

*Government Orders*

Further down, the article states:

Agitation to nationalize all Iranian oil production has been growing since the end of the War—Mohammad Mossadeq emerged as the Majlas member who rallied the nationalist cause, and the shah felt compelled to support the legislature's nationalization of the oil industry (after the fact, and to appoint Mossadeq as Prime Minister.

• (1620)

Then, enter the United States.

The shah saw his position gradually being eroded, whereupon he conspired with the Eisenhower administration to oust Mossadeq. Operation Ajax was set in motion in August 1953, whereby Mossadeq was deposed, the shah regained control, and a number of ultra-nationalists were tried and executed.

That is what the United States was willing to do, by way of aggression, to ensure a low price for the oil it wished to buy. So I say that the United States and some other countries come to this dispute without clean hands.

There is wide antipathy in the Arab world, so one reads. I have not had the opportunity to travel there, yet. There is wide antipathy toward Europeans, including the Europeans who govern the United States of America. It is not only with Iraq that we might find ourselves fighting. We know that some of the other countries there are not on our side or not fully on our side. Iran and Jordan have an uncertain position from our point of view, that is, from our military point of view. The danger is that the war that started by the NATO powers, with a few small allies including Egypt, making military moves to the Persian Gulf, might turn out to be unwinnable. I quote here from another article which I happened to find by chance, as I was browsing through *The Financial Post* on Tuesday, October 16. The article is by John Shiry and I quote:

U.S. and Western policy toward the Middle East is in a shambles. In the past and at present, the West's best friends have been monarchs who control most of the oil, and the state of Israel. History and population numbers are on the other side.

He goes on to point out, in another quotation:

The region has problems of poverty, illiteracy, public health, population growth, water supplies, development and food production.

At this time, about 200 million Arabs live in the area that stretches from Algeria to Iran. At current rates of growth that will double in less than 25 years and reach 500 million by the year 2025.

Now the point that he is making is that the oil tends to be in the countries with small populations and the countries with large populations are relatively poor and what he has described there is the poverty of the large populations. He goes on:

Most of these people live in countries that are not rich, and most of their cultures place a high value on having large families. At the same time, most of the economies are unable to provide adequate jobs, health care, education and housing for their existing populations. A central problem is that much of the region's oil wealth is in the countries with small populations.

The point that we of the countries who are members of NATO would do well to remember is the point that he makes in the last paragraph that I quote:

To many leaders and citizens of the region,—

—that is Arabia.

—the only things the West cares about are cheap oil and the security of Israel. That is not the case. But it is easy to see how the image can exist.

That is the warning. It is not just Saddam Hussein who sees us as the enemy, it a great many millions of people besides him. In fact, we have to understand that the era of gunboat diplomacy has come to an end. The NATO powers had better understand that we are not about to continue ruling the world for another five centuries. We have been selling arms. Some people grew quite rich in our country by selling arms to the former colonies. Other people grew rich by lending them money to buy the arms and collected the interest on the debts and overthrew governments if they did not pay the interest.

These people have all kinds of conventional weapons. We have had so many stories about weaponry that Saddam has and nearly all of it he bought from our countries except what he made with machinery he bought from our countries, such as chemical weapons and perhaps nuclear weapons. We ought not to be surprised if Saddam uses the weapons we provided him and uses them in the way we have been using them during this century, including the nuclear weapons.

The question is what alternative is there to both appeasement and to international war? The answer is common security. Former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance was one of the pioneers of this concept. He said some years ago: