Manukau Courier
PO Box 76-400
Manukau City

**Saddam and the Pat Booth theory**

Dear Sir,

I was quite disappointed by the biased and untrue view regarding Iraq's disarmament that Pat Booth presented. Except the 'oil' argument all usual leftish pet-theories were there. However, I would like your readers to consider the following:

1. One of the condition for Iraq to avoid war on its own soil was verifiable destruction of weapons of mass destruction (UN resolution 686). UN resolution 1441, passed in November, reaffirmed that. Iraq would face 'severe consequence' failing that. What would 'severe' be Pat? Business as usual?

2. The proof of disarmament lays with Iraq, according to that and the previous resolutions on this subject. We have had quite a few since 1991. The inspectors are not in Iraq to find weapons, but to find proof of disarmament.

3. It isn't that we don't know what disarmament should look like. Since 1989 three countries have shredded their weapons of mass-destruction and inspections have given proof of them: South Africa, Ukraine and Kazakhstan.

4. The 'report' Pat Booth mentions is laughable. I quote from "A Leftist's Case for War" by Mitchell Cohen: "Why did Saddam rebuff UN appeals to buy baby formula in 1998-1999? Why was he exporting food? Why was he importing massive quantities of scotch for his hierarchy and building an amusement park for the Ba'ath elite? Why has he spent two billion dollars on presidential palaces since the end of the Gulf War and offered another one billion dollars in aid to the Palestinian intifada? Why did mortality rates fall in the semi-autonomous Kurdish areas, where the UN-rather than Baghdad-administers proceeds of "oil for food"? Doesn't anyone notice that the UNICEF report was written in collaboration with Saddam's Ministry of Health?"

Yours sincerely,

Berend de Boer
Manukau City


PS: in case this letter is too long to be printed, perhaps you can just print argument 4? But the inclusion of the UN argument makes it more balanced.