Mr. President, for

the past few days we have debated the

details of a resolution but not the implication

of war with Iraq. We were

into the debate on the resolutions for 2

days, and then a cloture motion was

filed. I am reminded of the excellent

statements made by my friend from

West Virginia that this subject about

war and peace deserves a longer period

of time for discussion.

Earlier in the session, we debated for

21 days the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act; 23 days on the energy

bill; 19 days on trade promotion; 18

days on the farm bill—all extremely

important, but this issue is far more

so.

In facing the global challenges of

these times, we defend American values

and interests best when war is our

last resort, not our first impulse. I

commend President Bush for deciding

in the end to take America’s case to

the United Nations. Make no mistake

about it, this resolution lets the President

go it alone. Iraq should have no

doubt of the unity of the American

purpose and the seriousness of our intent.

Having suffered the tragedy of

September 11, we will leave no stone

unturned in the defense of innocent

Americans.

The question is not whether we will

disarm Saddam Hussein of his weapons

of mass destruction but how. And it is

wrong for Congress to declare war

against Iraq now before we have exhausted

the alternatives. It is wrong

for the President to demand a declaration

of war from Congress when he says

he has not decided whether to go to

war. It is wrong to avert our attention

now from the greater and far more immediate

threat of Osama bin Laden and

al-Qaida terrorism.

Pick up the paper and see the different

headlines: ‘‘Attacks Put Troops

on Alert’’; ‘‘They fear contact with al-

Qaida’’; ‘‘Tape, Assaults Stir Worry

About Resurgent Al Qaeda’’; and the

list goes on about the al-Qaida activities

all over the world.

We cannot go it alone on Iraq and expect

our allies to support us.

We cannot go it alone and expect the

world to stand with us in the urgent

and ongoing war against terrorism and

al-Qaida.

We cannot go it alone in attacking

Iraq and expect Saddam to keep his

weapons of mass destruction at bay

against us or our ally Israel.

We cannot go it alone while urging

unprincipled regimes to resist invasions

of their adversaries.

The better course for our Nation and

for our goal of disarming Saddam Hussein

is a two-step policy. We should approve

a strong resolution today calling

on the United Nations to require Iraq

to submit to unfettered U.N. weapons

inspections or face U.N.-backed international

force. If such option fails, and

Saddam refuses to cooperate, the President

could then come to the Congress

and request Congress to provide him

with authorization to wage war against

Iraq.

By pursuing this course, we maximize

the chance that the world can disarm

Saddam without our going to war

or, if war was necessary, we would be

joined by allied troops in the cause. In

the end, having tried these options and

failed, our allies are far more likely to

support our intervention should we

elect to attack alone.

The world looks to America not just

because of our superior might or economic

weight; they admire us and emulate

us because we are a friend and ally

that defends freedom and promotes our

values around the globe. Those same

traits that are the envy of the world

should guide us today as we conclude

this important debate.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia,

and I yield back to him the remainder

of my time.

Mr. President, we

face no more serious decision in our democracy

than whether to go to war.

America’s values and interests are

served best if war is a last resort. I do

not believe America should go to war

against Iraq unless and until other reasonable

alternatives are exhausted, and

I will vote against this resolution authorizing

the use of force against Iraq.

Too often in this debate, we have

failed to address the real effects of unilateral

war with Iraq. The more we debate

the war, the more we learn of the

danger of going to war alone, the danger

that it will cause to our urgent war

against al-Qaida and terrorism, the

danger that Saddam may be provoked

into using his weapons of mass destruction

against us or against Israel, the

danger that allies we need will refuse

to support us on other major challenges

in the years ahead, and the dangerous

new instability that could be

caused in that volatile region if we go

to war alone.

Because the threat of Saddam is real,

I commend President Bush for taking

America’s case to the United Nations.

We have a better prospect of disarming

Iraq with the world behind us, than

with our allies on the sidelines, or even

at odds with our mission.

As we approach a vote on this important

question, I offer the strongest possible

affirmation that good and decent

people on all sides of this debate who

may in the end stand on opposing sides

of this decision, are equally committed

to our national security.

The life and death issue of war and

peace is too important to be left to politics.

And I disagree with those who

suggest that this fateful issue cannot

or should not be contested vigorously,

publicly, and all across America. When

it is the people’s sons and daughters

who will risk and even lose their lives,

then the people should hear and be

heard, speak and be listened to.

But there is a difference between

honest public dialogue and partisan appeals.

There is a difference between

questioning policy and questioning motives.

There are Republicans and

Democrats who support the immediate

use of force, and Republicans and

Democrats who have raised doubts and

dissented.

In this serious time for America and

many American families, no one should

poison the public square by attacking

the patriotism of opponents, or by assailing

proponents as more interested

in the cause of politics than in the

merits of their cause. I reject this, as

should we all.

Let me say it plainly: I not only concede,

but I am convinced that President

Bush believes genuinely in the

course he urges upon us. And let me

say with the same plainness: Those

who agree with that course have an

equal obligation—to resist any temptation

to convert patriotism into politics.

It is possible to love America

while concluding that it is not now

wise to go to war. The standard that

should guide us is especially clear when

lives are on the line: We must ask what

is right for country and not party.

That is the true spirit of September

11, not unthinking unanimity, but a

clear-minded unity in or determination

to defeat terrorism, to defend our values

and the value of life itself.

Just a year ago, the American people

and the Congress rallied behind the

President and our Armed Forces as we

went to war in Afghanistan. al-Qaida

and the Taliban protectors who gave

them sanctuary in Afghanistan posed a

clear, present and continuing danger.

The need to destroy al-Qaida was urgent

and undeniable.

In the months that followed September

11, the Bush administration

marshaled an international coalition.

Today, 90 countries are enlisted in the

effort, from providing troops to providing

law enforcement, intelligence,

and other critical support.

But I am concerned that using force

against Iraq before other means are

tried will sorely test both the integrity

and effectiveness of the coalition. Just

one year into the campaign against al-

Qaida, the administration is shifting

focus, resources and energy to Iraq.

The change is priority is coming before

we have fully eliminated the threat

from al-Qaida, before we know whether

Osama bin Laden is dead or alive, and

before we can be assured that the fragile

post-Taiban government in Afghanistan

will consolidate its authority.

No one disputes that America has

lasting and important interests in the

Persian Gulf, or that Iraq poses a significant

challenge to U.S. interests.

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein’s

regime is a serious danger, that

he is tyrant, and that his pursuit of lethal

weapons of mass destruction cannot

be tolerated. The question is not

whether he should be disarmed, but

how.

How can we best achieve this objective

in a way that minimizes the risks

to our country? How can we ignore the

danger to our young men and women in

uniform, to our ally Israel, to regional

stability, the international community,

and victory against terrorism?

There is clearly a threat from Iraq,

and there is clearly a danger, but the

administration has not made a convincing

case that we face such an imminent

threat to our national security

that a unilateral American strike and

an immediate war are necessary.

Nor has the administration laid out

the cost in blood and treasure of this

operation.

With all the talk of war, the administration

has not explicitly acknowledged,

let alone explained to the American

people, the immense post-war

commitment that will be required to

create a stable Iraq.

The President’s challenge to the

United Nations requires a renewed effort

to enforce the will of the international

community to disarm Saddam.

Resorting to war is not America’s

only or best ocurse at this juncture.

There are realistic alternatives between

doing nothing and declaring unilateral

or immediate war. War should

be a last resort. Let us follow that

course, and the world will be with us—

even if, in the end, we have to move to

the ultimate sanction of armed conflict.

The Bush administration says America

can fight a war in Iraq without undermining

our most pressing national

security priority, the war against Al-

Qaida. But I believe it is inevitable

that a war in Iraq without serious

international support will weaken our

effort to ensure that Al-Qaida terrorists

can never, never, never threaten

American lives again.

Unfortunately, the threat from al-

Qaida is still imminent. The Nation’s

armed forces and law enforcement are

on constant high alert. America may

have broken up the al-Qaida network

in Afghanistan and scattered its

operatives across many lands. But we

have not broken its will to kill Americans.

As I said earlier, we still don’t know

the fate, the location, or the operational

capacity of Osama bin Laden

himself. But we do know that al-Qaida

is still there, and still here in America,

and will do all it can to strike at America’s

heart and heartland again. But we

don’t know when, where, or how this

may happen.

On March 12, CIA Director Tenet testified

before the Senate Armed Services

Committee that al-Qaida remains

‘‘the most immediate and serious

threat’’ to our country, ‘‘despite the

progress we have made in Afghanistan

and in disrupting the network elsewhere.’’

Even with the Taliban out of power,

Afghanistan remains fragile. Security

remains tenuous. Warlords still dominate

many regions. Our reconstruction

effort, which is vital to long-term stability

and security, is halting and inadequate.

Some al-Qaida operatives, no

one knows how many, have faded into

the general population. Terrorist attacks

are on the rise. President Karzai,

who has already survived one assassination

attempt, is still struggling to

solidify his hold on power. And although

neighboring Pakistan has been

our ally, its stability is far from certain.

We know all this, and we also know

that it is an open secret in Washington

that the Nation’s uniformed military

leadership is skeptical about the wisdom

of war with Iraq. They share the

concern that it may adversely affect

the ongoing war against al-Qaida and

the continuing effort in Afghanistan by

draining resources and armed forces already

stretched so thin that many Reservists

have been called for a second

year of duty, and record numbers of

service members have been kept on active

duty beyond their obligated service.

They said that spy satellite, reconnaissance

aircraft and other intelligence

analysts with regional or linguistic

expertise would have to be reassigned.

To succeed in our global war against

al-Qaida and terrorism, the United

States depends on military, law enforcement,

and intelligence support

from many other nations. We depend

on Russia and countries in the former

Soviet Union that border Afghanistan

for military cooperation. We depend on

countries from Portugal to Pakistan to

the Philippines for information about

al-Qaida’s plans and intentions. Because

of these relationships, terrorist

plots are being foiled and al-Qaida

operatives are being arrested.

Support from our allies has been indispensable

in the war on terrorism,

and has had real results: In December

2001, Singapore officials arrested 13

members of a group with ties to al-

Qaida that had planned to bomb the

U.S. embassy and U.S. commercial and

military targets in Singapore. Malaysia

has arrested nearly 50 suspected al-

Qaida terrorists since September 11th.

In March 2002, a joint U.S.-Pakistani

police operation arrested 29 al-Qaida

suspects, believed to include Abu

Zubayday, a key bin Laden deputy. In

May 2002, Morocco arrested three alleged

al-Qaida members in connection

with a plot to attack American and

British naval ships in the Straits of Gibraltar.

In June, Moroccan authorities

also detained Abu Zubair, nicknamed

‘‘the bear’’—a top associate of Abu

Zubaydah. In June 2002, Saudi Arabia

arrested seven al-Qaida members on

suspicion of planning terrorist attacks.

One of them, a Sudanese, had allegedly

been involved in a missile attack near

a Saudi airbase used by U.S. forces.

The United States has worked closely

with Yemen to combat terrorism, and

the Yemeni government recently reported

that it is holding 85 suspects accused

of links to al-Qaida and other

militant groups.

These arrests may seem small in

number. But we know only too well

that only 19 al-Qaida terrorists were

responsible for the murder of nearly

3000 Americans on September 11.

It is far from clear that these essential

relationships, which are yielding

tangible law enforcement results, will

survive the strain of unilateral war

with Iraq that comes before the alternatives

are tried, or without the support

of an international coalition.

A largely unilateral American war

that is widely perceived in the Muslim

world as untimely or unjust could

worsen not lessen the threat of terrorism.

War with Iraq before a genuine

attempt at inspection and disarmament,

or without genuine international

support, could swell the ranks

of al-Qaida sympathizers and trigger an

escalation in terrorist acts. As General

Clark told the Senate Armed Services

Committee, it would ‘‘super-charge recruiting

for al-Qaida.

General Hoar advised the Committee

on September 232 that America’s first

and primary effort should be to defeat

al-Qaida. In a September 10th article,

General Clark wrote: ‘‘Unilateral U.S.

action today would disrupt the war

against al-Qaida.’’ We ignore such wisdom

and advice from many of the best

of our military at our own peril.

We have known for many years that

Saddam Hussein is seeking and developing

weapons of mass destruction. Our

intelligence community is deeply concerned

about the acquisition of such

weapons by Iran, North Korea, Libya,

Syria and other nations. But information

from the intelligence community

over the past six months does not point

to Iraq as an imminent threat to the

United States or a major proliferation

of weapons of mass destruction.

In public hearings before the Senate

Armed Services Committee in March,

CIA Director George Tenet described

Iraq as a threat but not as a

proliferator, saying that Saddam Hussein,

and I quote, ‘‘is determined to

thwart U.N. sanctions, press ahead

with weapons of mass destruction, and

resurrect the military force he had before

the Gulf War.’’ That is unacceptable,

but it is also possible that it

could be stopped short of war.

In recent weeks, in briefings and in

hearings in the Senate Armed Services

Committee, I have seen no persuasive

evidence that Saddam is not today deterred

from attacking U.S. interests by

America’s overwhelming military superiority.

I have heard no persuasive evidence

that Saddam is on the threshold of acquiring

the nuclear weapons he has

sought for more than 20 years.

And the Administration has offered

no persuasive evidence that Saddam

would transfer chemical or biological

weapons of mass destruction to al-

Qaida or any other terrorist organization.

As General Joseph Hoar, the

former Commander of Central Command

told the members of the Armed

Services Committee, a case has not

been made to connect al-Qaida and

Iraq.

To the contrary, there is no clear and

convincing pattern of Iraqi relations

with either al-Qaida or the Taliban.

Moreover, in August, former National

Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft

wrote that there is ‘‘scant evidence’’

linking Saddam Hussein to terrorist

organizations, and ‘‘even less to

the September 11 attacks.’’ He concluded

that Saddam would not regard

it as in his interest to risk his country

or his investment in weapons of mass

destruction by transferring them to

terrorists who would use them and

‘‘leave Baghdad as the return address.’’

Some who advocate military action

against Iraq assert that air strikes will

do the job quickly and decisively, and

that the operation will be complete in

72 hours. But there is again no persuasive

evidence that air strikes alone

over the course of several days will incapacitate

Saddam and destroy his

weapons of mass destruction. Experts

have informed us that we do not have

sufficient intelligence about military

targets in Iraq. Saddam may well hide

his most lethal weapons in mosques,

schools and hospitals. If our forces attempt

to strike such targets, untold

numbers of Iraqi civilians could be

killed.

In the gulf war, many of Saddam’s

soldiers quickly retreated because they

did not believe the invasion of Kuwait

was justified. But when Iraq’s survival

is at stake, it is more likely that they

will fight to the end. Saddam and his

military may well abandon the desert,

retreat to Baghdad, and engage in

urban, guerrilla warfare.

Many believe that our armed forces

may need to occupy Baghdad, which

has over 5 million residents. In our

September 23 hearing, General Clark

told the committee that we would need

a large military force and a plan for

urban warfare. General Hoar said that

our military would have to be prepared

to fight block by block in Baghdad, and

that we could lose a battalion of soldiers

a day in casualties. Urban fighting

would, he said, look like the last

brutal 15 minutes of the movie ‘‘Saving

Private Ryan.’’

We know that the senior military

leadership is concerned about the longterm

consequences of an occupation.

Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld testified

in September that if force were

used in Iraq, disarmament would take

some period of time. As he said, ‘‘one

would think there would have to be a

military presence, undoubtedly a coalition

presence or a U.N. presence, for a

period of time.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office

estimated that the cost of an occupation

force would be $1 billion to $4

billion a month, depending on the size

of the force, and military experts have

suggested that up to 200,000 peace keepers

might be needed for the occupation.

However, and let me emphasize this,

the Congressional Budget Office concluded

that current U.S. Army forces

would be unable to support the needed

troop rotations for a prolonged 200,000-

person occupation.

I do not accept the idea that trying

other alternatives is either futile or

perilous—that the risks of waiting are

greater than the risks of war. Indeed,

in launching a war against Iraq now,

the United States may precipitate the

very threat that we are intent on preventing—

weapons of mass destruction

in the hands of terrorists. If Saddam’s

regime and his very survival are

threatened, then his view of his interests

may be profoundly altered: He

may decide he has nothing to lose by

using weapons of mass destruction

himself or by sharing them with terrorists.

Indeed, in an October 7 letter to Senator

GRAHAM, Chairman of the Senate

Intelligence committee, CIA Director

George Tenet stated this risk. He said,

‘‘Baghdad for now appears to be drawing

a line short of conducting terrorist

attacks with conventional or C.B.W.

against the United States.’’

In discussing the scenario of a military

attack, the CIA Director said,

‘‘Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-

led attack could no longer be deterred,

he probably would become much less

constrained in adopting terrorist actions

. . . Saddam might decide that

the extreme step of assisting Islamist

terrorists in conducting a W.M.D. attack

against the United States would

be his last chance to exact vengeance

by taking a large number of victims

with him.

In the same letter, the CIA declassified

an exchange between Senator

LEVIN and a senior intelligence witness.

When asked about the likelihood

of Saddam using weapons of mass destruction

without provocation, the intelligence

witness said, ‘‘My judgment

would be that the probability of him

initiating an attack . . . in the foreseeable

future, given the conditions we

understand now, the likelihood I think

would be low.’’ When asked about the

likelihood that Saddam would use

weapons of mass destruction if he

thought his regime was in danger, the

witness said, ‘‘Pretty high, in my

view.’’

Before the Gulf War in 1991, Secretary

of State James Baker met with

the Iraqis and threatened Hussein with

‘‘catastrophe’’ if he employed weapons

of mass destruction. In that war, although

Saddam launched 39 Scud missiles

at Israel, he did not use the chemical

or biological weapons he had.

If Saddam’s regime and survival are

threatened, he will have nothing to

lose, and may use everything at his disposal.

Israeli Prime Minister Ariel

Sharon has announced that instead of

its forbearance in the 1991 gulf war,

this time Israel will respond if attacked.

If weapons of mass destruction

land on Israeli soil, killing innocent civilians,

the experts I have consulted

believe Israel will retaliate, and possibly

with nuclear weapons.

This escalation, spiraling out of control,

could draw the Arab world into a

regional war in which our Arab allies

side with Iraq, against the United

States and against Israel. And that

would represent a fundamental threat

to Israel, to the region, to the world

economy and international order.

Nor can we rule out the possibility

that Saddam would assault American

force with chemical or biological weapons.

Despite advances in protecting our

troops, we may not yet have the capability

to safeguard all of them. The

Congressional General Accounting Office

published a report on October 1

which clearly suggests that our forces

are not adequately prepared for a

chemical or biological attack, even

though the Defense Department has

been taking significant actions to provide

such protection.

The GAO emphasizes the importance

of chemical and biological defense

training, the medical readiness of units

to conduct operations in a contaminated

environment, and the critical

need for an adequate supply of required

protective gear.

Our forces are already stretched thin

in other ways. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen

and Marines are serving their

country with great distinction. Just

under 70,000 Reservists and National

Guardsmen have been mobilized for the

war against terrorism. Many reservists

who were initially recalled for the war

in Afghanistan have been either de-mobilized

or extended for a second year.

They are concerned about the impact a

war against Iraq will have on their

families and on their jobs. Many employers

who are struggling in the current

sagging economy are also deeply

concerned about the stability of their

workforce. These patriotic Americans

are willing to sacrifice, but they deserve

to know that all reasonable alternatives

to war have been exhausted.

If we embark upon a premature or

unilateral military campaign against

Iraq, or a campaign only with Britain,

our forces will have to serve in even

greater numbers, for longer periods,

and with graver risks. Our force

strength will be stretched even thinner.

If in the end we must go to war,

the burden should be shared with allies,

and an alliance is less likely if war

becomes an immediate response.

Even with the major technological

gains demonstrated in Afghanistan, the

logistics and manpower required in a

war with Iraq would be extraordinarily

challenging if we could not marshal a

real coalition of regional and international

allies. The Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard

Myers, told the Senate Armed Services

Committee two week ago that because

of the high demand placed on some of

our forces, coalition partners would be

necessary to mitigate the risk of war

in Iraq.

President Bush made the right decision

on September 12 when he expressed

America’s willingness to work

with the United Nations to prevent

Iraq from using chemical, biological or

nuclear weapons. The President’s address

to the General Assembly challenging

the United Nations to enforce

its long list of Security Council Resolutions

on Iraq was powerful, and for

me, it was persuasive.

The President reports important

progress has been made in urging many

nations to join us in insisting that Saddam

Hussein’s regime be held accountable.

The meetings already held between

the U.N. and the Iraqi government

on resuming inspections reflects

the new international resolve to ensure

that Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction

are identified and destroyed. Yet,

the resolution before us would allow

the President to go it alone against

Iraq without seeing our U.N. initiative

through, and without exhausting the

alternatives.

To maintain the credibility he built

when he went to the U.N., the President

must follow the logic of his own

argument. Before we go to war, we

should give the international community

to chance to meet the President’s

challenge, to renew its resolve to disarm

Saddam Hussein completely and

effectively.

Some have argued that inspections

have already been tried, and that they

have failed. They argue that the international

community has exhausted the

option of inspections, and that immediate

war is now justified. I disagree.

I have spoken to former inspectors

and non-proliferation experts who are

convinced that 7 years of inspections

significantly impeded Saddam’s efforts

to acquire weapons of mass destruction.

Indeed, they are convinced that

inspections can work effectively again.

According to Rolf Ekeus, who served

as the executive chairman of the U.N.

Special Commission on Iraq from 1991

to 1997, inspectors ensured that not

much was left of Iraq’s once massive

weapons programs at the time they departed.

In fact, the seven years of inspections

that took place until 1998 succeeded in

virtually eliminating Saddam’s ability

to develop a nuclear weapon in Iraq

during that period. Even with Iraq’s

obstructions, those inspections resulted

in the demolition of large quantities

of chemical and biological weapons.

The inspection program, before its

forced termination in 1998, had accomplished

far more disarmament than the

gulf war itself.

President Bush acknowledged the

successes of the International Atomic

Energy Agency, or I.A.E.A., in thwarting

Saddam’s nuclear ambitions in his

October 7 address to the Nation. He

said, ‘‘Before being barred from Iraq in

1998, the International Atomic Energy

Agency dismantled extensive nuclear

weapons-related facilities, including

three uranium-enrichment sites.’’

A CIA assessment, released to the

public in October 2002, says: ‘‘Before its

departure from Iraq, the IAEA made

significant strides toward dismantling

Iraq’s nuclear weapons program and

unearthing the nature and scope of

Iraq’s past nuclear activities.’’

Even the assessment of Iraq’s WMD

program published by the British Government

to demand action in the

United Nations against Iraq acknowledges

the success of inspections. It

says: ‘‘Despite the conduct of the Iraqi

authorities towards them, both, the

UN, and the IAEA Action Team have

valuable records of achievement in discovering

and exposing Iraq’s biological

weapons program and destroying very

large quantities of chemical weapons

stocks and missiles as well as the infrastructure

for Iraq’s nuclear weapons

programme.’’

Among the U.N.’s significant

achievements cited in the assessment

are: The destruction of 40,000 munitions

for chemical weapons, 2,610 tons

of chemical precursors, and 411 tons of

chemical warfare agent. The dismantling

of Iraq’s prime chemical weapons

development production complex. The

destruction of 48 Scud-type missiles, 11

mobile launchers and 56 sites, 30 warheads

filled with chemical agents, and

20 conventional warheads. The destruction

of the al-Hakam biological weapons

facility and a range of production

equipment. The removal and destruction

of the infrastructure of the nuclear

weapons program, including a

weaponization and testing facility.

Experts on inspections advise that it

would be extremely hard for Iraq to

carry on an active and even secret

WMD program while inspections are

being conducted, especially with the

inspection technology that has been

developed over the last ten years. One

former nuclear inspector told me that

he found it hard to keep Iraqi scientists

quiet about Iraq’s nuclear program,

once they started to talk.

Given these assessments, there is

every reason to believe that unrestricted

and unconditional inspections

can again be effective in ensuring the

destruction of weapons of mass destruction.

It is an option that must be

given a clear chance before going to

war again.

So this should be the first aim of our

policy, to get U.N. inspectors back into

Iraq without conditions. I hope the Security

Council will approve a new resolution

requiring the Government of

Iraq to accept unlimited and unconditional

inspections and the destruction

of any weapons of mass destruction.

The resolution should set a short

timetable for the resumption of inspections.

I would hope that inspections

could resume, at the latest, by the end

of October.

The resolution should also require

the head of the U.N. inspection team to

report to the Security Council every

two weeks. No delaying tactics should

be tolerated, and if they occur, Saddam

should know that he will lose his last

chance to avoid war.

The Security Council Resolution

should authorize the use of force, if the

inspection process is unsatisfactory.

And there should be no doubt in Baghdad

that the United States Congress

would then be prepared to authorize

force as well.

The return of inspectors with unfettered

access and the ability to destroy

what they find not only could remove

any weapons of mass destruction from

Saddam’s arsenal. They could also be

more effective than an immediate or

unilateral war in ensuring that these

deadly weapons would not fall into terrorist

hands.

Before going to war again, we should

seek to resume the inspections now—

and set a non-negotiable demand of no

obstruction, no delay, no more weapons

of mass destruction in Iraq.

We know that our actions against

Iraq do not occur in a vacuum. The

world is watching. The Administration’s

decisions to abandon the Kyoto

Protocol on global warming, to unilaterally

withdraw from the ABM Treaty,

and to reject ratification of the Treaty

on the International Criminal Court

have left the unmistakable impression

across the globe that the United States

wants to write its own international

rules.

In February, Secretary of State Powell

testified that there was significant

concern among the Europeans earlier

last year about ‘‘unbridled U.S.

unilateralism,’’ because ‘‘the U.S. was

going off on its own without a care for

the rest of the world.’’ Further unilateral

action on our part, especially on

the all-important issue of war, could

trigger a new global anti-Americanism

that causes peoples and governments

to question our motives and actions on

a wide range of issues.

We should not embark on a unilateral

war, without fully considering the

potentially destabilizing impact on our

allies in the region.

If we insist on attacking Iraq alone

without the clear support of the international

community, we could inflame

anti-Americanism in the predominantly

Muslim countries throughout

the Middle East and South Asia. In an

article this month in the New York

Times, an expert at the Brookings Institution

wrote that regardless of our

real objectives, most Arabs and Muslims

will see ‘‘American imperialism’’

in a war with Iraq.

This expert says that a war with Iraq

would ‘‘render the Middle East more

. . . unstable than it is today.’’ Middle

Eastern leaders could be faced with

mass street protests over a highly unpopular

American strike.

Jordan’s King Abdullah, who is a

trusted friend of America, is deeply

concerned that war will inflame the

large Palestinian population and inflame

Islamic views. Iraq is one of Jordan’s

largest trading partners, and

King Abdullah is understandably concerned

about a potentially devastating

impact on the Jordanian economy.

Some experts have suggested that King

Abdullah may lose power if war breaks

out. Already the Jordanian Government

is working actively to discourage

popular outbursts against war with

Iraq.

In Egypt, President Mubarak is concerned

that war with Iraq will further

ignite strong Islamist sentiment.

We also need to consider the possibility

that Iran would try to increase

its strength and influence in Southern

Iraq in a post-Saddam era. More than

50 percent of the Iraqi population is

Shiite, just as in Iran, and if the Iranian

Government senses a vacuum, it

very well might try to increase its influence

in Iraq.

The United States must clearly act

to defend our national security against

an imminent threat. In doing so, the

President will have the full support of

Congress and the American people. But

when an imminent threat does not

exist, and when reasonable alternatives

are available, as they are now, we must

use them before resorting to war.

What can be gained here is success

and in the event of failure, greater

credibility for an armed response,

greater international support, and the

prospect of victory with less loss of

American life.

So what is to be lost by pursuing this

policy before Congress authorizes sending

young Americans into another and

in this case perhaps unnecessary war?

Even the case against Saddam is, in

important respects, a case against immediate

or unilateral war. If Prime

Minister Blair is correct in saying that

Iraq can launch chemical or biological

warheads in 45 minutes, what kind of

sense does it make to put our soldiers

in the path of that danger without exhausting

every reasonable means to

disarm Iraq through the United Nations?

Clearly we must halt Saddam Hussein’s

quest for weapons of mass destruction.

Yes, we may reach the point

where our only choice is conflict with

like-minded allies at our side, if not in

a multilateral action authorized by the

Security Council. But we are not there

yet.

The evidence does not take us there;

events do not compel us there and both

the war against terrorism and our

wider interests in the region and the

world summon us to a course that is

sensible, graduated, and genuinely

strong—not because it moves swiftly to

battle, but because it moves resolutely

to the objective of disarming Iraq

peacefully if possible, and militarily if

necessary.

In his October 7 address to the nation,

President Bush said Congressional

approval of a resolution authorizing

the use of force does not mean

that war with Iraq is ‘‘imminent or unavoidable.’’

The President himself has

not decided that our nation should go

to war. Yet, Congress is being asked to

authorize war now. He may decide not

to use that authority. But this resolution

leaves it to the President to make

the decision on his own, without further

recourse to Congress or to the

American people.

The power to declare war is the most

solemn responsibility given to Congress

by the Constitution. We must not

delegate that responsibility to the

President in advance.

Let me close by recalling the events

of an autumn of danger four decades

ago. When missiles were discovered in

Cuba—missiles more threatening to us

than anything Saddam has today, some

in the highest councils of government

urged an immediate and unilateral

strike. Instead the United States took

its case to the United Nations, won the

endorsement of the Organization of

American States, and brought along

even our most skeptical allies. We imposed

a blockade, demanded inspection,

and insisted on the removal of the missiles.

When an earlier President outlined

that choice to the American people and

the world, he spoke of it in realistic

terms not with a sense that the first

step would necessarily be the final

step, but with a resolve that it must be

tried.

As he said then, ‘‘Action is required

. . . and these actions [now] may only

be the beginning. We will not prematurely

or unnecessarily risk the

costs of . . . war—but neither will we

shrink from that risk at any time it

must be faced.’’

In 2002, we too can and must be both

resolute and measured. In that way,

the United States prevailed without

war in the greatest confrontation of

the Cold War. Now, on Iraq, let us build

international support, try the United

Nations, and pursue disarmament before

we turn to armed conflict.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise

today to offer my support for the pending

resolution. I am pleased to be a cosponsor

of the Lieberman-Warner-

McCain resolution because I believe it

is in our national security interests to

deal with the threat posed by Iraq. The

world would be a far safer place without

Saddam Hussein, and as long as he

remains in power, he will continue to

be a threat to the region, to the United

States, and to his own people.

Saddam Hussein is a destabilizing

force in the Middle East. A quick review

of history reveals he has invaded

two of his neighbors—Iran and Kuwait—

causing massive destruction,

killing hundreds of thousands of people,

and bankrupting his country. During

the gulf war, he launched ballistic

missiles at civilian populations in

Israel. He opposes the Middle East

peace process and has provided financial

rewards to the families of suicide

bombers. He supports organizations engaged

in terrorism and committed to

the overthrow of governments within

the region. It is clear that Saddam

Hussein is an opponent of stability in

the Middle East, and our efforts to

build a lasting peace in the region is in

jeopardy as long as he remains in

power.

In addition to being a threat to his

neighbors, Saddam Hussein is a threat

to the United States and to our vital

national security interests. There can

be no doubt that Iraq has continued its

drive to develop weapons of mass destruction

and the means to deliver

them. After the gulf war, Saddam Hussein

agreed to open up his country to

international inspectors, to destroy his

weapons stockpiles, and to halt all

weapons of mass destruction development

programs. Despite near continual

obstruction by Iraq, international

weapons inspectors were able to uncover

a portion of his extensive chemical

and biological weapons, and gain

vital information about his effort to

develop nuclear weapons.

However, the weapons inspectors’

progress was thwarted when Saddam

Hussein forced them to leave the country

in 1998. For 4 years, he has been

able to pursue chemical, biological,

and nuclear weapons capabilities outside

the watchful eye of the international

community. While Iraq has

agreed to allow the weapons inspectors

to return, I am skeptical that Saddam

Hussein will keep his word and allow

unfettered access to suspect sites. Already

there are indications that the

agreement under which the inspectors

will return allows Iraq to forbid entrance

into certain key locations.

Without full and guaranteed access to

all sites, this inspection regime is likely

to fail and prove to be just another

delaying tactic.

Saddam Hussein’s possession of weapons

of mass destruction is in itself a

threat to the United States, but equally

concerning is his ties to international

terrorism. It is clear that Iraq

is in violation of its obligation to renounce

terrorism and to halt its support

for terrorist organizations. Recently,

the Bush administration announced

that it has evidence linking

Saddam Hussein with international

terrorists. A link between Saddam Hussein’s

weapons of mass destruction and

al-Qaida terrorists would be the

gravest threat facing our Nation and

would require immediate action by the

United States.

Given this threat, and the fact that

Iraq is in violation of 16 separate

United Nations Security Council resolutions,

the United States is well within

its rights to act militarily to protect

the safety of the American people. I

disagree with those who argue our actions

must be tied to prior approval by

the United Nations. The defense of our

Nation should not be dictated by other

countries or international organizations.

If necessary, the United States

should be prepared to act alone.

However, I strongly support efforts

to build international support prior to

military action against Iraq. The support

of our allies, and the international

community as a whole, will increase

the chances of success for our policy in

Iraq and in the ongoing fight against

global terrorism. One reason why I support

the pending resolution is that I

believe a strong vote by Congress will

signal our national unity and make it

more likely that the President will

succeed in creating a strong international

coalition.

While much of our focus has been on

preparing for possible military action

against Iraq, and working with the

international community to resume inspections

of Iraq’s suspected weapons

of mass destruction sites, I believe we

must also begin the process of planning

for a post-Saddam Hussein Iraq. As a

part of this, we must begin to talk to

the Iraqi people and enlist their support

in the fight against Saddam Hussein.

There can be no doubt that no one

has suffered more from Saddam Hussein’s

regime than the people of Iraq.

The list of crimes Saddam Hussein

has perpetrated against his own citizens

is shocking. Since 1997, he has

killed over 2,500 prisoners—many of

whom were jailed simply for their opposition

to his regime. He has repressed

both the Kurds in the north

and the Shiites in the south by causing

environmental devastation, demolishing

homes, destroying villages, and

creating hundreds of thousands of internally

displaced people throughout

the country. In 1988 in the village of

Halabja, he used chemical weapons to

kill more than 5,000 innocent Iraqi civilians.

And while thousands of his people

starve, Saddam Hussein diverts

much needed food and medicine from

the U.N.’s Oil for Food Program for his

own enrichment.

Given his history, the Iraqi people

should no doubt welcome the end of

Saddam Hussein’s brutal regime. We

should ask for their support in ousting

Saddam by assuring them that our goal

is nothing short of helping them establish

a functioning, democratic society.

Iraq enjoys a wealth of natural resources

and a well-educated, innovative

population. The Iraqi people may well

thrive once they are allowed to harness

the power of democracy and free markets.

I believe we can succeed in helping

the Iraqi people create a better country.

It will be difficult and will take a

long-term commitment from the

United States. But ultimately, the success

of our efforts in Iraq will be judged

by our ability to make sure that Saddam

Hussein is not simply replaced by

another dictator who will pursue weapons

of mass destruction, invade his

neighbors, and support global terrorism.

This vote has particular significance

to me. My son, Brooks, is currently

serving in the 101st Airborne. The 101st

is one of the Army divisions that has

been identified by military leaders as

likely to prosecute the war against

Iraq. I know that a vote in favor of this

resolution may be a vote to send my

own son to war. Given this, I do not

take this vote lightly. I am very proud

of my son, and of the thousands of

South Dakotans serving in our Armed

Forces, and I know they are prepared

to do what is necessary to protect the

United States.

I will vote for this resolution because

I know putting a stop to Iraq’s weapons

of mass destruction program and ending

Saddam Hussein’s brutal dictatorship

is in our national security interests

and vital to protecting the American

people. While this approach is not

without danger, the greatest danger of

all would be in a failure of the U.S. and

the world community to act in a decisive

and urgent manner.