Mr. Speaker, most

people do not realize how many conservatives

are against going to war in

Iraq.

A strong majority of nationally syndicated

conservative columnists have

come out against this war. Just three

of the many, many examples I could

give include the following:

Charlie Reese, a staunch conservative,

who was elected a couple of

years ago as the favorite columnist of

C-SPAN viewers, wrote that a U.S. attack

on Iraq ‘‘is a prescription for the

decline and fall of the American empire.’’

Paul Craig Roberts, who was one of

the highest-ranking Treasury Department

officials under President Reagan

and now a nationally syndicated conservative

columnist, wrote:

James Webb, a hero of Vietnam and

President Reagan’s Secretary of the

Navy, wrote:

It is a traditional conservative position,

Mr. Speaker, to be against huge

deficit spending.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated

that a very short war, followed

by a 5-year occupation of Iraq, would

cost the U.S. $272 billion, this on top of

an estimated $350 billion deficit for the

coming fiscal year.

It is a traditional conservative position

to be against the U.S. being the

policeman of the world. That is exactly

what we will be doing if we go to war

in Iraq.

It is a traditional conservative position

to be against world government,

because conservatives believe that government

is less wasteful and arrogant

when it is small and closer to the people.

It is a traditional conservative position

to be critical of, skeptical about,

or even opposed to the very wasteful,

corrupt United Nations; yet the primary

justification for this war, what

we hear over and over again, is that

Iraq has violated 16 U.N. resolutions.

Well, other nations have violated U.N.

resolutions; yet we have not threatened

war against them.

It is a traditional conservative position

to believe it is unfair to U.S. taxpayers

and our military to put almost

the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions

on the U.S.; yet that is exactly

what will happen in a war against

Iraq. In fact, it is already happening,

because even if Hussein backs down

now, it will have cost us billions of dollars

in war preparations and moving so

many of our troops, planes, ships and

equipment to the Middle East.

It is a traditional conservative position

to be against huge foreign aid,

which has been almost a complete failure

for many years now. Talk about

huge foreign aid, Turkey, according to

reports, is demanding 26 to $32 billion;

Israel wants 12 to $15 billion; Egypt,

Jordan, Saudi Arabia want additional

aid in unspecified amounts.

Almost every country that is supporting

the U.S. in this war wants

something in return. The cost of all

these requests have not been added in

to most of the war costs calculations.

All this to fight a bad man who has a

total military budget of about $1.4 billion,

less than three-tenths of 1 percent

of ours.

The White House said Hussein has

less than 40 percent of the weaponry

and manpower that he had at the time

of the first Gulf War. One analyst estimated

only about 20 percent.

His troops surrendered then to camera

crews or even in one case to an

empty tank. Hussein has been weakened

further by years of bombing and

economic sanctions and embargoes. He

is an evil man, but he is no threat to

us; and if this war comes about, it will

probably be one of the shortest and certainly

one of the most lopsided wars in

history.

Our own CIA put out a report just a

few days before our war resolution vote

saying that Hussein was so weak economically

and militarily he was really

not capable of attacking anyone unless

forced into it. He really controls very

little outside the city of Baghdad.

The Washington Post 2 days ago had

a column which said

Fortune Magazine said,

Not only have most conservative columnists

come out strongly against this

war, but also at least four conservative

magazines and two conservative think

tanks.

One conservative Republican member

of the other body said last week that

the ‘‘rush to war in Iraq could backfire’’

and asked, ‘‘We are wrecking coalitions,

relationships and alliances so

we can get a 2-week start on going to

war alone?’’

The Atlantic Monthly magazine said

we would spend so much money in Iraq

we might as well make it the 51st

State. I believe most conservatives

would rather that money be spent here.

It is a traditional conservative position

to be in favor of a strong national

defense, not one that turns our soldiers

into international social workers, and

to believe in a noninterventionist foreign

policy, rather than in globalism or

internationalism. We should be friends

with all nations, but we will weaken

our own Nation, maybe irreversibly,

unless we follow the more humble foreign

policy the President advocated in

his campaign.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is very much

against every conservative tradition to

support preemptive war. Another member

of the other body, the Senator from

West Virginia, not a conservative but

certainly one with great knowledge of

and respect for history and tradition,

said recently