Madam Speaker, I have

come to the floor tonight to discuss

our Nation’s policy in Iraq and before I

discuss that most important issue I

would like to make a couple of preparatory

comments.

First, I would I want to express my

respect, admiration and appreciation

for the men and women of our Armed

Services who are today deployed in the

service of their country, who are already

assisting the security and freedoms

of our country today, regardless

of the outcome of our national policy

in Iraq. And I think it is important to

note in any discussion of our national

policy that the very reason we have the

opportunity to discuss and debate

these issues on the floor of the House

of Representatives are the contributions

past, present and future of the

men and women of the America’s

armed forces. Because the very right of

freedom of speech would not exist without

the courage and dedication of our

soldiers and sailors and Air Force personnel,

Marines and Coast Guard and

there are others.

We would not have the ability and

other Americans would not have the

ability to protest, to question their

government’s policy but for the dedicated

courage of these individuals. And

I have a particular personal connection

and admiration for them. In the last 2

weeks I have gone to two deployments

of citizens and my neighbors to the

Middle East. I went to the deployment

in Bremerton, Washington of the 8th

Navy Hospital Unit who left about 21⁄2

weeks ago and watched them say goodbye

to their husbands and wives and

children for the service of this country.

And I have them in mind when I am deciding

what position to take in Iraq.

I have the sailors of the U.S.S. *Rodney*

*Davis,* a U.S.S. frigate that shipped

off last weekend from Everett, Washington

now bound for the Middle East

and watched them say good-bye to

their loved ones on that dock, and I

have them in minds when I think about

what our policy ought to be in Iraq.

Regardless of what Americans think

their policy should be in Iraq, I think

we should stand absolutely unanimously

as we did in Congress here, in

the House last week when we passed a

resolution respecting and pledging our

support and our prayers, which the

brave men and women have tonight

and today, in the sands of the Middle

East, and we have should not forget

them in any stretch.

Second, I want to say that I think

that the U.S. Congress needs more discussion,

not less, of America’s policy in

Iraq. And I think it is very disappointing

to many Americans that

there has been a pall of silence in the

House about Iraq for the last several

months. It is disappointing because

while every democratically elected legislative

body around the world or many

of them have been debating this subject,

the very citadel of democracy, the

U.S. House of Representatives right

here, the People’s House, has been almost

absolutely silent on this issue,

and I think that is not in the best traditions

of democracy.

To that end, we have invited some of

my Republican colleagues, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. DELAY), to

lead an effort to debate what should be

our policy here in the House of Representatives,

and to date we have not

convinced them to agree to that type

of debate in the House and I think it is

very unfortunate. I hope that some of

my Republican colleagues will engage

with us in that discussion in the near

future, and we have hope the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. DELAY) would

reconsider and would allow debate to

occur on the floor of the House in this

regard.

And the reason I say that is while

this House did cast a vote, which I believe

unwisely abrogated our constitutional

authority to make the decision

on war to the executive branch, a lot

has happened since that decision

months ago. This Chamber should be

debating what the right course of action

is in Iraq. We owe it to the soldiers

and sailors of the 8th Hospital

Unit in the Navy and the people of the

U.S.S. *Rodney Davis* and all Americans

to decide and debate this subject. And

I think it is most unfortunate that the

House has derogated its responsibility

to make that decision and punted it

over to the White House down on Pennsylvania

Avenue. So I hope that we can

inspire additional debate. I have come

to discuss this today. I wish we had

others to join us who has a different

view about Iraq.

Now to the substance of Iraq, I will

pose about 8 or 10 questions that I

think that we need to have answered

before a war starts in Iraq.

The first question I would pose is, is

a policy of inaction in Iraq the right

and acceptable policy for America and

the international community? And I

will answer that with a resounding no.

Inaction is not an accepted policy

when it comes to Iraq. And fortunately

inaction is not what we have at this

moment. We have a policy of keeping

this thug, this tyrant, this diabolical

dictator in a tight little box and that is

where we ought to keep him, and we

ought to continue and promote and

make stronger our inspection protocol

to find and root out and disarm this tyrant.

And we have been having success

in that regard in the last several

weeks. And we ought to continue and

enhance and strengthen our no-fly

zone, which denies that dictator effective

control of 70 percent of his country.

And fortunately, and this is very

difficult to the Iraqi innocent citizens

under this tyrant’s control, but we

ought to continue this economic sanction

policy as well to keep this tyrant

in his box.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.

KIND) has joined us and I yield to him.

I appreciate it. We will

continue to get our efforts to get a dialogue

going in the House. The gentleman

has written the gentleman from

Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). I have written

the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

DELAY). We will continue these efforts.

Before the gentleman goes, I will

note just a little problem we will be

working on. I met with a group of reservists

last weekend because we are

having these longer deployments and

longer call-ups and one of the things

we need to work on is make sure they

get adequate health care when they

switch from one coverage to another as

well as adequate travel reimbursement

because, unfortunately, we will have

longer deployments. I will be talking

with the gentleman.

I thank the gentleman for joining me

and I thank him for his leadership on

this work.

Madam Speaker, we are talking

about inaction is not an option when it

comes to Iraq. And I point this out because

I feel that in the debate, those

who have supported a largely unilateral

war, which is the situation we are

in with very little international support,

those who support that position

have suggested that there is only two

decisions here, war or passivity, war or

inaction.

I think it is very important to note

that the course we are advocating is

that we continue to squeeze down on

this tyrant. And that it is important to

realize that we ought to engage the

power of the international community

to isolate him and to continue this disarmament

program, and I think just in

the last few days we have continued to

see success in the inspection process,

and it is important to realize no inspection

process is going to be totally

effective in the first 24 hours or the

first 30 days. It took us years in the

1990s but the disarmament program

and the inspection protocol, although

it was not absolutely foolproof, in fact

destroyed more weapons of Saddam

Hussein than were destroyed in the

Persian Gulf War. That is a significant

fact that is sometimes forgotten. It

ought to give us some degree of optimism

about continuing the inspection

protocol which is so important, which

we ought to make stronger.

By the way, when it comes to these

inspections, if we have to double the

number of inspectors, if we have to triple

the number of inspectors, if they

need to go up a factor of ten, it is

cheap at twice the price. Because

frankly this inspection protocol is

costing us a few million dollars a year.

A war will cost somewhere between 60-

and $120 billion a year to the United

States taxpayers. And we ought to advocate

with the United Nations to have

a more rigorous inspection protocol

and accomplish that.

The second question I would ask and

I think is important to answer in this

debate, is the President’s assertion, his

implicit assertion, that Saddam Hussein

was behind the horrendous attack

on our Nation September 11 supported

by the evidence of our intelligence

services? And I am afraid to say that

that assertion is wholly unsupported

by the evidence.

If Saddam Hussein were connected

with the September 11 attack on this

Nation, I would not hesitate for 5 seconds

to vote for an action by the

United States, even largely unilaterally,

as we did in Afghanistan, because

the Taliban was directly behind the attacks

of the United States of America.

It was responsible for thousands of

deaths.

I have listened closely for months

now for some shred of meaningful evidence

that Saddam Hussein had broken

with his decade of failing and refusing

to ally with the al Qaeda, and all of the

sudden the September 11 attack, and

that has been wholly missing in this

debate. I have gone to repeated classified

briefings; and I obviously will not

disclose what were in those briefings,

but I have come away from a review of

the entire record and not seen meaningful

evidence of a connection between

Saddam Hussein and September

11.

Frankly, it is not too surprising, because

anyone who has studied the Mideast

understands that there is a dramatic

difference between the thinking

of al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden and

the type of tyranny and oppression

that Saddam Hussein has advocated,

because al Qaeda has been a fundamentalist

Islamic group, and they have

called Saddam Hussein, as recently as

several weeks ago, an apostate, who is

a secular tyrant; and they have been

oil and water, and it is a good thing

that they have been.

I serve on the Committee on Financial

Services, and as recently as yesterday

we had the Homeland Security Department,

the Department of Justice,

and the Department of Treasury; and

we were looking at money laundering

and issues about the financing of terrorism.

I asked our three agencies

whether there was any evidence that

they would share with us that there

was any financing by Saddam Hussein

of the September 11 attacks, and I

asked them a very specific question,

because this is fundamental to the

President’s argument. They did not

present one shred of evidence that

there was a connection between Saddam

Hussein and September 11, and

this is very important in this debate.

It is not important to know whether

Saddam Hussein is a despicable, loathsome

human being who has been a tyrant,

who has tortured his citizens,

who has started wars, who one can find

no virtue in whatsoever. That is an accepted

fact, and we should not be naive

enough to think otherwise.

When it comes to deciding whether

America should go to war, it would be

a huge mistake to go to war based on

an illusion that this is the person responsible

for September 11; and unfortunately,

and it is unfortunate, I think,

I saw a poll the other day that the

President has convinced 42 percent of

Americans that Saddam Hussein was

behind September 11 when his own intelligence

agencies know otherwise.

That is unfortunate in this debate.

The third question I would ask that

is important to ask is what is the relative

threat posed by Iraq relative to

the threats posed by other nations and

non-nations around the world, and that

is an important question, because there

are an unlimited number of threats to

our personal security. It is unlimited,

and there is a hierarchy of how imminent

and how dangerous they are, and

if we simply focus on Iraq and if we are

willing to go to war in Iraq, to the detriment

of our ability to deal with other

threats that I believe are more imminent

and potentially more lethal, it

will be a bad decision by the United

States. So if I can, for a moment, talk

about some of these other threats.

The President has indicated that

Saddam Hussein has attempted to obtain

fissionable materiel and nuclear

weapons. This is true. It is clear that

Saddam Hussein has tried for decades

to obtain a nuclear device, and he has

been spectacularly unsuccessful in his

multiple-decade efforts, but other

countries have not been unsuccessful.

North Korea, the country that the

President of the United States told us

is not creating a crisis, a country that

has probably got fissionable materiel

and is on the course to have several nuclear

weapons in several months, that

recently intercepted our reconnaissance

aircraft, which has been involved

in infiltration of various other countries,

who is acting in a fanatical, totally

unpredictable manner, who may

have or will have shortly nuclear weapons

that can reach Japan, who is developing

missiles that can reach the western

coast of the United States in a few

years, that is an imminent threat to

this country. Unfortunately, America’s

response to North Korea has been damaged,

hindered and limited due to the

President’s concentration on Iraq, and

I have to stand here to sadly say that

if Saddam Hussein could, potentially, I

do not know how with the inspection

process, but with our inspection process

under way, he is decades away from

a nuclear weapon.

North Korea is months away from

nuclear weapons that are deliverable to

other nations and potentially the Western

United States in several years.

That is the number one threat to the

security of this Nation and the President,

who only has 24 hours in the day,

has been making a lot of calls about

Iraq, and has not had time to make

calls about North Korea; and we have

to be aware of the presence of these

other threats.

Second threat, Iran. I was in Israel

about a year and a half ago, and I met

with the number three or five person in

the Israeli defense force, and I asked

him what he was most concerned about

in threats in the region and to the security

of Israel. Obviously, the

intafada, creating the havoc and destruction,

is first on his mind; but he

told me, and he had a lot of concern in

his voice when he told me this, that we

had to really crack down on a country

that started with the letter I in the

Mideast, because they were very, very

dangerous to the regional security of

the area and to the security of Israel,

and that country was Iran.

Because he told me that, because of

the assistance of Russia, Iran was making

significant progress to nuclear

weapons, and his statement to me almost

a year and a half ago has been

borne out by the intelligence photographs

we saw last, I guess it was, Monday

now in our newspapers about the

cascade of centrifuges that Iran has developed

to develop fissionable materiel

in relatively short order for another

nuclear power in the Mideast. That is a

clear and present danger to the security

of the Mideast and ultimately to

the United States, but the United

States has not been able to deal with

that threat because it has been so focused

on Iraq, and I think that is most

unfortunate.

While we are fighting a war in Iraq, if

that breaks out, these other nucleararmed

countries, or very shortly will

be, will be perfecting their weaponry

under the cover of this war of Iraq.

While we are fighting a country that is

trying to make balsa wood airplanes,

that we are now told was the reason to

go to war, and I will come to that in a

moment, we have got to be very cautious

about focusing on one threat to

the detriment of our ability to deal

with others.

Fourth question, are we making

progress in disarmament of Iraq? I

have been actually relatively pleasantly

surprised at the rate of progress

we have made. It seems like every

week or two we have been able to make

progress in the disarmament of Iraq,

and the folks listening probably are

more familiar than I am; but it is important

to note that progress continues

as it did in the 1990s.

I think we cannot be naive. There is

no way to guarantee absolute 100 percent

disarmament of Iraq unless it becomes

under our military control. It

would take years to conduct searches

of every nook and cranny in Iraq; but

what we can say, I think with a relative

degree of assurance, is that we

have stopped Iraq’s efforts to the extent

they existed, which were quite rudimentary,

at least in the last year or

two, toward a nuclear weapon.

We have significantly impaired any

ability to have a meaningful bioweapons

hazard program, and we are on

the way to assuring that the destruction

of the delivery system or potential

delivery system to the al-Samoud missile

system, which I think now we have

destroyed about 40 percent of their

missile system, we are making real

progress. The question in my mind is

why stop that progress now in favor of

a war while we are continuing to make

progress on this effort? I do not believe

there is a good answer to that question.

Fifth question, what would be needed

in postwar Iraq? Here is where I think

unfortunately the administration is

wholly not up at least at the moment

to the task of what they have said

their goal is in Iraq. The President has

offered a variety of statements as to

what his goal is in Iraq. He has said

that he has wanted to wage war or may

want to wage war in Iraq in order to

preserve the sanctity of the United Nations

to make sure that the United Nations

has credibility, and he has said

that he is concerned about Iraq’s

threatening its neighbors. He said that

it is for our own personal security, and

he has said that he wants to free the

Iraqi people from this tyrant; and I

want to address that last goal of freeing

Iraq from this tyrant.

The reason I want to address that is,

to me, that actually if there were a legitimate

reason for a war in Iraq would

be the one that would be most telling

and most consistent with the facts and

the evidence, and the reason is because

there is no question but that innocent

Iraqis, by the millions, have suffered at

the hand of this tyrant. It is an appealing

thought to believe that we could

free them from that control of this despot.

That is appealing.

I have to say that in reviewing the

plans, or lack of plans, and the commitment,

or lack of commitment, of

this administration, the ability of

George Bush to bring democracy to

Iraq, at best, is highly speculative; and

I will tell my colleagues the reasons

why.

Number one, exhibit A, Afghanistan.

I believed war in Afghanistan was necessary

from a personal security standpoint

due to the tie of the Taliban government

to the September 11 attack;

but we had a perfect opportunity to, in

fact, try to establish a democracy, and

this administration has blown it big

time. To the extent that when it came

time for this year’s budget, to put

money in to help the rebuilding of Afghanistan,

to help restore democracy

to keep out the return of the Taliban,

do my colleagues know how much

money they put in their budget? Zero

dollars, zero dollars for democracy in

Afghanistan.

Their explanation was they forgot,

and I think that was very candid. The

President’s administration forgot

about the goal of democracy in Afghanistan;

and today we are faced with the

same problem we had after there were

efforts to kick the Russians out, which

is the return of the Taliban and the return

to tyranny and return to the war

lords because we have not made the investment

that is required to get the job

done in Afghanistan; and if we want a

template, unfortunately, and I think it

is unfortunate, if we want a template

of what the Bush administration would

do in Iraq, look what they have done in

Afghanistan, which is to basically say

we are going to take care of about a 10-

block area around Kabul so we can say

we have got some vestiges of a country.

That is a farrier and I have not seen

anything better planned for Iraq.

We have been asking on a bipartisan

basis for the administration’s plans on

a postwar Iraq for months and months

now; and we have been given, I do not

know how to say this charitably. I am

searching for a way to say it charitably.

A joke perhaps is the best thing

to say on what their plans are on a

postwar Iraq.

Here is a country, cobbled together

after the British Empire left the Mideast,

of three distinct ethnic groups

that have never worked together except

under the heels of a despot with

the Kurds who the administration has

already decided to sell out to Turkey

for the 15th time to the Kurds, the

Kurds who are now finally enjoying

some degree of autonomy under our nofly

zone. We have got the Kurds some

freedom today from Saddam Hussein

because of our no-fly zone and think of

the irony of it.

The President may be on the cusp of

a war, and he has agreed to turn them

back to Turkey, and in fact, that is

overstating a little bit, but he has allowed

Turkey, under the secret deal he

wants to make, to come into the

Kurds’ territory; and what an irony it

is that the President says he wants to

restore democracy in Iraq, and the first

deal he cuts with Turkey is to allow

them to come back in and again be

dominant over the Kurds who are now

free for the first time in decades.

That is the type of shady dealing and

efforts that have plagued us in our

Mideast policy for years.

And to think that we can break these

eggs and put them back into the democracy

category with the lack of

commitment of this administration is

wholly speculative and most disappointing

to the poor people of Iraq.

And I think anyone who knows the history

of these people knows how terrible

their conditions have been.

Frankly, if we had an administration

that we believed we could have confidence

would really commit to the democracy

in Iraq, for the long-term future,

and who made the commitment

financially and otherwise, I would be a

lot more willing to look at the idea.

But we do not have that right now in

this administration.

Talk about a financial commitment,

we are talking about tens of millions,

perhaps in the billions, of dollars in a

postwar Iraq. And the President has

not even factored in the cost of even

the attack, much less the postwar cost

into his budget, nor have my friends on

the Republican side of the aisle. What

type of commitment do we think we

can make to the international community

to in fact build democracy in Iraq

when we basically have said we are not

going to spend a dime to do it and we

have been afraid, Congress and the administration,

to build into our budget

the cost that it would take to do this?

No, perhaps building democracy in Iraq

after a war could be a great vision, but

we have certainly not seen the vision

to make it happen.

Six. What are the real goals of the

administration in Iraq? Here is something

I think that is very important in

the discussion. The discussion we have

heard, and it has changed over time,

but when the President went to the

United Nations at one time, he said his

good deal was the disarmament of Iraq.

The problem is, and the reason I believe

we have had so much problem in

winning and building an international

coalition, unlike the success that the

first President Bush enjoyed, is that

President Bush, in the very first statement

of his administration, said that

was not our goal at all. He said our

goal was simply to remove Saddam

Hussein, period. No ifs, ands, buts. No

disarmament. Saddam Hussein was

going to have to go.

When the President said, as he did

most recently last week, that it is simply

about removing Saddam Hussein, it

did not matter what benchmarks he

made, did not matter what inspections

we had or what disarmament he would

do, he was going to have to go, well,

that would be attractive; but it has

damaged our ability to build an international

coalition to deal with this

despot. And it is an unfortunate contrast

to the skills that the first President

Bush demonstrated in building an

international coalition to deal with the

threat in Iraq.

When the first President Bush spoke

with respect to our international partners,

we were clear to them about our

goals, we hewed to the commitments

we made to our international partners,

and we did not tell our international

partners that we were going to do what

we were going to do, and it did not

matter what they thought. That is

what the first President Bush did, and

he was successful. This administration

has violated all those fundamental precepts

of human communication, which

is respect for one another.

The other goal is the President has

said he wants to make sure the United

Nations resolutions are honored. That

is a legitimate goal. He has implicitly

said he wants to show respect for the

United Nations and build it up as a coalition,

an international body that can

deal with this. That is a laudable goal

and an important one, but it certainly

is shortchanged and has its legs cut out

from underneath it when in the same

breath the President says he wants to

respect the United Nations, but then

says he is going to ignore the United

Nations if they do not do exactly as he

wants them to do and he will start a

war anyway.

You do not instill trust in your colleagues,

or in the United Nations, when

right out of the box you say you are

just coming to them for a rubber stamp

and you are going to start a war anyway.

It is not the way to build respect

in the United Nations. It is one of the

problems we are having now in trying

to build an international coalition to

deal with this problem.

Seventh question. What has changed

since Congress voted on this resolution?

I thought it was unwise then for

the U.S. Congress to derogate its constitutional

duty to make a decision

about war when it voted to essentially

allow one person, one person in this

country, to make the decision to go to

war, rather than the elected officials

here in Congress. When they drafted

the Constitution, they said Congress

had the power to declare war, so that

one person would not have that awesome

challenge and responsibility.

Nonetheless, Congress did that, and my

side of the vote did not prevail.

It is important to have this discussion

now because since that decision,

other potential enemies of the United

States have used our continued concentration

and obsession, and I will not

use the word obsession, I will strike

that word, but our concentration on

Iraq has allowed them to continue to

develop their own nuclear weapons programs.

And we have been totally ineffective

in dealing with those other

issues, and that calls for Congress to

have a debate about what the current

state of this situation is. And we

should have one.

The eighth question. Has the President

really leveled with the American

people about the ramifications of this

war financially and otherwise? The sad

fact is that he has not. He has refused

to even discuss with the U.S. Congress

what the costs are going to be. And at

the same time that we are going to

incur from $60 billion to $120 billion in

cost, the President, unlike any other

wartime President in American history,

and every other wartime President

in American history has leveled

with the American people, and they

have told the American people what

the war would cost in lives and treasury.

They have been straight and said

we need to pay this. And this President

has not been straight with the American

people about the cost of this war,

either in lives or treasury, because he

wants his tax cut above everything.

Above everything. At the same time we

are going to spend an additional $60 billion

to $120 billion, he continues to try

to ram through these tax cuts, which is

his number one ideological belief.

Now, to me, when we have seen our

soldiers and sailors off to harm’s way

in this war, and they are making this

sacrifice, it does not seem to me to be

right that the President of the United

States says we might have a war overseas,

but we are going to have a fiscal

party at home. That is irresponsible,

and it does not respect the tradition

and the willingness of Americans to

sacrifice together when we do face a

mutual security threat.

Number nine. What does a war in

Iraq do to our security on the downside?

Because many of us believe, and I

believe, that while a war in Iraq and

the elimination of Saddam Hussein’s

rule could reduce a particular threat

that he presents, it could create greater

threats in many other ways. I believe

that in balancing those threats

there is as much potential increased

harm to the United States, in threats

to our security, as there is benefit. And

there are multiple reasons for that.

The most obvious reason is what is

happening in Iraq today, where we have

kicked Saddam Hussein out of a particular

region in the northeast corner

of the country and al Qaeda has moved

in.

It is a great irony. We have seen the

sort of picture of what Iraq is going to

look like in a post-Saddam Hussein

world. Because in this corner of chaos,

where there is no state, it is like a little

Afghanistan about a decade ago.

The fundamentalist Islamic movement

has moved in and this group has now

got about 700 fighters that are grouping

in Iraq. Not under or allied with

Saddam Hussein, but they are using

the absence, this vacancy, this vacuum

of state control to regroup and potentially

plan attacks against the United

States of America. By creating a chaotic

situation in Iraq, we not only inspire

the hatred which we have heard

so many people talk about of young

Muslim folks in the Mideast, but we

will provide them a place to group,

which is in a vacuum of what used to

be Iraq.

It has been said by many people that

a war in Iraq could be sort of the great

dream of Osama bin Laden. Because no

Osama bin Laden is going to bring

down the United States in his wildest

imagination. His dream is to incite a

war between the West and Muslim nations.

And his dream can only be accomplished

in one possible way, and

that is if the United States acts in a

way which will prove to folks in the

Muslim nations that in their view that

we intend a colonial empire in the Middle

East, which I do not believe we do.

But to them, having an occupied Mideast

Muslim nation, occupied for potentially

years, and we have been in

Germany for over 50, the ramifications

of the recruiting efforts of Osama bin

Laden are obvious.

I cannot think of a single thing that

could potentially allow the regrouping

of the al Qaeda network other than a

war with Iraq, eventually. This is truly

one battle we could win but lose the

war. That is why war does not always

buy more security. Sometimes it buys

less, even if you win the first battle.

And I think we should think about

that.

Tenth. What would a largely unilateral

war do to America’s moral leadership

in the world? I will close on this

point, because I think it could be the

most important for the long-term future

of our Nation.

I believe America is a unique country

that has a unique responsibility for

moral leadership in the world. The

world looks to us for leadership. It

looks to us for an idea of what is acceptable

conduct by nations and men.

It looks to us to lead in the establishment

of a rules-based society, because

that is the genius of America. We have

rules here and we follow rules here.

Other countries do not. They do not

have rules they follow in a lot of countries.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Empire,

an empire we contained in a way

that certainly makes Saddam Hussein

look like a petty little maggot, but we

contained the Soviet Union for many,

many decades, and we should think

about that in regard to Saddam Hussein.

But we have this moral leadership,

and we wear the cloak of moral

leadership in the world, and we are

looked to all over the world for leadership.

The Statue of Liberty is not just

about immigration. That flame is

about leading the world in a lot of

ways, not just economically.

It is my belief that should we go it

alone, largely alone, which is the position

we are in at the moment, if there

is a lack of success developing an international

coalition, which there has

been a spectacular failure at this moment,

if we act without United Nations

sanctioning, we will have damaged our

ability to fulfill the destiny of America

to lead the world to a new civilization

internationally, not just along the borders

of our country. That is why it is so

important for us to work with the

international community to maintain

what we have right now, which is the

admiration of the world.

Think about what has happened in

the last 12 months, where in the weeks

following September 11 the world embraced

us. There were headlines around

the world in various newspapers. We

were all Americans. Think how far that

has changed because of the reaction

against the United States and this administration

acting so cavalierly in

certain regards. It is disappointing.

But we can regain this. We can regain

our position. We can continue to

keep this tyrant in his box. We can

build an international coalition. We

can succeed in these inspections. We

can continue our no-fly zone. We

should continue to work with the

international community. And in the

days ahead, we hope that the President

will listen to the American people and

the voices from around the world in

doing that, because that is America’s

destiny.