Mr. Speaker,

President Bush, from all appearances,

seems poised to attack the country of

Iraq sometime in the next 2 or 3 weeks

according to news reports, according to

reading a bit between the lines of

statements coming from the Bush administration.

The fundamental question

about whether or not the United

States should launch a preemptive

strike without U.N. support against

Iraq, the fundamental question is

whether that attack against Iraq

makes the United States a safer country

and whether it makes American civilians

traveling abroad, living abroad

more importantly, perhaps, living in

the United States, whether it makes

all of us safer. The CIA says no.

A CIA analysis said that the chances

of what they call a blowback, meaning

attacks against civilians from terrorists

abroad or terrorists inside the

United States, that attacks against civilians,

the chances increase according

to the CIA, so-called blowback, the

term they used, the chances increase if

we launch a preemptive strike against

Iraq without U.N. support. Several

four-star generals testified in the other

body and said that an attack against

Iraq without U.N. support, a preemptive

attack will, in their words, supercharge

al Qaeda recruiting. Common

sense simply tells you that the U.S.

will not be a safer place, will be a more

dangerous place, that civilians in this

country will in fact be in more danger

if we unilaterally attack Iraq. Common

sense says that, Mr. Speaker, because

if Saddam Hussein is backed into a corner,

Saddam Hussein, who has not attacked

anyone in the last 10 years, if

he is backed into a corner with whatever

weapons he might have, the

chances are he is much more likely to

attack the United States if in fact that

happens.

Mr. Speaker, this country for the last

five decades has followed a military

doctrine of containment and deterrence

and diplomacy. Dwight Eisenhower

when urged by some advisers and some

newspapers similar to the actions of

the Washington Post, those kind of jingoist,

expansion, let’s-get-into-war

newspapers that encouraged him,

Dwight Eisenhower, to go to war

against Stalin and the Soviets, Dwight

Eisenhower said, ‘‘That’s not what we

do in this country. We don’t launch

preemptive attacks against people. Instead

we contain, we deter, we use diplomacy.’’

Dwight Eisenhower and others contained

and deterred and used diplomacy

with Joseph Stalin and the Soviets

to contain them. We used the same

containment and deterrence and diplomacy

with the People’s Republic of

China and Mao Zedong. John Kennedy

used the same kind of deterrence and

containment against Fidel Castro and

the Cubans to keep them in check, to

keep them from expanding. And the

United States Government, George

Bush, Sr., President Clinton, and the

first couple of years of President Bush,

we have done the same containment

and deterrence to keep Saddam Hussein

in check.

Now if we launch a preemptive attack

against Iraq, go against a country

that has not attacked us, a country

that we know has no ties to the terrorists

who attacked our country, we

know Saudi Arabia has ties. In fact the

people who attacked our country, most

of them were from Saudi Arabia. We

also know that the Saudi royal family

happens to be friends of the Bush family.

Saudi Arabia is still our friend. We

do not attack them even though they

have ties to al Qaeda.

We are not attacking North Korea,

even though we know they have nuclear

weapons. We are not attacking

Iran, even though they are a part of the

axis of evil. The President has decided

that we are about to attack Iraq, a

country where we have contained and

deterred and kept Saddam Hussein in

check.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we decide to

change our military doctrine of containment,

deterrence and diplomacy, to

change our military doctrine that we

have followed for the last five or six

decades, and preemptively strike a

country that has not attacked us, the

message around the world, the message

to the Russians is going to be, it is

okay to chase down Chechen terrorists

and go into Georgia and attack them.

The message to the Chinese will be, it

is okay to clamp down harder on Tibet,

it is okay maybe to invade Taiwan because

the United States launched a

preemptive attack, and maybe it is

okay for the world powers to engage in

that kind of lawlessness. And most

problematically and most dangerously

and most frighteningly, Mr. Speaker, it

will say to India that maybe it is okay

to launch a preemptive strike against

Pakistan over Kashmir. It will say to

Pakistan, maybe it is okay to launch a

preemptive strike against India over

Kashmir. Those happen to be, Mr.

Speaker, two countries that have nuclear

weapons.

So if we go against the U.N. decision,

if we go into Iraq without U.N. support

preemptively, first of all it clearly

makes our country more dangerous because

you can count on as we attack

Iraq, you can count on Al-Jazeera taping

hostilities and taping casualties of

Iraqi civilians and the message that

that is going to send to the Arab world

of destabilization, making the world a

more dangerous place to be.