Madam Speaker, the U.S.-NATO war against Serbia is illegal

by all standards. Congress has not declared war. Therefore, the

President has no authority to wage war. Attacking a sovereign nation

violates long-standing international law as well as the NATO and U.N.

charters.

NATO's aggression is immoral as well. It forces U.S. citizens and

others in Europe opposed to the war to pay for it, and some are even

forced to fight in it against their will. If the war expands, we can

expect the return of the draft to make sure there are enough soldiers

to participate.

As ugly as the Yugoslavian civil war may be in Kosovo, and as heart

wrenching as the pictures of mass refugees fleeing their homeland is,

one evil can never justify another. If one is disinclined to be

persuaded by law and morality and responds only to emotions, propaganda

and half-truths, then one must consider the practical failure of

compulsive intervention in the affairs of other nations.

Prior to NATO's expanding the war in Yugoslavia, approximately 2,000

deaths in the past year were recorded in Kosovo. As a consequence of

NATO's actions, the killing has now escalated and no one can hardly be

pleased just because now Serbs, our once-valiant allies against the

Nazis, are dying. Those who are motivated by good intentions while

ignoring facts cannot be excused for the escalating and dangerous

crisis in Yugoslavia.

The humanitarian concerns for Albanian refugees is justified, but

going to war because of emotional concerns while ignoring other

millions of refugees around the world only stirs the passions of the

oppressed, whether they are Kurds, Palestinians, Tibetans, East

Timorans or Rwandans.

When NATO talks of returning Albanians to their homes in Kosovo, I

wonder why there is no reference or concern for the more than 50,000

Serbs thrown out of their homes in Bosnia, Slovenia and Croatia.

Current NATO policy in Yugoslavia will surely encourage more ethnic

minorities around the world to revolt and demand independence.

Some in Congress are now saying that although they were strongly

opposed to the administration's policy of bombing in Yugoslavia prior

to its onset, conditions are now different and an all-out effort to win

with ground troops, if necessary, must be undertaken. This, it is said,

is required to preserve NATO's credibility.

Who cares about NATO's credibility? Are American lives to be lost and

a greater war precipitated to preserve NATO's credibility? Should the

rule of law and morality be thrown out in an effort to preserve NATO's

credibility? Can something be wrong and misguided before it is started

and all of a sudden deserve to be blindly supported?

This reasoning makes no sense.

No one has quite figured out the secret motivation of why this war

must be fought, but I found it interesting that evidence of our weapons

shortage is broadcast to the world and to the Serbs. Surely one result

of the war will be a rapid rush by Congress this year to massively

increase the military budget. But a serious discussion of our flawed

foreign policy of intervention that has served us so poorly

unfortunately will not occur.

Political leaders and pundits are struggling to define an exit

strategy for the war. In the old days when wars were properly declared

for national security reasons, no one needed to ask such a question. A

moral war fought against an aggressor for national security reasons was

over when it was won. It has only been since Congress has reneged on

its responsibility with regards to war power that it has become

necessary to discuss how we exit a war not legitimately entered into

and without victory as a goal.

The political wars, fought without declaration, starting with the

Korean War to the present, have not enhanced the long-term security and

liberty of the American people. Institutionalizing a collective

approach to war

seems a result of the obsession to save face for NATO. Never before in

our history have we Americans accepted so casually the turning over of

a military operation to foreign control with non-American spokesmen

briefing us each day.

This is a major step in further solidifying the world government

approach to all political problems. There is, however, one major

contradiction to the internationalist desire to assimilate all

countries and ethnic groups and have them governed by a single world

government.

Quite ironically, ethnic diversity will surely be the casualty of all

of this mischief. NATO and the U.S. are co-conspirators and military

allies of a Serbian province that is seeking to become a separate

ethnic country. Let there be no doubt, if NATO has its way, Albanian

Kosovars will not remain part of Serbia.

The US-NATO War against Serbia is illegal by all standards. Congress

has not declared war; therefore the President has no authority to wage

war. Attacking a sovereign nation violates longstanding international

law, as well as the NATO and UN Charters.

NATO's aggression is immoral as well. It forces US citizens and

others in Europe, opposed to the war, to pay for it and some are even

forced to fight in it against their will. If the war expands we can

expect the return of the draft to make sure there are enough soldiers

to participate.

As ugly as the Yugoslavian civil war may be in Kosovo and as heart

wrenching as the pictures of mass refugees fleeing their homeland is,

one evil can never justify another.

If one is disinclined to be persuaded by law and morality and

responds only to emotions, propaganda, and half-truths, then one must

consider the practical failure of compulsive intervention in the

affairs of other nations.

Prior to NATO's expanding the war in Yugoslavia approximately 2,000

deaths in the past year were recorded in Kosovo. As a consequence of

NATO's actions the killing has now escalated and no one can hardly be

pleased just because now Serbs, our once valiant allies against the

Nazi's, are dying. Those who are motivated by good intentions while

ignoring facts cannot be excused for the escalating and dangerous

crisis in Yugoslavia.

The humanitarian concerns for Albanian refugees is justified, but

going to war because of emotional concerns, while ignoring other

millions of refugees around the world, only stirs the passions of the

oppressed, whether they are Kurds, Palestinians, Tibetans, East

Timorans, or Rwandans. When NATO talks of returning Albanians to their

homes in Kosovo, I wonder why there's no reference or concern for the

more than 500,000 Serbs thrown out of their homes in Bosnia, Slovenia,

and Croatia. Current NATO policy in Yugoslavia will surely encourage

more ethnic minorities around the world to revolt and demand

independence.

Some in Congress are now saying that although they were strongly

opposed to the administration's policy of bombing in Yugoslavia prior

to its onset, conditions are now different and an all-out effort to win

with ground troops if necessary, must be undertaken. This, it is said,

is required to preserve NATO's credibility. Who cares about NATO's

credibility? Are American lives to be lost and a greater war

precipitated to preserve NATO's credibility? Should the rule of law and

morality be thrown out in an effort to preserve NATO's credibility? Can

something be wrong and misguided before it's started and all of a

sudden deserve to be blindly supported? This reasoning makes no sense.

No one has quite figured out the secret motivation of why this war

must be fought. But I found it interesting that evidence of our weapons

shortage is broadcast to the world and to the Serbs. Surely, one result

of the war will be a rapid rush by Congress this year to massively

increase the military budget. But, a serious discussion of our flawed

foreign policy of intervention that has served us so poorly,

unfortunately, will not occur.

Political leaders and pundits are struggling to define an ``exit

strategy'' for the war. In the old days when wars were properly

declared for national security reasons, no one needed to ask such a

question. A moral war, fought against an aggressor, for national

security reasons, was over when it was won. It's only been since

Congress has reneged on its responsibility with regards to war power,

has it become necessary to discuss how we ``exit'' a war not

legitimately entered into, and without victory as the goal. The

political wars fought without declaration, starting with the Korean War

to the present, have not enhanced the long-term security and liberty of

the American people.

Institutionalizing a collective approach to war seems to be a result

of the obsession to ``save face'' for NATO. Never before in our history

have we Americans accepted so casually the turning over a military

operation to foreign control with non-American spokesmen briefing us

each day. This is a major step in further solidifying the world-

government approach to all political problems.

There is, however, one major contradiction to the internationalist's

desire to assimilate all countries and ethnic groups and have them

governed by a single world government. Quite ironically, ethnic

diversity will surely be the casualty of all this mischief.

NATO and the US are co-conspirators and military allies of a Serbian

Province that is seeking to become a separate ethnic country. The full

force of our efforts, no matter what humanitarian picture is painted to

justify our actions, is to make Kosovo an Albanian Muslim state

separate from Serbia.

Current NATO and US policy completely contradict the professed goal

of multi-ethnicity and assimilation of all people. NATO's operation, by

its very nature, is bureaucratically burdened by the effort to appease

the political concerns of 19 different countries. This inefficiency and

the contradiction of supporting the establishment of an ethnic state

will guarantee NATO's deserved demise. The sooner we get out of

Yugoslavia the better off everyone will be.