but he stated that we should do more research (CNN). No weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq after the invasion, so this war was not based on just reasons. Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency Mohamed ElBaradei said that *"the most dissatisfying moment of my life, of course, was when the Iraq war was launched. That hundreds of thousands of people lost their lives on the basis of fiction, not facts, makes me shudder* (Reuters)." Enemark and Michaelsen stressed that the occupation of Iraq by coalition forces was unjust. They analyzed this occupation in accordance with just war theory. The Security Council didn't authorize coalition forces to occupy Iraqi territory. Also, there was no collective endorsement of international society for occupation. They highlighted that this occupation didn't come from a need of humanitarian intervention. At the time of military intervention, there was no massive loss of civilian life in Iraq, so it wasn't humanitarian intervention. Moreover, this military action was disproportionate when threat perception of coalition forces was analyzed. They underscored that this was a political decision (2005, p.562-563). Additionally, the United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan stated that

the invasion of Iraq was illegal because of the fact that it was done by unilateral action. It should have been started and completed by decision of the United Nations (BBC). In addition to the shortage of evidence of mass destruction weapons, Canadian national public opinion was a factor not to go to the war.

#### 4. CANADIAN NATIONAL PUBLIC OPINION

Generally it can be said that Canadian national public opinion was opposed to participating in the occupation of Iraq. Before the invasion, Canadian nation organized many protests in the country. According to CBC, on 17 November 2002 many people organized protests against the occupation of Iraq across Canada this weekend. Activists, union leaders and members staged protests outside of the Ontario legislature to say ‘no’ to war. They criticized the United States and its political partners. Approximately 2,000 people supported anti-war protests. People thought that American foreign policies were reflections of imperialism. Some people showed their posters and placards saying ‘*don’t assault Iraq*’ and they criticized American foreign policy with harsh words (CBC).

Gallup carried out a survey about public opinion of Canada on potential invasion of Iraq. Survey was conducted on 3-9 February 2003 with 1,000 Canadian adults. According to the survey, 62 percent of Canadian nation were opposed to American military attack on Iraq. 63 percent of people were opposed to Canadian military attack on Iraq. Survey asked the most important reasons of American military action in Iraq. Mostly people said that American aim was to disarm weapons of mass destruction of Iraq. 23 percent of people said that American policy was aiming to take control of Iraqi oil resources. According to the survey, the third aim of American military action in Iraq was to topple Saddam Hussein. 15 percent of people said that American military action was in Iraq because of the fact that Iraq supported international terrorism. A small scale of people thought that the US will create a democratic government in Iraq. The answers of the survey are as follows:

**Table 1: The Most Important Reasons of American military policy in Iraq**

Disarming weapons of mass destruction of Iraq	35%
Taking control of Iraqi oil resources	23%
Toppling Saddam Hussein	14%
Iraqi support for terrorism	15%
The desire of President Bush to finish job coming from the First Gulf War	6%
Creating a democratic government	4%
Iraqi threat against Israel	2%
American general policy against Islam	Less than half of 1%

**Source:** Gallup, Unwilling Coalition? Majorities in Britain, Canada Oppose Military Action in Iraq, <https://news.gallup.com/poll/7798/unwilling-coalition-majorities-britain-canada-oppose-military-act.aspx> [Access: 8 December 2019].

The answers showed that Canadian national public opinion perceived American aims in terms of weapons of mass destruction of Iraq. People mostly thought that the United States wanted to disarm Iraqi weapons. When the answers are analyzed, it can be seen that the second reason was to take control of Iraqi oil resources. They selected this reason because they believed that economy was a reason behind this military action. The United States wanted to take control of this fields. The third reason was to topple Saddam regime. Bush administration perceived

Saddam regime as a corrupt administration and terrorism supporter. The fourth reason was about again terrorism. 15 percent of people said that there was an Iraqi support for terrorism. The desire of Bush administration to complete unfinished business had a small scale of selection. Just 6 percent of people opted to say this. Creating a democratic government was an ideal in which Canadian public opinion didn't trust. Iraqi threat against Israel and American general policy on Islam were too weak reasons to be selected according to the survey. Canadian national public opinion prevented the government from taking part in Iraq war as the most important voice of Canada. Furthermore, the lack of endorsement of the UN Security Council and the desire for showing full independence of Canada against the United States were the factors not to be engaged into the war.

## **5. THE LACK OF ENDORSEMENT OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL AND SHOWING FULL INDEPENDENCE OF CANADA**

Jean Chrétien government was opposed to military involvement in the invasion of Iraq without the UN endorsement and resolution authorizing military measure. They wanted to see strong evidence that Iraqi government had weapons of mass destruction. On 20 March 2003, the invasion of Iraq started. Before three days, on 17 March 2003 the House of Commons of Canada discussed the position of Canada in the occupation of Iraq. Leader of the opposition Stephen Harper asked that 150 military personnel are working with British and American troops on the ground, will these Canadian forces stay in cooperation with American and British counterparts if there will be a war? Jean Chrétien described the position of Canada related to Iraq war. He said that the approval of the Security Council was required. If the Security Council adopts a resolution authorizing military operation against Iraqi government, Canada would join military campaign. He stated that unless the Security Council adopts a new resolution, his government will not make the decision to participate in the war. The resolution authorizing military campaign was very important to take part in this military operation. However, at the same time he said that Canadian ships were in the region, and they will continue their task against terrorism. Canadian military participation was not possible without endorsement of the Security Council.

He continued saying that Canada will fight against terrorism as it does in Afghanistan. In the Gulf, keeping peace and security is very important for our foreign policy. Moreover, he expressed that if there will be a war, Canada will participate in reconstruction process of Iraq. Canada will help victims of a war. However, he also said that he was hoping there won't be a war of course. Also, he stated that Iraqi government should conform to the resolutions of the Security Council. It goes without saying that the most important step for Jean Chrétien was a resolution of the United Nations authorizing military campaign. He clearly said that Canada will not participate in a war without endorsement of the Security Council resolution. Additionally, the most important names of the cabinet of Chrétien were opposed to the invasion. In the same debates, Minister of National Defense John McCallum said that coalition of states is multinational. France, New Zealand, Greece, and the Netherlands are there. According to him, Canada is taking part in a fight against terrorism for the Gulf region and the World while keeping communication with these states. In addition to this, Foreign Minister of Canada Bill Graham stated that the position of Prime Minister was very clear that Canada would not join

the war and invasion without endorsement of the United Nations Security Council resolution. Americans will know this and they will be able to make their decision in accordance with this position. Obviously, Bill Graham stressed that Canada wanted to create peace among states, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien wanted to see a solution without war (the House of Commons of Canada).

After the Iraq war began, one of the most important topics of the House of Commons of Canada was reconstruction of Iraq. On 21 March 2003, one of the leaders of Bloc Québécois Gilles Duceppe asked that there will absolutely be a regime change in Iraq, but the United States must not transform Iraq into its protectorate. Did Canada take a decision for reconstruction of Iraq under the UN? Minister of Foreign Affairs Bill Graham answered this question and said that this is absolutely very crucial question. Canada supports an administration process of Iraq by the United Nations after the war. The United Nations should reconstruct and administer post-war Iraq (the House of Commons of Canada). Reconstruction and post-war administration of Iraq should be done by the authority of the UN. Manuel Dorion-Soulié and Stéphane Roussel stated that the politics of Jean Chrétien was supporting soft power because Prime Minister Chrétien didn't believe that hard power is a prestigious way to reach peace and security. For his politics, soft power was more important than any kind of power projection. As a liberal, Chrétien generally supported soft power in international relations (2014, p.15-16).

He wanted to reach a compromise between conflicting interests under the umbrella of the United Nations. However, Bush administration didn't give him this chance by invading Iraq. Jean Chrétien stated in an interview with *Le Devoir* that after the Iraq war, Iranian influence on Iraq increased. Iran is Shiite while Iraq is Sunni. In the past, Saddam fought against Iran with American support. Finally, this war is not a successful progression for American foreign policy in the Middle East. He explained that without endorsement of the UN resolution, Canada didn't participate in this war and military coalition. Evidence of weapons of mass destruction was not convincing enough. He was not persuaded by evidence to send troops to the war. Since the beginning of coalition process, the position of Canada not to send troops without the UN endorsement has been so clear. Also, he explained that Canada generally was accused of being so close to its big neighbor, the United States. Generally, people say that Canada is a partner of the United States. Some countries thought that Canada was 51<sup>st</sup> state of the United States. This decision was very important for that reason. It showed that Canada has a full independence of foreign policy against the United States, so this decision was very important for the reputation of Canada (*Le Devoir*).

Canada and the United States are neighbor countries on the American continent. They have strong economic and political relations. Also, Canada supported American aims in Afghanistan and took a leading role in military operations. However, the period of Jean Chrétien was different from the others. He was critical of American foreign policy. It was an exceptional decision for Canadian politics. In the next chapter, US – Canada relations of today will be analyzed.

## **6. THE US – CANADA RELATIONS TODAY**

The US and Canada are good allies today. They have strong economic, educational and political relations. American trade in goods and services with Canada was totally 718.5 billion dollars

in 2018. While American exports were 363.8 billion dollars, imports were 354.7 billion dollars. Canada is the second largest trading partner of the US in goods with 618.6 billion dollars in 2018. American goods exported to Canada were in total 299.8 billion dollars. Goods imported from Canada were in total 318.8 billion dollars. In 2018, Canada was the biggest export market for American goods. Moreover, Canada was the third biggest goods supplier for American import in 2018 (Office of the United States Trade Representative). The US and Canada have strong economic relations today as we can see.

It is important to say that the US, Canada, and Mexico signed in 2018 to ameliorate NAFTA into 21<sup>st</sup> century standards. Furthermore, these two countries have memberships in the same organizations. They have been including the UN, NATO, WTO, G7, and G20. Also, Organization of American States and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum are amongst these organizations. Also, two countries have joint education programs. The Youth Ambassadors program includes high school students for three weeks to participate in a leadership program in the US. Moreover, two countries are supporting Fulbright Canada. With this program, skilled students from the US and Canada can study in one of these countries.

These two countries have partnerships in security. They are implementing extensive law enforcement programs. They include the Border Enforcement Security Taskforces (BESTs), and the Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETS). These countries have shared borders, so they should have close relations. For example, US Customs and Border Protection (CBP) creates control mechanisms at eight airports of Canada (U.S. Department of State).

Even if Canada has some problems Trump administration, in foreign policy and international problems, generally it supports American aims. This situation was different in the invasion of Iraq 2003. However, today it can be seen that Canadian leaders would support American foreign policy aims. For example, President Nicolas Maduro of Venezuela said that there was a US-led coup in Venezuela (CNN). Canada had temporarily shut its embassy in Venezuela (Deutsche Welle). Canada has criticized political situation in Venezuela that this political administration undermined democratic institutions. Canada has been at the forefront of international movements that wanted to recognize Juan Guaido as the legitimate political leader of the country. Canada has taken the position that the US supported.

These two countries are member of the same collective security organization, NATO. The article 5 of The North Atlantic Treaty, which created NATO, says that parties to this treaty have concluded that when an armed attack to one or more of them in Europe or North America will be perceived as an assault to all of them (The North Atlantic Treaty). Canada shares the same line with the US. The decisions of Canadian foreign policy would be different from American aims and decisions, but they are members of NATO. They share the same responsibilities and roles in this collective security organization. From today's perspective, Canadian decision not to go to the war was a different point in political history, but they share same identity of western political power inside NATO.

## **7. CONCLUSION**

It is concluded that the approach of Jean Chrétien government was appropriate to international law. Today in international relations, military operations are justified and made legitimate by decisions of the United Nations Security Council resolutions. The Security Council is the sole

institution that has power monopoly on a legitimate basis. Chrétien government wanted to see strong evidence that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Moreover without endorsement of the UN, the government didn't support the military coalition even if it supports combat against terrorism. Canada and the US are good allies. Prime Minister Chrétien took a decision despite close relations between these two states.

There are four reasons of Chrétien government's decision. The first reason is that the United States didn't show enough evidence of weapons of mass destruction. Chrétien thought that without strong evidences this couldn't be true. Furthermore, Iraq partly conformed to the UN inspection requirements. While Chrétien thought a more detailed inspection, Bush administration immediately wanted to invade Iraq in the 2003 spring. Hans Blix and ElBaradei didn't report weapons of mass destruction. Also, Iraq had destroyed facilities of some weapons during the process. Chrétien thought that weapons of mass destruction were an American speculation and it should have been completely examined. The second reason is that Chrétien government didn't want to send its troops to a military operation without the Security Council resolution authorizing military intervention. This approach was appropriate to international law and the system of the UN. This was true that he wanted to share the responsibility with other countries in frame of the UN. The third reason is that Canadian public opinion didn't support the invasion of Iraq by Canada. 63 percent of Canadian nation were opposed to military attack on Iraq by Canadian military forces.

The last reason is that Chrétien wanted to show the political independence of Canada in constructing foreign policy. He consolidated the independence of Canada from its big superpower neighbor. By this decision, he showed that Canada could make decisions totally which were independent of the superpower. Canada is not 51<sup>st</sup> state of the US. On the contrary, Canada is a sovereign state that has strong relations with the superpower. In the light of the information mentioned above, it is concluded that Prime Minister Chrétien and his government made a decision totally independent of its big neighbor, the US. There were four reasons of this decision. They were failure to find out weapons of mass destruction, absence of the Security Council resolution, non-interventionist public opinion, and finally the desire to show political independence of Canada in constructing its own foreign policy.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Barry, D. (2005). "Chrétien, Bush, and the War in Iraq", *American Review of Canadian Studies*, Vol.35, No.2, 215-245.

BBC, Iraq war illegal, says Annan, [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/3661134.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3661134.stm) [Access: 29 November 2019].

CBC, Canadian activists stage anti-war rallies, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/canadian-activists-stage-anti-war-rallies-1.356085> [Access: 8 December 2019].

Clarkson, S. and Lachappelle, E. (2005). "Jean Chrétien's legacy in managing Canadian-American relations", *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, Vol.12, No.2, 65-82.

CNN, Transcript of President Bush's address, <https://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/> [Access: 17 November 2019].

CNN, Pentagon assessment of Desert Fox: 'Job extremely well done', <http://edition.cnn.com/US/9812/19/iraq.us.forces.02/> [Access: 5 November 2019].

CNN, Canada's Chretien criticizes 'regime change' in Iraq, <http://edition.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/americas/02/28/sprj.irq.canada.us.reut/> [Access: 28 November 2019].

CNN, Transcript of Blix's U.N. presentation, <http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/03/07/sprj.irq.un.transcript.blix/> [Access: 29 November 2019].

CNN, Maduro says a US-led 'coup' is behind the political upheaval in Venezuela, <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/01/27/americas/venezuela-maduro-us-coup-accusation/index.html> [Access: 17 January 2020].

CTV News, Saying 'no' to Iraq War was 'important' decision for Canada: Chretien, <https://www.ctvnews.ca/politics/saying-no-to-iraq-war-was-important-decision-for-canada-chretien-1.1192878> [Access: 25 November 2019].

Deutsche Welle, Canada suspends operations at Venezuela embassy, <https://www.dw.com/en/canada-suspends-operations-at-venezuela-embassy/a-49011031> [Access: 16 January 2020].

Dorion-Soulié, M. and Roussel, S. (2014). "« Oui » à l'Irak? Le baptême du feu de Stephen Harper et l'émergence du néocontinentalisme (2002–2003)", *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, Vol.20, No.1, 9–18.

Enemark, C. and Michaelsen, C. (2005). "Just War Doctrine and the Invasion of Iraq", *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, Vol.51, No.4, 545-563.

Fawn, R. (2008). "No Consensus with the Commonwealth, No Consensus with Itself? Canada and the Iraq War", *the Round Table*, Vol.97, No.397, 519 – 533.

Gallup, Unwilling Coalition? Majorities in Britain, Canada Oppose Military Action in Iraq, <https://news.gallup.com/poll/7798/unwilling-coalition-majorities-britain-canada-oppose-military-act.aspx> [Access: 29 November 2019].

Ismael, T.Y. and Ismael, J.S. (2005). "Whither Iraq? Beyond Saddam, sanctions and occupation", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol.26, No.4-5, 609 – 629.

Lachapelle, G. (2003). "Pourquoi le gouvernement canadien a-t-il refusé de participer à la guerre en Irak ?", *Revue française de science politique*, Vol.53, 911-927.

Le Devoir, La plus grosse manifestation de l'histoire du Québec, <https://www.ledevoir.com/societe/20668/la-plus-grosse-manifestation-de-l-histoire-du-quebec> [Access: 25 November 2019].

Le Devoir, Irak: les 10 ans du non canadien - Jean Chrétien ne regrette rien, <https://www.ledevoir.com/politique/canada/373123/jean-chretien-ne-regrette-rien#> [Access: 3 December 2019].

NATO, The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington D.C: 4 April 1949, Article 5.

O'Connor, B. and Vucetic, S. (2010). "Another Mars–Venus divide? Why Australia said ‘yes’ and Canada said ‘non’ to involvement in the 2003 Iraq War", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.64, No.5, 526-548.

Office of the United States Trade Representative, U.S.-Canada Trade Facts, <https://ustr.gov/countries-regions/americas/canada> [Access: 11 January 2020].

Patrick, S. (2003). "Beyond Coalitions of the Willing: Assessing U.S. Multilateralism", *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol.17, No.1, 37-54.

Reuters, IAEA chief: should have 'howled' louder on Iraq, <https://www.reuters.com/article/idINIndia-41663720090810> [Access: 29 November 2019].

The Government of Canada, The Canadian Armed Forces Legacy in Afghanistan, <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-national-defence/services/operations/military-operations/recently-completed/canadian-armed-forces-legacy-afghanistan.html> [Access: 24 November 2019].

The House of Commons of Canada, House Publications 17 March 2003, <https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/37-2/house/sitting-71/hansard> [Access: 29 November 2019].

The House of Commons of Canada, House Publications 21 March 2003, <https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/37-2/house/sitting-75/hansard#SOB-467216> [Access: 29 November 2019].

The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 660, Date of Resolution: 2 August 1990.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 661, Date of Resolution: 6 August 1990.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 678, Date of Resolution: 29 November 1990.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 687, Date of Resolution: 3 April 1991.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 707, Date of Resolution: 15 August 1991.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 1060, Date of Resolution: 12 June 1996.



The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 1368, Date of Resolution: 12 September 2001.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution, Number of Resolution: 1441, Date of Resolution: 8 November 2002.

The United Nations, UNSCOM Chronology, <https://www.un.org/Depts/unscom/Chronology/chronologyframe.htm> [Access: 27 November 2019].

The U.S. Department of State Archive, U.S. - Canada Smart Border/30 Point Action Plan Update, <https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/wha/rls/fs/18128.htm> [Access: 24 November 2019].

The Washington Post, Text of President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/sou012902.htm?> [Access: 27 November 2019].

U.S. Department of State, U.S. Relations with Canada, <https://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-canada/> [Access: 14 January 2020].

Vucetic, S. (2006). "Why did Canada sit out of the Iraq war? One constructivist analysis", *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, Vol.13, No.1, 133-153.