Madam President,

the true greatness of America lies in

the values we share as a nation.

From America’s beginning, we shared

a passionate concern for the rights and

the well-being of each individual—a

concern stated eloquently in our founding

documents, the Declaration of

Independence, the Constitution and the

Bill of Rights.

From our immigrant roots, we

learned not only to tolerate others

whose appearance, religion, and culture

are different from our own, but to respect

and welcome them, and to recognize

our diversity as a source of great

strength.

From our religious faith and our

sense of community, we gained an understanding

of the importance of fairness

and compassion for the less fortunate.

In the same way that parents try to

build a better life for their children,

each generation of Americans has tried

to leave a more just society to the

next. We all know that our history includes

periods when grave injustices

were tolerated. Those dark periods in

our national history teach us lessons

we must never forget. But we have battled

fiercely to overcome injustice, and

we are a better nation for our willingness

to fight those battles.

Our most deeply held national values

are rooted in our pursuit of justice for

all. It urges us to ensure fair treatment

for each person, to extend help to those

in need, and to create opportunity for

each individual to advance. Those are

among the most important yardsticks

by which we measure our success in

building ‘‘a more perfect union.’’

Now as we consider the prospect of

war with Iraq, many of us have serious

questions about whether current national

policy reflects America’s values.

We owe it to the brave men and

women of our armed forces to ensure

that we are embarked on a just war—

that the sacrifice we ask of them is for

a cause that reflects America’s basic

values.

Our men and women in uniform are

working and training hard for the serious

challenges before them. They are

living in the desert, enduring harsh

conditions, and contemplating the horrors

of the approaching war.

Their families left behind are sacrificing,

too, each and every day here at

home, wondering if their loved ones in

uniform will return unharmed. Many—

especially the families of our reservists—

are struggling to make ends meet

as their spouses are called up for

months of duty abroad. Wives are separated

from husbands. Children are separated

from fathers and mother. Businesses

and communities are struggling

to go forward without valued employees

now serving in the gulf.

More than 150,000 National Guard and

Reserve soldiers have been mobilized.

Of these, 13,000 have been on active

duty for at least a year. Others return

home from deployments, only to turn

around and head back overseas for a

new tour of duty. For many of these

soldiers, ‘‘the expected one weekend a

month, two weeks a year’’ is merely a

slogan, and does not reflect their new

reality. In fact, today’s reservists are

spending thirteen times longer on active

duty than they did a decade ago.

A recall to active duty brings financial

hardship as well. Many give up

larger civilian salaries when they go on

active duty. The law requires employers

to take back reservists after their

deployments. But for those who work

in small firms or are self-employed,

there are no such guarantees unless

their firms are still in business.

The families of our men and women

in uniform pay a price for this deployment.

During the Vietnam War, only 20

percent of all Army military personnel

were married. Today over 50 percent of

the military are married, which means

enormous strain on the families who

are left behind to worry and cope with

the sudden new demands of running a

household alone, never knowing how

long their loved ones will be away.

Among those on active duty, we are

demanding more from our troops for

longer periods of time. One of our aircraft

carriers, the USS Abraham Lincoln,

has been away from home port for

233 days. The crew expected to return

for Christmas, and had made it half

way home across the Pacific Ocean

when they were given orders to turn

around and head for the Persian Gulf.

These men and women are forced to

put their lives on hold, missing births,

delaying weddings, and dealing with

family crises by phone and e-mail.

These men and women are well-prepared

to serve their country. But in

calling them up, we also pay the price

here at home with increased vulnerability

in our police and fire departments.

A recent survey of 8,500 fire departments

by the International Association

of Fire Chiefs showed that

nearly three-fourths of them have staff

in the Reserves. A similar survey of

more than 2,100 law enforcement agencies

by the Police Executive Research

Forum found that 44 percent have lost

personnel to call ups.

These are Americans who love their

country. They proudly wave the Stars

and Stripes on our national holidays.

They honor and pray for past veterans

on Memorial Day. Their children are in

our schools. They attend our churches,

our synagogues, and our mosques. We

see them in the grocery store or at

PTA meetings. They are a part of our

communities—and a part of us. And

they are willing to give their lives for

their country. So we owe it to these

men and women and their families—

these brave Americans—to get it right.

I am concerned that as we rush to

war with Iraq, we are becoming more

divided at home and more isolated in

the world community. Instead of persuading

the dissenters at home and

abroad, the Administration by its

harsh rhetoric is driving the wedge

deeper. Never before, even in the Vietnam

war, has America taken such bold

military action with so little international

support. It is far from clear

that the United Nations Security

Council will pass any new resolution

that we can use as authorization for

military action in Iraq. Even some

strategically important allies, such as

Turkey, who were expected to be with

us, have backed away. The administration

continues to turn a deaf ear to all

of these voices, and single-mindedly

pursues its course to war.

Within the rising chorus of dissent

have been the voices of much of the organized

religious community in this

country—Christian, Jewish and Muslim.

Within the Christian community,

opposition to war against Iraq includes

the Roman Catholic Church, to which I

belong, and many mainline Protestant

and Orthodox churches. These are not

pacifist groups who oppose war under

all circumstances. They are religious

leaders who say the moral case has not

been made for this war at this time.

War is not just another means to

achieving our goals. More than any

other option, it is dangerous, it is deadly,

it is irreversible. That is why,

whenever we resort to force in the

world, there is an urgent need to ensure

that we remain true to our values

as Americans.

Saddam Hussein is one of the most

brutal tyrants on the world stage

today. He has murdered thousands of

his own people—many with chemical

and biological weapons. He has attempted

to wipe out entire communities.

He has attacked neighboring

countries. He supports terrorism

against innocent civilians throughout

the Middle East. Undeniably, the world

would be a better place without Saddam

Hussein. That fact, however,

should not be the end of the inquiry,

but only the beginning.

From the perspective of our shared

values, the fundamental question is

whether this is a ‘‘just war.’’ That is

not an easy question to answer, because

some elements of a just war are

clearly present.

There are six principles that guide

the determination of ‘‘just war.’’ They

were first developed by St. Augustine

in the Fifth Century and expanded

upon by St. Thomas Aquinas in the

Thirteenth Century. To be just a war

must have a just cause, confronting a

danger that is beyond question; it must

be declared by a legitimate authority

acting on behalf of the people; it must

be driven by the right intention, not

ulterior, self-interested motives; it

must be a last resort; it must be proportional,

so that the harm inflicted

does not outweigh the good achieved;

and it must have a reasonable chance

of success.

These are sound criteria by which to

judge our impending war in Iraq.

First, does Iraq pose a danger to us

that is beyond question?

Clearly, Iraq does pose a considerable

danger, principally because of Saddam

Hussein’s biological and chemical

weapons and his history of attempts to

develop nuclear weapons. But it is not

at all clear that the only way to protect

ourselves from that threat is war.

In fact, many of us are deeply concerned

that initiating a war to remove

Saddam Hussein will actually increase

the danger to the American people.

The biological and chemical weapons

Saddam has are not new. He has possessed

them for more than a decade. He

did not use them against us in the gulf

war and he did not use them against us

in the years since then, because he understands

that any use of them would

lead to his certain destruction. As CIA

Director George Tenet stated last year

in testimony before Congress, the

greatest danger of their use occurs if

Saddam knows he is about to be removed

from power and therefore perceives

he has nothing left to lose.

Iraq, to the best of our knowledge,

has no nuclear weapon. If nuclear

weapons in the hands of a rogue state

are our principal concern, then certainly

North Korea poses a much more

imminent threat. And Iran—not Iraq—

is close behind.

The President must explain why war

with Iraq will not distract us from the

more immediate and graver danger

posed by North Korea. Something is

wrong at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue if

we rush to war with a country that

poses no nuclear threat, but will not

even talk to a country that brandishes

its nuclear power right now. Any nuclear

threat from Iraq, we are told, is

probably 5 years into the future. But

the threat from North Korea exists

today.

Desperate and strapped for cash,

North Korea is the greatest current nuclear

danger to the United States, and

it is clearly taking advantage of the

situation in Iraq. It is the country

most likely to sell nuclear material to

terrorists. It may well have a longrange

missile that can strike our soil.

War with Iraq will clearly undermine

our ability to deal with this rapidly escalating

danger. But our options are

not limited to invading Iraq or ignoring

Iraq. No responsible person suggests

that we ignore the Iraqi threat.

The presence of U.N. inspectors on

the ground in Iraq, coupled with our

own significant surveillance capacity,

make it extremely unlikely that Iraq

can pursue any substantial weapons development

program without detection.

If we can effectively immobilize

Saddam’s activity, the danger his regime

poses can be minimized without

war.

Above all, we cannot allow differences

over Iraq to shatter the very

coalition we depend upon in order to effectively

combat the far greater and

more imminent threat posed by the al-

Qaida terrorists. Close international

cooperation is what led to the recent

arrest in Pakistan of the planner of the

9/11 attack.

Second, has the war been declared by

a legitimate authority acting on behalf

of the people?

When Congress voted last October,

most Members believed that the use of

force by America would have United

Nations backing. Such backing is now

highly unlikely. Last October, no

international inspectors had been in

Iraq for 5 years. Now, U.N. inspectors

are on the ground engaged in disarming

Saddam.

No war by America can be successfully

waged if it lacks the strong support

of our people. And America remains

divided on an invasion of Iraq

without United Nations approval. The

reason for that lack of support today is

clear. The administration has not made

a convincing case that war is necessary,

nor have they credibly answered

crucial questions about the cost

of the war in lives and dollars, how

long American troops will remain in

Iraq, and what type of Iraqi government

will replace Saddam.

In his address last week on a postwar

Iraq, President Bush failed to give

adequate answers to the key questions

on the minds of the American people

about the war and its aftermath. He

painted a simplistic picture of the

brightest possible future—with democracy

flourishing in Iraq, peace emerging

among all nations in the Middle

East, and the terrorists with no base of

support there. In a dangerous world,

the fundamental decision on war or

peace cannot be made on rosy and unrealistic

scenarios.

Third, any war must be driven by the

right intention.

I do not question the President’s motive

in pursuing this policy, but I seriously

question his judgment.

The Bush administration was wrong

to allow the anti-Iraq zealots in its

ranks to exploit the 9/11 tragedy by

using it to make war against Iraq a

higher priority than the war against

terrorism.

Al-Qaida—not Iraq—is the most imminent

threat to our national security.

Our citizens are asked to protect themselves

from al-Qaida with plastic sheeting

and duct tape, while the administration

prepares to send our armed

forces to war against Iraq. Those priorities

are wrong.

In a desperate effort to justify its

focus on Iraq, the administration has

long asserted that there are ties between

Osama and Saddam—a theory

with no proof that is widely doubted by

intelligence experts. Two weeks after 9/

11, Secretary Rumsfeld claimed that we

had ‘‘bulletproof’’ evidence of the link.

But a year later, CIA Director Tenet

conceded in a letter to the Senate Intelligence

Committee that the Administration’s

understanding of the link

was still ‘‘evolving’’ and was based on

‘‘sources of varying reliability.’’ In

fact, the link is so widely doubted that

intelligence experts have expressed

their concern that intelligence is being

politicized to support the rush to war.

Fourth, war must always be a last resort.

That is why all options must be pursued.

Inspections still have a chance to

work in Iraq. Progress is difficult. No

one said it would be easy. But as long

as inspectors are on the ground and

making progress, we must give peace a

chance.

But before resorting to war, it is extremely

important to reach agreement

that there is no alternative. Nations

that have been among our closest allies

oppose us now because they do not believe

that the alternatives to war have

been exhausted. Many of them believe

that an invasion of Iraq could destabilize

the entire Middle East.

Many of them believe that instead of

subduing terrorism, war with Iraq will

increase support and sympathy in the

Islamic world for terrorism against the

West. We cannot cavalierly dismiss

these concerns of our allies.

War with Iraq runs the very serious

risk of inflaming the Middle East and

provoking a massive new wave of anti-

Americanism that may well strengthen

the terrorists, especially if we act

without the support of the world community.

A year ago, The Wall Street Journal

quoted a dissident in Saudi Arabia who

has turned his focus from his own government

to the U.S. Government. He

said: [The main enemy of the Muslims

and the Arabs is America—and we

don’t want it to impose things on us.

We would rather tolerate dictatorship

in our countries than import reforms

from America.]

The war against al-Qaida is far from

over, and the war against Iraq may

make it worse.

After 9/11 we witnessed an unprecedented

rallying of the world community

to our side. That international

unity was our strongest weapon

against terrorism. It denied terrorists

sanctuary, it led to a vital sharing of

intelligence, and it helped to cut off

the flow of financial resources to al-

Qaida. We cannot allow that international

cooperation to shatter over

our differences on Iraq. We cannot be a

bully in the world school yard and still

expect friendship and support from the

rest of the world.

Fifth, any war must be proportional,

so that the harm inflicted does not outweigh

the good achieved.

If there is a war, we all pray that it

will be brief, and that casualties will be

few. But there is no assurance of that.

Certainly, we have the military power

to occupy Iraq. But that may only be

the beginning. Our troops may be confronted

by urban guerilla warfare from

forces still loyal to Saddam or simply

anti-Western. The war may be far more

brutal than we anticipate.

In such a conflict, innocent civilian

casualties could also be high. We cannot

let Saddam hide behind innocent

human shields if there is a war. But

that large risk makes it all the more

imperative for war to be only a last resort.

We have been told that an attack on

Iraq will begin with an enormous

cruise missile assault to destroy their

infrastructure, strike fear and awe in

the hearts of the enemy, and undermine

their will to resist. We know that

thousands of cruise missiles will be

fired in the first 48 hours of the war,

more than were launched in the entire

40 days of the gulf war. Such a massive

assault will unavoidably produce a

very substantial number of civilian

casualties. That harsh reality adds

greatly to the burden that must be

overcome by those who argue that war

is the proper response now. It is a burden

they have not met.

One of the highest and worst costs of

war may be the humanitarian costs.

Sixty percent of Iraq’s people rely on

the United Nations’ Oil-for-Food Program

for their daily survival. Food is

distributed through 46,000 government

distributors supplied by a network of

food storage barns. A war with Iraq

will disrupt this network. Many Iraqis,

especially poor families, have no other

source of food. Women and children

will be the most vulnerable victims.

According to recent reports, 500,000

Iraqi children already suffer from malnutrition.

And what are the costs to America?

We all know there is an increased risk

of another domestic terrorist attack.

The war will make it a more dangerous

time on the American homefront.

There will also be a very substantial

financial cost to the war The shortterm

cost is likely to exceed $100 billion.

The long-term cost, depending on

how long our troops must remain in

Iraq, will be far more. If our national

security were at stake, we would spare

no expense to protect American lives.

But the administration owes the nation

a more honest discussion about

the war costs we are about to face, especially

if America has to remain in

Iraq for many years, with little support

from other nations.

The sixth element of a just war is

that it must have a reasonable chance

of success.

I have no doubt that we will prevail

on the battlefield but what of the consequences

for our own national security

and the peace and security of the

Middle East?

We know that a stable government

will be essential in a post-war Iraq. But

the administration refuses to discuss in

any real detail how it will be achieved

and how long our troops will need to

stay. President Bush assumes everything

will go perfectly. But war and

it’s consequences hold enormous risks

and uncertainties.

As retired General Anthony Zinni

has asked, will we do what we did in

Afghanistan in the 1970s—drive the old

Soviet Union out and let something arguably

worse emerge in it’s place?

The vast majority of the Iraqi people

may well want the end of Saddam’s

rule, but they may not welcome the

United States to create a government

in our own image. Regardless of their

own internal disagreements, the Iraqi

people still feel a strong sense of national

identity, and could quickly reject

an American occupation force that

tramples on local cultures.

We must recognize that from the day

we occupy Iraq, we shoulder the responsibility

to protect and care for its

citizens. We are accountable under the

Geneva Conventions for public safety

in neighborhoods, for schools, and for

meeting the basic necessities of life for

23 million Iraqi civilians.

This daunting challenge has received

very little attention from the administration.

As the dust settles, the repressed

tribal and religious differenced

of the past may come to the fore—as

they did in the brutal civil wars in the

former Yugoslavia, in Rwanda, and

other countries. As our troops bypass

Basra and other Iraqi cities on their

way to Baghdad, how will we prevent

the revenge bloodletting that occurred

after the last Gulf War, in which thousands

of civilians lost their lives?

What do we do if Kurds in northern

Iraq proclaim an independent

Kurdistan? Or the Shia in southern

Iraq move toward an alliance with

Iran, from which they have long drawn

their inspiration?

We have told the government of Turkey

that we will not support an independent

Kurdistan, despite the fact

that the Kurdish people in Iraq already

have a high degree of US-supported autonomy

and have even completed work

on their own constitution. Do we send

in our troops again to keep Iraq

united?

Post-War Afghanistan is not exactly

the best precedent for building democracy

in Iraq. Sixteen months after the

fall of the Taliban government in Afghanistan,

President Hamid Karzai is

still referred to as ‘‘the Mayor of

Kabul’’—because of the weak and fragile

hold of his government on the rest

of the nation. Warlords are in control

of much of the countryside. The Afghan-

Pakistani border is an area of anarchy—

and ominous al-Qaida cells.

The U.S. military is far from

equipped to handle the challenge of

meeting the needs of a post-Saddam

Iraq. Our government must have a plan

in place to care for the population. Yet

we have heard little from the administration

on how they intend to meet

this obligation. To succeed in winning

the peace, we will need the help and

support of the international community.

That is afar less likely to happen

if we do not have the international

community with us the start.

Before the President makes the final

fateful decision to go to war in Iraq,

his administration must answer each of

these just war questions much more

convincingly than they have so far.

The American people are waiting for

the answers. The entire world is waiting

for the answers.

We are no at a major cross-road in

our history. The 9/11 attrocities has

forced us all to think profoundly about

what is great in America. All through

our shock and grief, the people’s courage

never failed. 9/11 was one of the Nation’s

saddest hours, but the response

was one of our finest hours.

That hour must not be lost. It can

mark the beginning of a new era of

common purpose—a return to policies

which truly reflect America’s values, a

return to the genuine pursuit of justice.

The unselfishness we saw in 2001

must not give way to selfishness in

2003. The noble caring for one another

that we celebrated then must not be

succeeded now by a retreat from our

ideals.

Yes, our country is strong but it can

be stronger—not just in the power we

hold, but in the promise we fulfill of a

nation that truly does make better the

life of the world. If we rededicate ourselves

to that great goal, our achievements

will reverberate around the

globe, and America will be admired

anew for what it must be now, in this

new time, more than ever—‘‘the last,

best hope of earth.’’

I yield the floor and suggest the absence

of a quorum.