Mr. Speaker, I want

to thank the Speaker and the leadership

for providing me with this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it was just a few moments

ago that 25 Members of Congress,

in temperatures that outside

were over 90 degrees, stood one after

another to announce their opposition

to the war resolution that has been

presented to this Congress.

As the vote on whether or not this

Nation goes to war approaches in this

Chamber, a vote which most surely will

come within a few days, I think it is

important, Mr. Speaker, for us to be

able to make the case to the American

people as to why it is not appropriate

for this country to go to war and to encourage

the American people to call

their Members to make sure that government

of the people, by the people,

and for the people does prevail.

The Members who joined me today,

Members for whom I have the greatest

gratitude, include the gentlewoman

from Florida (Ms. BROWN), the gentleman

from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

CAPUANO), the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), the

gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS),

the gentleman from Illinois (Mr.

DAVIS), the gentleman from Oregon

(Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentlewoman from

the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN),

the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

DOGGETT), the gentleman from California

(Mr. FARR), the gentleman from

California (Mr. FILNER), the gentlewoman

from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE),

the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR),

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr.

MORAN), the gentleman from Massachusetts

(Mr. OLVER), the gentlewoman

from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS), the gentleman

from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS),

the gentleman from New York (Mr.

SERRANO), the gentlewoman from Illinois

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentlewoman

from California (Ms. SOLIS), the

gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES),

the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

WATERS), the gentlewoman from California

(Ms. WATSON), and the gentlewoman

from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

One after another they came before

the national press to make their case

as to why this Congress should vote

against any resolution which would put

us on a path towards war. And one

after another, in front of the National

Press Corps, they called out to the

American people to tell the American

people to make sure that they called

their Members of Congress; that if they

did not want war, these Members told

the National Press Corps, that if the

American people do not want war, to

call their Congressman.

So, Mr. Speaker, today, I intend to

do a number of things. I intend to

present to this Congress an analysis of

the joint resolution which was offered

to this Congress; and, after presenting

that analysis, I want to put in perspective

where we are in this moment in

history.

The resolution which this Congress is

facing says: ‘‘Whereas in 1990 in response

to Iraq’s war of aggression

against an illegal occupation of Kuwait,

the United States forged a coalition

of nations to liberate Kuwait and

its people in order to defend the national

security of the United States

and enforce United Nations Security

Council resolutions relating to Iraq.’’

The American people need to know

that the key issue here is that in the

Persian Gulf War there was an international

coalition. World support was

for protecting Kuwait. There is no

world support for invading Iraq.

The resolution goes on to say:

‘‘Whereas after the liberation of Kuwait

in 1991, Iraq entered into a United

Nations sponsored cease-fire agreement

pursuant to which Iraq unequivocally

agreed, among other things, to eliminate

its nuclear, biological, and chemical

weapons programs and the means

to deliver and develop them, and to end

its support for international terrorism;

‘‘Whereas the efforts of international

weapons inspectors, United States intelligence

agencies, and Iraqi defectors

led to the discovery that Iraq had large

stockpiles of chemical weapons and a

large scale biological weapons program,

and that Iraq had an advanced

nuclear weapons program that was

much closer to producing a nuclear

weapon than intelligence reporting had

previously indicated.’’

But the key issue here that the

American people need to know is that

U.N. inspection teams identified and

destroyed nearly all such weapons. A

lead inspector, Scott Ritter, said that

he believes that nearly all other weapons

not found were destroyed in the

Gulf War. Furthermore, according to a

published report in The Washington

Post, the Central Intelligence Agency,

yes, the Central Intelligence Agency,

has no up-to-date accurate report on

Iraq’s capabilities of weapons of mass

destruction.

The resolution that is presented to

this Congress says: ‘‘Whereas Iraq, in

direct and flagrant violation of the

cease-fire, attempted to thwart the efforts

of weapons inspectors to identify

and destroy Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction

stockpiles and development

capabilities, which finally resulted in

the withdrawal of inspectors from Iraq

on October 31, 1998.’’

What the American people need to

know, and the key issue here, is that

the Iraqi deceptions always failed. The

inspectors always figured out what

Iraq was doing. It was the United

States that withdrew from the inspections

in 1998, and the United States

then launched a cruise missile attack

against Iraq 48 hours after the inspectors

left. And it is the United States, in

advance of a military strike, the U.S.

continues to thwart, and this is the administration’s

word, weapons inspections.

Now, this resolutions, and what I am

doing here obviously is stating the resolution

as a point and then making the

counterpoint so the American people

can understand that this is a capsule

summary of the debate that is going to

take place in this House next week.

In the resolution the administration

contends: ‘‘Whereas, in 1998 Congress

concluded that Iraq’s continuing weapons

of mass destruction programs

threatened U.S. vital interests and

international peace and security, declared

Iraq to be in material and unacceptable

breach of its international obligations

and urged the President to

take appropriate action, in accordance

with the Constitution and relevant

laws of the United States, to bring Iraq

into compliance with its international

obligations.’’

The resolution says: ‘‘Whereas Iraq

both possesses a continuing threat to

the national security of the United

States and international peace and security

in the Persian Gulf region and

remains in material and unacceptable

breach of its international obligations

by, among other things, continuing to

possess and develop a significant chemical

and biological weapons capability,

actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability,

and supporting and harboring

terrorist organizations.’’

The American people deserve to

know that the key issue here is that

there is no proof that Iraq represents

an imminent or immediate threat to

the United States of America. I will repeat:

there is no proof that Iraq represents

an imminent or immediate

threat to the United States. A continuing

threat does not constitute a

sufficient cause for war. The administration

has refused to provide the Congress

with credible evidence that

proves that Iraq is a serious threat to

the United States and that it is continuing

to possess and develop chemical

and biological and nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, there is no credible evidence

connecting Iraq to al Qaeda and

9–11, and yet there are people who want

to bomb Iraq in reprisal for 9–11. Imagine,

if you will, as Cleveland columnist

Dick Feagler wrote last week, if after

this country was attacked by Japan at

Pearl Harbor in 1941, if instead of retaliating

by bombing Japan, we would

have retaliated by bombing Peru. Iraq

is not connected by any credible evidence

to 9–11, nor is it connected by

any credible evidence to the activities

of al Qaeda on 9–11.

The resolution says, and I quote, continuing

in this comparison point by

point, the resolution says, that we will

be voting on the administration’s resolution:

‘‘Whereas Iraq persists in violating

resolutions of the United Nations

Security Council by continuing

to engage in brutal repression of its

population thereby threatening international

peace and security in the region,

by refusing to release, repatriate,

or account for non-Iraqi citizens

wrongfully detained by Iraq, including

an American serviceman, and by failing

to return property wrongfully

seized by Iraq from Kuwait.’’

The counterpoint, and what the

American people deserve to know, the

key issue here, is that this language is

so broad that it would allow the President

to order an attack against Iraq

even though there is no material

threat to the United States. Since this

resolution authorizes the use of force

for all Iraq-related violations of U.N.

Security Council directives, and since

the resolution cites Iraq’s imprisonment

of non-Iraqi prisoners, this resolution

could be seen by some to authorize

the President to attack Iraq in

order to liberate Kuwaiti citizens, who

may or may not be in Iraqi prisons,

even if Iraq met compliance with all

requests to destroy any weapons of

mass destruction.

The resolution goes on to say:

‘‘Whereas the current Iraqi regime has

demonstrated its capability and willingness

to use weapons of mass destruction

against any other nations

and its own people;

‘‘Whereas the current Iraqi regime

has demonstrated its continuing hostility

toward, and willingness to attack,

the United States, including by

attempting in 1993 to assassinate

former President Bush and by firing on

many thousands of occasions on United

States and Coalition Armed Forces engaged

in enforcing the resolutions of

the United Nations Security Council.’’

The counterpoint of this, Mr. Speaker,

and the key issue here, is that the

Iraqi regime has never attacked, nor

does it have the capability to attack,

the United States. The no-fly zone was

not the result of a U.N. Security Council

directive. Now, many people do not

know that. They think the U.N. Security

Council established the no-fly

zone. It did not. The no-fly zone was illegally

imposed by the United States,

Great Britain, and France, and is not

specifically sanctioned by any Security

Council resolution.

The resolution goes on to say, and I

quote from the resolution: ‘‘Whereas

members of al Qaeda, an organization

bearing responsibility for attacks on

the United States, its citizens, and interests,

including the attacks that occurred

on September 11, are known to

be in Iraq.’’

Well, the American people need to

know there is no credible evidence that

connects Iraq to the events of 9–11 or to

participation in those events by assisting

al Qaeda.

The resolution states, and I quote:

‘‘Whereas Iraq continues to aid and

harbor other international terrorist organizations,

including organizations

that threaten the lives and safety of

American citizens.’’

The key issue here, and the counterpoint

that the American people need to

know, is that any connection between

Iraq’s support of terrorist groups in the

Middle East, Mr. Speaker, is an argument

for focusing great resources on

resolving the conflict between Israel

and the Palestinians. It is not a sufficient

cause for the United States to

launch a unilateral preemptive strike

against Iraq. Indeed, an argument

could be made that such an attack

would exacerbate the condition in the

Middle East and destabilize the region.

The resolution states: ‘‘Whereas the

attacks on the United States of America

of September 11, 2001 underscored

the gravity of the threat posed by the

acquisition of weapons of mass destruction

by international terrorist organizations.’’

And, again, and I stress, the American

people need to know that there is

no connection between Iraq and the

events of 9–11. However, this resolution

attempts to make the connection over

and over and over. And just saying that

there is a connection does not make it

so, because the Central Intelligence

Agency has not presented this Congress

with any credible information that indicates

that there is in fact a tie between

Iraq and 9–11, between Iraq and

al Qaeda, or Iraq and the anthrax attacks

on this Capitol.

And if we are to go to war against

any Nation, and I oppose us doing this

in this case, we ought not be taking

such action in retaliation, and ought

not put it in a document like this in retaliation,

attacking a nation that had

nothing to do with 9–11.

The resolution goes on to say,

‘‘Whereas Iraq’s demonstrated capability

and willingness to use weapons

of mass destruction, the risk that the

current Iraqi regime will either employ

those weapons to launch a surprise attack

against the United States or its

Armed Forces or provide them to international

terrorists who would do so,

and the extreme magnitude of harm

that would result to the United States

and its citizens from such an attack,

combine to justify action by the United

States to defend itself’’; that is the assertion.

The key issue here is that there is no

credible evidence that Iraq possesses

weapons of mass destruction. If Iraq

had successfully concealed the production

of such weapons since 1998, and let

us assume that somebody has information

they have never told Congress,

they have never been able to back up,

but they have this information and it

is secret, and they secretly know Iraq

has such weapons, there is no credible

evidence that Iraq has the capability to

reach the United States with such

weapons, if they have them, and many

of us believe no evidence has been presented

that they do.

In 1991, the Gulf War, Iraq had a demonstrated

capability of biological and

chemical weapons, but they obviously

did not have the willingness to use

them against the Armed Forces of the

United States. Congress has not been

provided any credible information

which proves that Iraq has provided

international terrorists with weapons

of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will be

presented to this Congress to vote on

as a cause of war. I am reading the

exact quote from the resolution, and

then I am making the counterpoint. In

effect, this is the first step towards a

debate on this issue on this floor.

The resolution says, ‘‘Whereas

United Nations Security Council Resolution

678 authorizes the use of all necessary

means to enforce United Nations

Security Council Resolution 660

and subsequent relevant resolutions

and to compel Iraq to cease certain activities

that threaten international

peace and security, including the development

of weapons of mass destruction

and refusal or obstruction of

United Nations weapons inspections in

violation of United Nations Security

Council Resolution 687, repression of

its civilian population in violation of

United Nations Security Council Resolution

688, and threatening its neighbors

or United Nations operations in

Iraq in violation of United Nations Security

Council Resolution 949.’’

The counterpoint and what the

American people need to know is that

the U.N. Charter, and we participate in

the United Nations, we helped form the

United Nations, we helped set up this

international framework of law that is

represented by the United Nations,

that the United Nations Charter forbids

all Member nations, including the

United States, from unilaterally enforcing

U.N. resolutions.

We cannot do this on our own. We

cannot decide that some nation is in

violation of U.N. resolutions and we

take it upon ourselves to render justice.

The resolution states, that will be before

this House as a cause of war,

‘‘Whereas Congress in the Authorization

for Use of Military Force Against

Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1) has

authorized the President to use United

States Armed Forces pursuant to

United Nations Security Council Resolution

678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation

of Security Council Resolutions

660, 612, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669,

670, 674, 677’’; and the point is the same.

If those Security Council resolutions

are not being implemented, that is up

to the United Nations and the Security

Council to take up the matter. It is not

up to the United States to initiate unilateral

action enforcing U.N. resolutions

with military force.

The resolution which is being presented

to this House next week says,

‘‘Whereas in December 1991, Congress

expressed its sense that it supports the

use of all necessary means to achieve

the goals of United Nations Security

Council Resolution 687 as being consistent

with the Authorization of Use

of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution

(Public Law 102–1), that Iraq’s repression

of its civilian population violates

United Nations Security Council

Resolution 688 and constitutes a continuing

threat to the peace, security,

and stability of the Persian Gulf region,

and that Congress supports the

use of all necessary means to achieve

the goals of United Nations Security

Council Resolution 688.’’

Well, the counterpoint here is this,

and what we are going to be asserting

on the floor of this House is that this

clause demonstrates the proper chronology

of international process in contrast

to the current march to war. In

1991, the United Nations Security

Council passed the resolution asking

for enforcement of its resolution. Member

countries authorized their troops

to participate in a U.N.-led coalition to

enforce the U.N. resolutions. Now the

President is asking Congress to authorize

a unilateral first strike before the

U.N. Security Council has asked its

member states to enforce U.N. resolutions.

If we believe in international law,

then we ought to look to what this

country did in 1991 when it joined the

United Nations’ effort on this matter

on global security and not go it alone,

not initiate a unilateral action or attack

or preemptive strike.

The resolution here says, ‘‘Whereas

the Iraq Liberation Act (Public Law

105–338) expressed the sense of Congress

that it should be the policy of the

United States to support efforts to remove

from power the current Iraqi regime

and promote the emergence of a

democratic government to replace that

regime.’’

Well, the counterpoint is this, and

the American people should know this,

this sense of Congress resolution which

is referred to in that paragraph was not

binding. Furthermore, while Congress

supported democratic means of removing

Saddam Hussein, and I voted for

that, we clearly did not endorse the use

of force contemplated in this resolution.

Where does it end? Is there some

other leader we do not like that we are

going to use force to take out? Nor did

Congress endorse assassination as a

policy. It is absolutely horrific that a

Nation which has prided itself as celebrating

the rule of law, as believing in

the rights of all people, that we would

have any document in our government,

have any public official in our government,

have anybody working for this

government implying or openly advocating

that we would use assassination

as a policy. This country has suffered

from assassination of some of our

greatest leaders, some of our greatest

Presidents, and we know that once that

principle goes out there, that it can

only go against the highest principles

this country stands on.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution says,

‘‘Whereas on September 12, 2002, President

Bush committed the United

States to work with the United Nations

Security Council to meet our common

challenge posed by Iraq and to work for

the necessary resolutions, while also

making it clear that the Security

Council resolutions will be enforced,

and that the just demands of peace and

security will be met, or action will be

unavoidable.’’

It goes on to say, ‘‘Whereas the

United States is determined to prosecute

the war on terrorism and Iraq’s

ongoing support for international terrorist

groups combined with its development

of weapons of mass destruction

in direct violation of its obligations

under the 1991 cease-fire and other

United Nations Security Council resolutions

make clear that it is in the national

security interests of the United

States and in furtherance of the war on

terrorism that all relevant United Nations

Security Council resolutions be

enforced, including through the use of

force if necessary.’’

That is their cause of war. Now what

the American people need to know, and

the other side of that key issue is, unilateral

actions against Iraq will cost

the United States the support of the

world community, adversely affecting

the war on terrorism. No credible intelligence

exists which connects Iraq to

the events of 9/11 or to those terrorists

who perpetrated 9/11. And under international

law, the United States does

not have the authority to unilaterally

order military action to enforce United

Nations Security Council resolutions.

The point that the administration is

trying to make, and it is in this resolution,

that it is a cause of war is that,

‘‘Whereas Congress has taken steps to

pursue vigorously the war on terrorism

through the provision of authorities

and funding requested by the President

to take the necessary actions against

international terrorists and terrorist

organizations, including those nations,

organizations or persons who planned,

authorized, committed, or aided the

terrorist attacks that occurred on September

11, 2001, or harbored such persons

or organizations.’’

The key issue here and what the

American people need to know and

what will be in debate on this floor

next week is that the administration

has not provided Congress with any

proof that Iraq is in any way connected

to the events of 9/11. The American

people are fair people. They do not believe

in hitting someone who did not

hit them. They believe in self-defense,

but they do not believe that we should

bomb Iraq if Iraq is not connected to 9/

11.

The administration in the resolution

that we will be voting on next week,

their cause of war says, ‘‘Whereas the

President and Congress are determined

to continue to take all appropriate actions

against international terrorists

and terrorist organizations, including

those nations, organizations or persons

who planned, authorized, committed or

aided the terrorist attacks that occurred

on September 11, 2001, or harbored

such persons or organizations.’’

Again, I repeat, the answer to that is

obvious. By now people need to understand,

the American people need to

know, the counterpoint is the administration

has not provided Congress with

any proof that Iraq is in any way connected

to the events of 9/11. Furthermore,

there is no credible evidence

that Iraq has harbored those who are

responsible for planning the attacks.

The resolution says, ‘‘Whereas the

President has the authority under the

Constitution to take action in order to

deter and prevent acts of international

terrorism against the United States, as

Congress recognized in the joint resolution

on Authorization for Use of Military

Force (Public Law 107–40);’’ and

what the American people need to

know and the key point here, the counterpoint

is that this resolution that we

passed, the one we passed last year,

that was specific to 9/11. It was a limited

response to 9/11. It did not authorize

war without end. We did not vote

for that. We did not vote to conduct

war against Iraq a year ago.

The resolution states, ‘‘Whereas it is

in the national security of the United

States to restore international peace

and security to the Persian Gulf region.’’

The key issue here, Mr. Speaker,

what do we mean by national security

interests? If by national security interests

of the United States the administration

means oil, it ought to communicate

such to the Congress. A unilateral

attack on Iraq by the United

States will cause instability and chaos

in the region, and it will sow the seeds

of future conflict all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have an enactment

clause in all laws which is effectively

the stuff of which the law is made. All

of the things that I have cited before

are substantially prefatory clauses,

even hortatory language, but the real

guts of the law comes in the enactment

clause.

The short title is the Authorization

for the use of Military Force Against

Iraq.

Section 2. Support for United States

Diplomatic Efforts.

The Congress of the United States

supports the efforts by the President to

strictly enforce through the United Nations

Security Council all relevant Security

Council resolutions applicable

to Iraq and encourages him in those efforts;

and, B, obtain prompt and decisive

action by the Security Council to

ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy

of delay, evasion and noncompliance

and promptly and strictly complies

with all relevant Security Council resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can and Congress

should support this clause. However,

the section I am about to read,

which is section 3, undermines the effectiveness

of this section 2. Any peaceful

settlement requires Iraq compliance.

The totality of this resolution,

however, indicates the administration

will wage war against Iraq no matter

what. This approach, of course, would

undermine negotiations.

I am going to cite from section 3

which is the section that all Americans

are going to want to know about:

Section 3. Authorization for Use of

United States Armed Forces.

Authorization. The President is authorized

to use the Armed Forces of

the United States as he determines to

be necessary and appropriate in order

to, 1, defend the national security of

the United States against the continuing

threat posed by Iraq; and, 2, enforce

all relevant United Nations Security

Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the key issue here and

the counterpoint and what will be the

focus of debate in this House next week

is this fact: this clause is substantially

similar to the authorization that the

President originally sought. It gives

authority to the President to act prior

to and even without a U.N. resolution,

and it authorizes the President to use

U.S. troops to enforce U.N. resolutions,

even without United Nations’ request

for it. So what we are talking about

here is unilateralism. Go it alone. Policeman

of the world. Strike first. Send

a signal to every other nation; strike

first. This is a violation of chapter 7 of

the U.N. charter, which reserves the

ability to authorize force for that purpose

to the Security Council alone.

Under chapter 7 of the charter of the

United Nations, it says that the Security

Council shall determine the existence

of any threat to peace and shall

make recommendations to maintain or

restore international peace and security.

That is from article 39. It says

that only the Security Council can decide

that military force would be necessary.

The Security Council may decide

what measures are to be employed,

to give effect to its decisions. Article

41. And it may take such action by air,

sea or land forces as may be necessary

to maintain or restore international

peace and security. That is article 43.

Furthermore, the resolution that will

be before us authorizes use of force illegally

since the U.N. Security Council

has not requested it. According to the

U.N. charter, members of the U.N. such

as the U.S. are required to make available

to the Security Council on its call

and in accordance with the special

agreement or agreements, armed

forces. The U.N. Security Council has

not called upon its members to use

military force against Iraq at the current

time. Furthermore, changes to the

language of the previous use of force

resolution drafted by Congress and objected

to by many Members of Congress

are cosmetic.

I want it stated, Mr. Speaker, if I

thought for a moment that this country

was facing a threat and was under

attack, I and every Member of this

Congress would rise in a single voice.

By voice we would have a unanimous

resolution defending this country, because

that is our proud tradition. As a

matter of fact, that is one of the

foundational principles of this country,

to provide for the common defense. We

have an obligation to provide for the

common defense. But we also have an

obligation not to let that hallowed

principle, that sacred principle of providing

for the common defense be misused.

It says provide for the common defense,

not provide for the common offense.

It is called the Department of

Defense, not the Department of Offense.

America is not an aggressor Nation,

but the resolution that is brought

in this House next week would for the

first time in the history of this country

make America an aggressor Nation. We

have to remember that we are heirs to

an incredible tradition, a tradition of

standing up for honesty and decency

and human rights in this world, a tradition

of truth telling, a tradition upon

which 226 years rests. In that tradition

there are no Democrats or Republicans;

there are only Americans. Before this

Congress defames the purpose of this

country by voting for such a resolution,

we owe it to the American people

to go over every aspect of this resolution

to make sure that we are not making

a grievous mistake that would set

this country on a path towards destruction.

Mr. Speaker, many of us remember

last month when we left this Chamber

to join hundreds of Members of Congress

in a solemn commemoration of 9–

11 and in solidarity with New Yorkers

at Federal Hall in New York City. I

know the Speaker and other Members

of Congress, all of us, could sense a special

energy at that sacred shrine to democracy

where George Washington was

sworn in, where a Congress of 2 centuries

ago received the Bill of Rights.

As I stood there, Mr. Speaker, in a moment

of reflection, I could envision the

Congress of long ago gathering as a

galaxy of stars just cascaded from the

sky through that circular opening

above the rotunda of Federal Hall. In

my mind’s eye, I could see this galaxy

of stars coming through representing

universal principles pouring into this

venerable site, in forming the pledge

that Washington made to a new Nation,

freedom’s holy light illuminating

the Bill of Rights.

In that moment, I had a new understanding

about our flag. Our flag as

spangled with stars as a bolt of heaven

itself connects the United States with

eternal principles of unity, of brotherhood

and sisterhood. Look at that flag.

Those stars are not just 50 States. They

are principles. And the energy of the

stars, present at the birth of this Nation,

is still with us. It is upon that

dark blue cloth of our flag. One bright

star there shines for hope, another star

for optimism, another for well-being,

one for freedom, one star for abundance,

one star for creativity, one for

togetherness, and one for peace. One

star to wish upon to create our highest

aspirations, to make our dreams come

true.

This, our country and our very selves

are all made of such stars. As the popular

song goes, ‘‘This is who we are.’’

This is what gives higher meaning to

our being an American. This is what

gives higher meaning to patriotism. I

love our flag. Though some would

make it stand for chaos and war, I see

the field of stars as standing for the

highest expression of human unity. A

higher meaning of the United States is

that we express wholeness through the

unity of 50 States. Out of many, we are

one. That is the motto up there, Mr.

Speaker, e pluribus unum, Latin for

‘‘out of many, we are one.’’ We present

ourselves to the world as an exemplification

of the principle of oneness, of

the universality of all, of the confirmation

of one in the many. The world.

Out of many nations we are one. Universality,

that is where we come from.

The idea of America emerged from

the intellectual energy, the heart energy,

the spirit energy of the Renaissance,

the genesis and a journey of

lovers marrying their fortunes together,

bound for America, looking for

that lamp lifted beside the golden door

of liberty. The quest for universal principles,

of justice, of human rights, of

civil rights, of opportunity, of a meaningful

future is what caused millions,

millions to see America as the light of

nations. These universal principles are

the stars by which those who came to

our shores sailed. These are the stars

that can guide us past the shoals of

arms dealers and oil interests who

today would crash our ship of state

upon the rocks of war.

America has a higher destiny. As

with generations past, our destiny can

take us to places we have never been

before or can only imagine, places of

peace, places of plenty, places of hope,

places of love. We have a right to live

up to our ideals. That is our birthright.

We should not trade it for the pretensions

of empire, nor for delusions of

grandeur, nor for all the gold in Fort

Knox, all the tea in China, nor all the

oil in Iraq. America has a higher destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak

about the America that can be, about

reestablishing the context of our Nation,

about a second renaissance which

can begin in this Nation with this generation.

First, let us travel to the place where

civilization was born thousands of

years ago, upon the banks of the Tigris

and Euphrates. Let us see there, instead

of dancing with death and killing

untold thousands of innocent civilians,

we can change directions, pull back

from war with Iraq, change the outcome,

connect with our aspirations for

peace and reclaim our ingenuity and

creativity in human relations.

Why is this war and why has this war

that we are facing with Iraq, why has it

been presented as inevitable? Is it not

time to insist that our leaders stop incessant

war talk, this assumed right to

unilateral action? Is it not time that

we insist on preventive diplomacy and

our obligation to work with the world

community on matters of global security?

Why is this war being presented

as inevitable?

The headlines from The New York

Times the day after we visited to commemorate

9–11 read, ‘‘Bush to Warn

U.N., Act on Iraq or U.S. Will. He Leads

Nation in Mourning at Terrorist

Sites.’’ There is no credible evidence

linking Iraq with 9–11, with al Qaeda,

or with anthrax attacks. There is no

credible evidence Iraq has usable weapons

of mass destruction, the ability to

deliver such weapons, or the intention

to do so.

When Iraq possessed such weapons,

quite sad to say, they did it with the

knowledge and sometimes with materials

from the United States. During

the administration of President

Reagan, 60 helicopters were sold to

Iraq. Later reports said Iraq used U.S.

helicopters to spray Kurds with chemical

weapons. According to The Washington

Post, Iraq used mustard gas

against Iran with the help of intelligence

from the CIA. Intelligence reports

cited the use of nerve gas by Iraq

against Iran. Iraq’s punishment? The

U.S. reestablished full diplomatic ties

around Thanksgiving of 1984. Throughout

1989 and 1990, U.S. companies, with

the permission of the first Bush government,

sent to Iraq, the government

of Saddam Hussein, tons of mustard

gas precursors, live cultures for bacteriological

research, helped to build a

chemical weapons factory, supplied

West Nile virus, supplied fuel explosive

technology, computers for weapon

technology, hydrogen cyanide precursors,

computers for weapon research

and development, and vacuum pumps

and bellows for nuclear weapons plants.

‘‘We have met the enemy,’’ said Walt

Kelly’s Pogo, ‘‘and he is us.’’

Unilateral action on the part of the

United States or in partnership with

Great Britain would for the first time

set our Nation on a blood-stained path

of aggressive war, a sacrilege against

the memory of those who fought to defend

this country. America’s moral authority

would be undermined throughout

the world. It would signal for Russia

to invade Georgia; China, Taiwan;

North Korea, South; India, Pakistan;

and destabilize the entire Gulf and

Middle Eastern region.

There is a way out. We need a comprehensive

solution to the crisis in

Iraq. It must involve the United Nations,

and it can be facilitated by Russia,

which signed a $40 billion trade

agreement with Iraq. Inspections for

weapons of mass destruction must

begin immediately. Inspectors must

have free and unfettered access to all

sites. Negotiations must begin.

Concerning the counterproductive

policies, a regime change and sanctions,

emergency relief must be expedited.

Free trade except in arms should

be permitted. Foreign investments

should be allowed, and the assets of

Iraq abroad must be restored. A regional

zone free of weapons of mass destruction

should be established.

If we could take a new direction in

Iraq and the region, we could begin a

new era of peace. We do not have to go

to war. We could refocus our effort on

the conflict between the Palestinians

and the Israelis. We could bring new

initiatives to help Pakistan and India

resolve Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, in total, the United

States can repair its position in the

world community through cooperation,

not confrontation. We can change the

world for the better, and we can look

to the heavens itself for guidance. We

can begin by banning any research

planning or deployment of weapons in

outer space. Human destiny has always

been linked with the stars. How grim

that America is planning to put weapons

in outer space, to seize the ultimate

high ground, to attempt to gain

strategic advantage over every nation

on Earth.

We must turn back from such arrogance.

We must let the name of peace

be hallowed on Earth as it is in the

heavens. With a space preservation

treaty, we must direct our efforts towards

solving conflicts on this planet

rather than spreading war and perpetuity

throughout the universe in a

plan paradoxically called Vision 2020.

I have a vision of nations working together

cooperatively, using what President

Franklin Roosevelt called the

science of human relations. That is the

basis for the creation of a department

of peace which seeks to make nonviolence

an organizing principle in our

society for domestic as well as international

policy. War is not inevitable

unless we refuse to work for peace patiently

and tirelessly.

I envision a U.S. leadership which

will end the threat of nuclear destruction

by realizing the promise of the

Nonproliferation Treaty. Seventeen nations

possess, are pursuing, or are capable

of acquiring nuclear weapons.

Now is the time to stop the drive towards

nuclear rearmament. Now is the

time to provide incentives to stop the

nuclear arms race, to stop building nuclear

weapons, and to stop testing.

America should restore the ABM

Treaty and begin again with Russia

true arms reductions towards the day

when all nuclear weapons are abolished,

and America can lead those 26

nations which possess or they are pursuing

or are trying to get chemical

weapons of mass destruction. We need

to move towards participation in the

chemical weapons convention and

agree to have such weapons eliminated

worldwide. America can lead the way

towards the destruction of all biological

weapons of mass destruction by

signing on to the biological weapons

convention. Twenty nations have designs

on such weapons. Let America

lead the way towards abolishing biological

weapons.

We have much work to do to regain

world leadership in ending the proliferation

of small arms by signing the

small arm treaty and to eliminate the

scourge of land mines. America can

help strengthen the cause of international

justice by agreeing to the

International Criminal Court. Certainly,

certainly a Nation which has an

interest in bringing to justice those in

violation of international law should

support an international court which

would accomplish just that.

Mr. Speaker, last month I represented

the United States at the

World Summit on Sustainable Development.

There with the gentleman from

California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the

gentleman from Oregon (Mr.

BLUMENAUER), I called for our Nation

to join with the world community in

solving the challenge of global climate

change and working to reduce carbon

emissions, greenhouse gases. America

must lead the way towards sustainable

and renewable energies. As a first step,

I joined with Mayor Brown of Oakland,

proposing a $50 billion solar initiative

in cooperation with Mikhail

Gorbachev’s Global Green.

It is the United States that lead the

way towards a global community

which is inclusive and sustainable,

which promotes democratic values, and

which enables the growth of potential

and the health of each person by putting

human rights and workers’ rights

and environmental quality principles

into each and every trade agreement.

There is much work to do on the

world stage, but we cannot do it by creating

war when we ought to be working

for peace. Iraq is not an imminent

threat, but an unemployment rate

which is reaching 6 percent is an imminent

threat. Forty-one million Americans

without health insurance is an

imminent threat. The high cost of prescription

drugs, an imminent threat.

Unregulated energy companies which

charge confiscatory rates for electricity

and gas, an imminent threat.

Large corporations which lie about

their value and deprive stockholders of

their life’s savings, an imminent

threat. Seniors losing their pensions,

an imminent threat.

So, too, is the climate of fear being

cycled in this country. Every time a

civil liberty is rolled back or undermined

in America, a little bit of our

free Nation dies. Each government report

which drums terror and fear weakens

our Nation. When Francis Scott

Key wrote ‘‘Oh, say does that starspangled

banner yet wave, o’er the land

of the free and the home of the brave,’’

he made the essential connection between

democracy and courage. Courage

will guide our Nation through this crisis.

Courage will enable us to set our

government right. Courage will enable

us to go to the campuses, to labor

halls, to churches and to the streets to

organize against a war which will undermine

our Nation, ruin our reputation,

kill innocent people, and damage

the economy of our Nation and the

world.

We are at a critical and creative moment

in the human history where we

have it within our power to change the

world. It is about evolutionary politics

which follows an evolutionary consciousness.

We can do it by changing

the way we look at the world, by contemplating

and realizing universal

brotherhood and sisterhood of all persons.

We can do it by tapping into our

own unlimited potential to think anew.

Imagine, imagine if we could look at

our Nation today with the same daring

with which our Founders gazed. Imagine

if we could regain the capacity of

spirit which animated freedom of

speech, the right to assemble, the right

to vote, freedom from fear, freedom

from want.

I tell my colleagues that there is another

America out there, and it is

ready to be called forward. It is the

America of our dreams. It is the America

of the flag full of stars. It is the

America which is in our hearts, and we

can make it the heart of the world.

I thank the people of the 10th Congressional

District for giving me the

honor to serve the State of Ohio in this

Congress, and I join once again in gratitude

to all those Members of Congress

who today called on the people of

America to reconfirm the commitment

of government of the people, by the

people, and for the people, to reconfirm

the connection which you have with

this country. And if you do not want

war with Iraq, then the people have the

right to contact their Members of Congress

and tell them so. That is the essence

of representative government;

that is the process I am proud to be a

part of. That is why it is a privilege to

be a Member of the Congress of the

United States.