Madam President, I

rise in support of an amendment which

I have offered which will increase the

authority of the President of the

United States to use force to protect

the people of the United States.

This amendment will designate a set

of international terrorist organizations

for whom the President does not now

have the authority to use force as

within the range of his authority.

There has been a lot of discussion

over the past several months about

connecting the dots, seeing a pattern

out of what might appear to be isolated

independent events. It is always easier

to do that after the disaster, after September

11, than it is before. I consider

us today as standing before the event

has occurred, and I think we can begin

to see the pattern of the dots today.

What are those dots? What is that pattern?

First, a new element has been added

to our assessment of national security

risk. That is the element of what is the

risk to Americans in the homeland.

When we went to war in Korea, we did

not ask the question: What will this

mean to our people at home? We did

not ask that question in Vietnam. We

did not ask that question when we

voted together to authorize the President

to use force in the Persian Gulf.

This is a new phenomenon in the paradigm

of American and national security

consideration.

The second dot is, who poses the

greatest risk inside the homeland? In

my judgment, it is those nations, organizations,

and persons who possess

three primary characteristics: One, access

to weapons of mass destruction;

two, a hatred for the United States;

and three, a significant presence of

trained operatives within the United

States. It is that triumvirate which

makes our enemy lethal.

The third dot, that we have the opportunity

to reduce the risk of that triumvirate.

We can do it by rolling up

the terrorists here at home, or we can

do it by cutting off the support which

the terrorists are receiving from

abroad. I suggest we ought to be doing

both.

If we are going to effectively attack

over there, it requires we have the resources,

a strategy, and the authorization

to use the force against our enemy

over there.

The next dot is a surprising dot. It is

essentially a void. Unlike many Members

of this Chamber—and I will cite

one who just a few moments ago gave

a speech in which he implied the President

of the United States today has the

authority to take on international terrorists

who meet these requirements:

Access to weapons of mass destruction,

hatred of the United States, and a significant

presence inside the United

States of America. The answer is, no,

the President today does not have such

authority. In my judgment, the Congress

should grant this authority and

do so concurrent with the granting to

the President his power to use force in

Iraq, because it is that act of giving

the authority to commence war in Iraq

that is going to raise the risk of those

terrorists among us attacking.

Those are the dots I see. That is the

sequence I think the dots lead us to.

There is one thing we agree upon,

and that is that Saddam Hussein is an

evil man. He is a tyrant. He has used

chemical and biological weapons on his

own people. He has disregarded United

Nations resolutions calling for inspections

of his capabilities and research

and development programs. His forces

regularly fire on American and British

jet pilots enforcing the no-fly zones in

the north and south of his country.

And he has the potential to develop

and deploy nuclear weapons, a potential

that we need to monitor closely.

Saddam Hussein lives in a tough

neighborhood. It is a neighborhood in

which the United States has a number

of commitments and threats. The underlying

resolution suggests Saddam

Hussein is the ultimate bully, the

baddest dog in this rough neighborhood,

and that taking him out now and

for good is in the Nation’s highest priority.

I respectfully disagree. And in so disagreeing,

I am, or at least I was, joined

by the President of the United States

and the Secretary of Defense.

Less than 13 months ago, 9 days after

the terrorist attack of September 11,

the President declared our top national

priority to be a war on terrorism. This

is what he said:

In his State of the Union speech on

January 29 of this year, President Bush

restated our priority:

That is what the President said on

January 29.

Just Monday of this week, on the anniversary

of the commencement of the

war in Afghanistan, Secretary of Defense

Donald Rumsfeld recommitted

himself to the war on terrorism. The

Secretary repeated the statement he

had made one year earlier:

The Secretary of Defense proceeded

to say:

The war on terrorism did not begin in

Afghanistan. For us, it began in the

United States of America on September

11th, 2001. It began and it continues

in our homeland. As we assess

the many challenges faced by the

United States—and Saddam Hussein is

clearly among those challenges—we

must ask: What is our greatest responsibility?

In my opinion, the answer is

easy: Securing the peace and safety of

the homeland or our great Nation.

And what is the most urgent threat

to our peace and security? In my judgment,

it is that shadowy group of

international terrorists who have the

capabilities, the materials, conventional

and weapons of mass destruction,

the trained core of zealots united

by their hatred for the United States,

and the placement of many of those

bombthrowers so they are sleeping

among us, waiting for the order to assault.

For the better part of 2 years, 19 of

those killers took silent refuge in the

sanctuary of the United States, silent

refuge until they struck us on September

11. Three thousand twenty-five

innocent lives later, we have learned

the bitter lesson of the power of those

who live dual lives in our communities.

To the outside they were appearing to

be unexceptional, while they were prepared

to do the most unimaginable

evil. Those who committed mass murder

left behind a much larger number

of terrorists, continuing their dual existence

of duplicity.

How many of these are there, Mr.

President? What are the skills they

possess? What are their plans and intentions?

Why are they so driven by

hatred? The answer is we know only

dimly.

Unfortunately, our ability to tear

out these weeds from our home garden

is limited because the attention we

have paid to understanding this enemy

next door has been grossly inadequate.

The Inspector General at the Department

of Justice issued a report just

last month, in September. That report

concluded:

But the IG report went on:

So we arm for battle with a shield of

ignorance at home. Unfortunately, one

of the realities of the startup of the

proposed Department of Homeland Security

is that, for at least a transition

period, Americans will be even more

vulnerable in the homeland. Agencies

such as the Coast Guard, Border Patrol,

Immigration Service, which will

play a key role in protecting our perimeter

defenses, will be distracted as

organizational relationships of decades

or more are reshuffled. And a final increased

vulnerability is the likelihood

that, if war starts and intensifies in

Iraq, this very conflict thousands of

miles away could spark a wake-up call

to action from the sanctuaries of the

Middle East and Central Asia to the

sleepers in your hometown.

Mr. President, I refer you to the

front-page story in today’s Washington

Post, which talks about the possibility

of counterattacks in the United States

after a war commences in Iraq.

The first prong of our defense here in

the homeland, which is to root out the

terrorists among us—both because of

the instability of the days through

which we are and will be living and our

lack of preparation through the quality

of intelligence we need—is not a shield

that should give us great hope.

Thus, the importance of a second

strategy for disrupting and decapitating

the enemy among us—attacking

them at their source, just as we have

done with such devastating effectiveness

against al-Qaida in Afghanistan.

One of the reasons the anticipated second,

third, and fourth wave of terrorist

acts have not occurred since September

11 is the military assault we began on

October 7, 2001, has largely dismantled

the command-and-control operations of

al-Qaida, making it more difficult for

them to support and provide financing

and logistics to their large number of

operatives in the United States.

I believe we need to adopt a similar

strategy of disruption and dismantlement.

What is it going to take to do

so? First, it is going to require the

President of the United States have the

authority to use that necessary force

to dismantle, as he said in his State of

the Union speech, the terrorist camps,

terrorist plans, and the command-andcontrol

centers of these organizations.

Here we come to a point of widespread

confusion, and that is the President already

has this authority.

On Sunday afternoon, a prominent

foreign policy spokesman appeared immediately

after Senator SHELBY and

myself on a talk show and, in passing

in the hallway, she said, ‘‘I support the

position that you have taken that we

need to go after these international

terrorists, but doesn’t the President already

have the authority to do so?’’ I

quickly explained that the answer was

no. I think she was stunned at the vulnerability

we have and by the limited

authority the President has.

Our colleague, the Senator from

Texas, today in her remarks implied

she thought the President of the

United States had the authority to attack

international terrorism broader

than those who are directly linked to

the events of September 11.

If I might say, the very language of

the resolution we are considering today

carries the same inference.

The language of the resolution states

that:

The fact is the only group the President

has authority to use force against

is those who planned, authorized, committed,

or aided in the terrorist attack

that occurred on September 11. The

President specifically was denied the

authority to take on the other terrorist

groups who, in my judgment,

represent the greatest threat inside the

American homeland today.

Let me just give a little bit of history.

On September 12, President Bush

requested robust authority to launch a

full-scale war on terror. He sent to the

Congress a proposed resolution which

stated:

That is what the President asked for

on September 12, 2001. But Congress demurred.

They only granted the President

the power to use necessary force

related to those nations or organizations

and persons which were determined

to be connected to the tragedy

of September 11. Al-Qaida was not only

our bull’s-eye, it was the totality of

the target. Two days after the Congress

gave the President this limited authority,

President Bush, on September 20,

expanded the scope of the war:

From that point until today, Mr.

President, the stated mission of the

United States in the war on terror has

fallen well beyond the authority we

have given to the President of the

United States to deliver on that mission.

The President continues:

This limited authority to use force

has made it possible for America and

our allies to crush the Taliban and severely

cripple al-Qaida. The amendment

I offer would extend that power

to the President to use necessary force

through the next still vigorous and violent

band of terrorists.

Against whom would the President

by this amendment be given power to

use force? The State Department has

identified 34 international terrorist organizations,

approximately two-thirds

of which are in the region of the Middle

East and central Asia. They list five, in

addition to al-Qaida, that have these

characteristics: They currently receive

support from a state that possesses

weapons of mass destruction; they have

a history of hating and killing Americans;

and they have the ability today

to strike within the United States of

America.

Who are these groups? I will name

them and then talk about the A team:

The Abu Nidal organization, Hamas,

the Islamic Resistance Movement, the

Palestine Islamic Jihad, and the Palestine

Liberation Front.

Who is the A team? The A team is

Hezbollah, ‘‘the party of God.’’

Hezbollah was formed in 1982 in response

to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

This organization, which is based

primarily in Lebanon and Syria and financed

from Iran, is a radical Shi’a

group which takes its ideological inspiration

from the Iranian revolutions

and teachings of Ayatollah Khomeni.

Hezbollah formally advocates the ultimate

establishment of Islamic rule in

Lebanon and liberating all occupied

Arab lands, including Jerusalem. It has

expressed as a goal the elimination of

Israel. Although closely allied with and

closely directed by Iran, the group may

have conducted operations that were

even beyond those approved by the

Government of Iran.

While Hezbollah does not share the

Syrian regime’s secular orientation,

the group has been a strong tactical

ally in helping Syria advance its political

objectives in the region.

What are some of the activities of

Hezbollah? It is known or suspect to

have been involved in numerous anti-

U.S. terrorist attacks, including the

suicide truck bombing of the U.S. Embassy

in Beirut in April of 1983; the

U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut in October

1983; the U.S. Embassy annex in

Beirut in September of 1984; three

members of Hezbollah are on the FBI’s

list of the 22 most wanted terrorists for

the hijacking of TWA flight 847 during

which a U.S. Navy diver was murdered;

elements of the group are responsible

for the kidnaping and detention of U.S.

and Western hostages.

The group also attacked the Israeli

Embassy in Argentina in 1992 and is

suspect in the 1994 bombing of the

Israeli Cultural Center in Buenos

Aires, and the Senator from Texas

stated, in her judgment, they were also

responsible for Khobar Towers.

This group receives a substantial

amount of financial, training, weapons,

explosives, diplomatic, and organizational

aid from Iran and receives diplomatic,

political, and logistical support

from Syria. Hezbollah has a significant

presence of its trained merchants of

death placed in the United States of

America.

Mr. President, you will note that several

of these organizations gravitate

around one axis of evil: Iran. And not

surprisingly.

Yesterday, October 8, former FBI Director

Louis Freeh testified before the

joint inquiry on the attacks of September

11 which are being conducted

by the House and Senate Intelligence

Committee. Mr. Freeh cited the conclusions

of the National Commission

on Terrorism that:

My amendment says that those five

groups should also be brought within

the ambit of evil that the President of

the United States should be entitled to

use force against to protect the security

of the people of the United States

of America.

What strategy should be used against

the designated international terrorist

groups? The decision will be left to the

President. The Congress invested its

confidence in the judgment of the

President on September 18 of last year

when it gave him the power to use

force against the Taliban and al-Qaida.

If the underlying resolution is adopted,

he will have the authority to use force

against Iraq.

This amendment will give the President

the next stage of powers which he

will be required to have in order to

wage war on terror and to do so to a

successful conclusion. The President

would have the authority and the subsequent

accountability to use these

three authorities in whatever sequence

and with whatever impact he deems to

be in our national interest.

In this stage on the war on terror,

the President has already fashioned a

war plan: To take out the training

camps, the incubators from which in

the 1990s thousands of youth were given

the skills and the determination to be

hardened assassins; to attack the terrorists’

plans, to disrupt and dismantle.

Many of these operations, and particularly

the training camps, are flourishing

today in the orbit of Iran. We

should empower the President to take

those acts that are going to be necessary

to protect the security of the

United States.

Director Freeh, in his remarks yesterday,

spoke of the need for a full arsenal

of weapons to triumph over terrorists.

Director Freeh said:

I am not prepared to say the only response

I want against these five organizations

that have access to weapons of

mass destruction, that have a history

of killing Americans and have a capability

to do so here at home because of

a significant presence of their

operatives among us, that we are going

to tell the President of the United

States that he does not have the authority

to attack with force these terrorists

groups where they live and to

disband and dismantle their capability

of continuing to provide support to

their agents in the United States.

I believe our national will and our

obligation to the security of the American

people, especially their security

on our native soil, demand a fuller response

to meet this fuller challenge.

I conclude by saying that I am not

optimistic about the prospects for this

amendment, but I am deeply concerned,

and I am deeply saddened. I am

concerned in part because I see us making

life-and-death decisions without

consideration because we do not have

access to what might be critical, and I

would suggest determinative, information.

I believe the national security interests

are being put at risk by this information

not being available.

I am saddened because I fear the action

we are going to take will increase

the risk at home without increasing

our capability to respond to that risk.

I have been described as a cautious

man. I will accept that label. I do not

see the world as a simple set of blacks

and whites. I see the world as a complex

of grays. That leads to caution. I

believe that caution today is to recognize

that we are not dealing with one

evil, as evil as Saddam Hussein might

be. We are dealing with a veritable

army of evils.

We must be prepared to respond to

that army of evils. I believe the step we

can take today is to give to the President

of the United States the opportunity

to exercise his judgment as to

whether he believes it would be appropriate

to use U.S. force against these

five international terrorist groups

which represent, in my judgment, the

most serious urgent threat to the interests

of the United States of America,

including a threat to Americans at

home.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I appreciate

the thoughtful remarks of the

Senator from Connecticut and the Senator

from Arizona. The Senator from

Arizona concluded with the hope that

we may soon be working together on

expanding our efforts to reach those

who threaten us here at home. I only

hope we will not have another 3,025

Americans unnecessarily exposed to

the risks that I see if we do not supplement

this resolution with the immediate

authority of the President to use

force against those organizations

which have access to weapons of mass

destruction, which have killed Americans,

and which have substantial numbers

of operatives inside the United

States of America at this hour. I invite

anybody to say Iraq doesn’t meet those

standards.

We are not talking about a threat 90

days from now. We are not talking

about a threat that may come a year

from now if nuclear material is made

available. I am talking about a threat

that can happen this afternoon.

Let us trace the history of what Congress

did. The President asked for this

authority on September 12, 2001. We denied

it.

When I was in law school, one read

the legislative history to try to arrive

at legislative intent. It seems to me,

just as a first-year-law legislative interpretation,

that probably doesn’t

mean giving the President authority

beyond that which is specifically provided.

Therefore, the President of the

United States, in my judgment, does

not have the authority today to use

force against Hezbollah or these other

groups.

But even beyond the legal limits, let

us talk about the pragmatics. The

President of the United States in his

State of the Union Address on January

29 said our first priority was terrorists—

our first priority. And do you

know what the first priority of the

first priority was? The training camps.

Why did he say that? Because those

who were responsible said if there was

one major mistake we made in the

1990s, it was allowing al-Qaida training

camps to be a sanctuary where every

year thousands and thousands of young

people were converted into hardened

assassins.

If that is the criticism we are going

to have, because in the 1990s we allowed

that to go on month after month

and year after year, what is going to be

our excuse today when similar training

camps are in operation in Iran, Syria,

and Syrian-controlled areas of Lebanon?

And we are not going to give the

President of the United States the authority

to use force against those

camps? It is inconceivable to me. The

very fact that the President, recognizing

this, has not acted against those

camps is, in my judgment, the strongest

verification that he doesn’t think

he has the authority to do so.

I believe it is not in our national interest

to leave this question ambiguous.

We want to deter groups such as

Hezbollah from continuing to aid, or to

provide aid, comfort, and support to

their operatives who are placed in the

United States. Until we reach the point

that we can domestically, through law

enforcement means and domestic intelligence,

locate and eradicate those

operatives who are in this country, we

must pursue as aggressively as possible

to cut off their support system.

I cannot believe we are saying we are

not prepared today to make an unambiguous

decision. We don’t want to

have the Hezbollah going to their lawyers

and asking the question, What is

the legislative interpretation of what

Congress did on September 18, 2001?

Does it put us under the gun? I don’t

want them to have that in their mind.

I want them to know, with the clearest

method we can write in English and

that can be interpreted in all the languages

these people speak, that we

mean they are under the gun, and they

are under the gun now.

There has been a lot of discussion

about urgency. Why do we need to do

things now? Why can’t we wait for 60

days?

Let me tell you why we cannot afford

to wait. We are taking an action by authorizing

the President to take action

against Saddam Hussein. I will stand

first in line to say he is an evil person.

But we, by taking that action, according

to our own intelligence reports—

and, friends, I encourage you to read

the classified intelligence reports

which are much sharper than what is

available in declassified form—we are

going to be increasing the threat level

against the people of the United

States. I think we have a moral and

legal obligation to at the same time be

taking what reasonable steps we can to

confront that increased vulnerability.

If you do not like what I am suggesting,

if you do not think we ought

to give the President authority to use

force against groups such as Hezbollah,

what do you think we ought to do? Or

do you disagree with the premise that

we are going to be increasing the

threat level inside the United States?

If you disagree with that premise,

what is the basis upon which your disagreement

is predicated? If you reject

that, and believe that the American

people are not going to be at additional

threat, then, frankly, my friends—to

use the term—blood is going to be on

your hands. I think we are going to be

at substantially greater threat.

I think there are some things we

ought to be doing now. We certainly

should be escalating the FBI intelligence

and other efforts to root out

the terrorists who are among us. But

we also ought to be attacking the terrorists

where they live because it is on

the offensive—not the defensive—in my

judgment, that we are going to eventually

win this war on terror.

My friends, as I said, I am not optimistic

about the adoption of this. I recognize

there are backroom deals made.

This is what people have come together

on and locked down on, and say: We are

locking down on the principle that we

have one evil, Saddam Hussein. He is

an enormous, gargantuan force, and

that is whom we are going to go after.

That, frankly, is an erroneous reading

of the world. There are many evils

out there, a number of which are substantially

more competent, particularly

in their ability to attack Americans

here at home, than Iraq is likely

to be in the foreseeable future.

But we are going to say we are going

to ignore those and we are going to

allow them to continue to fester among

us. I do not wish to be part of that decision.

I am concerned by those who see

only one evil, who believe we must all

commit ourselves to the arrangement

that has been made by a few who have

that view of the world. I urge my colleagues

to open there eyes to the much

larger array of lethal, more violent

foes who are prepared today to assault

us here at home.

I said in my closing remarks that I

was concerned and saddened. I am saddened

because I know my colleagues

would not knowingly place U.S. lives in

unnecessary peril. I am as sure as I

have ever been of anything in my life,

the peril here in America caused by the

action we are about to take could be

substantially reduced by giving to the

President of the United States the additional

powers to send the strongest

possible message, and, if necessary, the

force to eradicate those who are evil

and who have placed evildoers among

us, and who are prepared to awaken

those evildoers to attack. The responsibility

is ours.

Thank you, Mr. President.