Madam President, I

would like to take a few minutes to

speak about the current situation in

Iraq.

There has been a broad consensus

that Saddam Hussein is a murderous

tyrant and that the world is a more

dangerous place if he has weapons of

mass destruction. There has also been

consensus that he has not complied

with his obligations under the U.N.

ceasefire resolution at the end of the

Gulf War and the numerous resolutions

that followed, which called for him to

disarm, particularly with respect to

weapons of mass destruction. And

there has been consensus that the U.N.

should enforce its resolutions more

forcefully than it had in recent years.

This led to passage of U.N. Security

Council Resolution 1441 which resulted

in the resumption of weapons inspections

by the U.N.

Now there is division at the U.N.

Many members of the United Nations

want to complete the inspections and

keep Saddam contained and in a box

until those inspections are completed.

Just a few days ago, the President said

he would call for a vote at the U.N. Security

Council to authorize the use of

force so that every member nation

could state its position. The President

has now apparently reversed himself in

the face of a likely rejection by the Security

Council.

The issue, until yesterday, was

whether to proceed militarily without

the support of the world community as

expressed by the Security Council or,

alternatively, to give the inspectors

the months they said they need to

complete their work, the position

which many members of the Security

Council apparently favor.

The President has apparently chosen

the former course. I have felt that

course was unwise for a number of reasons.

By failing to rally the Security

Council to a common view, we have

lost the best chance to force Saddam

Hussein to capitulate because it is

likely that only if Saddam Hussein sees

a united world at the other end of the

barrel will he see no potential to turn

the tide to his favor. A world solidly

against him would be a world that an

anti-U.S. propaganda machine would

have great trouble stirring up. Just as

in the gulf war, Saddam was unable to

score any propaganda points when 28

nations, including a number of Muslim

nations, provided military forces

against him.

Another reason I have felt that proceeding

without the U.N. would be unwise

is we would lose some support in

the region, with the resulting loss of

staging areas and overflight rights, as

is apparently the case in Turkey,

which, in turn, could increase the

length of the war and the number of

casualties.

There are also serious long-term

risks in proceeding without support of

the world community as expressed

through the U.N. Such an attack on

Iraq would be viewed by much of the

world as an attack by the West against

an Islamic nation, rather than of the

world against Saddam. We would fuel

the anti-Americanism that is already

so prevalent, and stoke the terrorism

which is already our No. 1 threat.

Admiral Lowell Jacoby, the Director

of the Defense Intelligence Agency,

told the Senate Armed Services Committee

in February:

I have also felt that proceeding without

the U.N. would make it less likely

that other nations will join us in the

difficult tasks of providing stability in

reconstructing Iraq in the aftermath of

the conflict. U.N. Secretary General

Kofi Annan recently said the following:

The European Union’s External Relations

Commissioner, Chris Patten,

likewise pointed out recently that ‘‘if

it comes to war, it will be very much

easier’’ to make a case for other countries

to contribute to the reconstruction

of Iraq ‘‘if there is no dispute

about the legitimacy of the military

action that has taken place.’’

Further, and of great significance,

President Bush’s principal basis for

launching a military action is Iraq’s

failure to comply with U.N. Security

Council Resolution 1441 and other U.N.

resolutions. But how is it credible to

invoke the Security Council’s resolutions

as a basis for our action and then

ignore that same Security Council if it

does not agree with us on the wisdom

of military action at this time and does

not give us the resolution we want?

Stressing the importance of a U.N.

authorization does not give the U.N. a

veto over American action. Nobody has

a veto over America’s foreign policy or

decisionmaking. The decision is America’s

and America’s alone. The issue is

not whether we need the U.N.’s permission

to use force; we don’t. The issue is

whether it would be wise to have the

U.N.’s support and whether we will be

more secure from terrorists and other

threats if we initiate a military action

against Iraq without the support of the

world community. If there were an imminent

threat against us, we would

not—and should not—hesitate to use

force. But attacking in the absence of

an immediate threat is a very different

scenario with very different risks.

The President has said that the U.N.

will become irrelevant if it does not

authorize member states to use military

force at this time against Iraq.

But the Security Council’s decision in

this matter, whichever way it would

have gone, would have been highly relevant.

If the Security Council authorized

force by member states, that would be

relevant as a statement of the world

community against Saddam. But if the

Security Council rejected authorizing

force at this time, as they apparently

would have, it would still be relevant

because our use of military force in the

face of such a Security Council rejection

could have a worldwide negative

political impact with great peril to us.

The issue is not whether we will prevail

militarily without the U.N.’s support;

we will. The issue is whether our

long-term security would be enhanced

in that circumstance or whether chaos

and instability in the Middle East, following

our unilateral action, will be

deep and long and more costly, and

whether the level of terrorism against

us in the world will rise to a higher

point than it otherwise would.

The U.N. too often has been seen by

the administration as an obstacle to

overcome instead of an opportunity to

rally the world. And the administration

has also weakened its case at the

U.N. in a number of ways.

It has used divisive rhetoric and denigrating

attitude towards the views of

other nations whose support we seek.

Countries have been told ‘‘you are either

with us or against us.’’ The U.N.

has been told that while we welcome

U.N. endorsement, we can do just fine

without you. U.N. inspectors were

called ‘‘so-called’’ inspectors. And before

U.N. inspections even began, they

were called useless. Germany and

France were sneered at as being part of

‘‘old Europe.’’ This kind of rhetoric

alienates our friends and fuels the inflammatory

propaganda of our enemies.

Divisive and dismissive rhetoric

is no way to rally the Security Council.

It comes across as bullying and domineering.

The White House spokesmen have

also spun facts in a transparent way,

contradicting themselves from day to

day. The refusal of Iraq to assure the

safety of U–2 surveillance planes was at

first called a serious breach of resolution

1441. When agreement was reached

between U.N. inspectors and Iraq to fly

the planes shortly thereafter, the

White House spokesman said the agreement

was no big deal. Similarly, when

the inspectors determined that Iraqi

missiles violated U.N. resolutions limiting

their range, the White House

pointed to the violation as significant

evidence of noncompliance. When, soon

thereafter, Iraq agreed to destroy those

missiles, with U.N. inspectors looking

on, the White House spokesman said

that action was evidence of the Iraqis’

deception. That kind of spinning and

reversal of field by White House

spokesmen has not helped our credibility

or our cause.

We will prevail militarily in Iraq on

our own, albeit with increased risk, but

it will be more difficult to win the

larger war on terrorism without the

world community in our corner. We

need the eyes and the ears and the intelligence

of the people of the world if

we are going to detect and ferret out,

deter, and destroy those who care nothing

for international law and do not

even accept the rules of war.

Historically, America has been

strongest when we found common

cause with other nations in pursuit of

common goals. The path to a safer

world and a more secure America has

rarely come from a go-it-alone approach.

Thomas Friedman wrote recently

in the New York Times:

If war against Iraq comes, far better

it be seen as the decision of the world

community, not just a U.S.-British decision.

The President said accurately on

January 3 that Saddam Hussein has no

respect for the Security Council and

does not care about the opinion of

mankind. But surely we should.

President Bush has now decided to

end the diplomatic effort. Those of us

who have questioned the administration’s

approach, including this Senator,

will now be rallying behind the

men and women of our armed forces to

give them the full support they deserve,

as it seems certain we will soon

be at war.

Last October a majority of both

Houses of Congress voted to authorize

the President to use military force

with or without the authority of the

United Nations. While I disagreed with

that decision and offered an alternative,

the overriding fact is that this

democracy functions through debate

and decision. The decision to give the

President wide authority was democratically

arrived at.

The courageous men and women

whom we send into harm’s way are not

just carrying out their orders with

bravery and the highest form of professionalism.

They are also implementing

the outcome of the democratic debate

which this Nation protects and honors.

Those men and women should know

that they have the full support and the

fervent prayers of all of the American

people as they carry out their missions.

Madam President, I ask unanimous

consent that my recent remarks to the

Council on Foreign Relations and the

Boston World Affairs Council, along

with two of my opening statements at

recent Armed Services Committee

hearings, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows:

I yield the floor and suggest

the absence of a quorum.