If you accept the premise that the regime in Iraq

is totalitarian, in a sense it controls. If you were to get rid of embargoes

on trade in food and medicines, it would control distribution

and all of that. Why would that make things better than the

oil-for-food and medicines program that now exists, and also provides

in part for distribution of food and medicines in the North of

Iraq? In a sense, the Iraqi oil is being used to pay to help feed and

supply the Kurds in the North.

Do you mean more is getting to the north?

Their investments during the Iraq-Iran war were

for weapons, many of them provided by Western countries, to develop

their nerve gas potential to use against their own people in

Iraq.

No, I was thinking one can make a case that the

sanctions and the prohibitions on new investments in South Africa

helped persuade the business community there to lobby, to come

down against apartheid and the apartheid government, and played

a major role in creating the dynamic by which Nelson Mandela was

freed, and they went to free elections.

Would the gentleman yield?

Could I just give the opposite side of that view?

First of all, these sanctions were imposed to achieve certain things,

first and foremost of which is to help ensure the elimination of a

program of weapons of mass destruction. They are not essentially

designed to make Saddam fall.

There are other aspects of U.S. policy that are maybe directed toward

that. The Chairman has been heavily involved in some of

those issues. But this was evolved for the possibility of the lifting

of sanctions, and was held out to the Iraqi government, based on

their willingness to go along with a serious and intrusive inspection

program to ensure that these programs were not going on.

We have no idea what the Iraqi people think, because Saddan

uses every means of repression and suppression, up to and including

mass executions and murder, to create the demonstrations of

support for his regime, the squashing of dissidents and all of that.

Leading up to the Gulf War, the argument of people who opposed

the war was, do sanctions. The people who decided to support the

war were saying, we do not think sanctions are going to achieve

getting them out of Kuwait. But now the sanctions are focused on

getting back in a meaningful inspection program, and then, with

the possibility then that sanctions would be lifted.

It is possible that if you took away the oil-for-food program and

allowed free trade and donations in food, that resources would then

go to otherwise better the lives of the Iraqi people for infrastructure.

I believe it is just as equal or an even greater possibility that,

that program will be used to even more quickly rebuild the military,

pursue the weapons of mass destruction program, and freeup

those resources from oil sales for that purpose. That is the other

side of the debate.