Mr. President, I rise to

express my support for a resolution authorizing

the use of force against Iraq.

I do so with two cardinal prerequisites:

first, that all possible means be exhausted

short of war to enforce United

Nations resolutions concerning Iraq

and, second, that any attack against

Iraq take place as part of an international

coalition. That is why I am

pleased to cosponsor the amendment

offered by my colleague from Michigan,

Mr. LEVIN, the Chairman of the

Armed Services Committee.

Before the United States wages war

against Iraq, President Bush and the

Congress owe it to the young Americans

who face death or injury in that

conflict to ensure that every effort has

been made to obtain our ends without

endangering them. Every ounce of

preparation must be taken to ensure a

swift and efficient outcome should war

become necessary. As another President,

Herbert Hoover, once said, ‘‘Older

men declare war. But it is youth that

must fight and die.’’ The burden is on

our leaders to justify why young men

and women need to risk their future

now.

Defense analysts suggest that anywhere

from 100,000 to 400,000 troops will

be necessary for an attack. There are

already approximately 75,000 Reservists

and National Guard troops on active

duty, and even more may be needed to

deal with the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan

while not degrading military

missions elsewhere in the world. An occupation

force in Iraq might require at

least 75,000 troops plus a civilian counterpart

to the military presence. The

Congressional Budget Office estimates

that the war will cost between $6 billion

to $9 billion a month on top of an

initial deployment cost of $9 billion to

$13 billion and that an occupation force

would cost $1 billion to $4 billion per

month. Remember in the first Persian

Gulf War, it was our allies who paid for

the war. The cost of the war this time

will be borne largely by the American

treasury, unless we are supported by an

international coalition. With a battered

economy, it will be difficult to

fund two wars at once for an indefinite

period of time. Already our funds are

stretched. The head of the U.S. Special

Operations Command has indicated

that he requires an additional $23 billion

over the next 5 years to maintain

his global responsibilities.

The need to justify such a course of

action is particularly critical in the

case of Iraq as President Bush is advocating

a preemptive strike against a

potential threat to the American

homeland. Traditionally, America has

never sought war by striking first nor

has America eagerly sought foreign entanglements.

This would be a preemptive

war and one in which we could

have few allies. Not since the Spanish-

American War would the United States

be fighting a war so far from our borders

with so few friends.

As we consider this war, we must also

consider the implications of what we

are doing. Saddam Hussein is not the

only dictator who oppresses his people,

attacks his neighbors, and is developing

weapons of mass destruction

(WMD). North Korea’s Kim Jong Il,

Libya’s Muammar Qadhafi, Iran’s Ayatollah

Khamenei, Syria’s Bashar al-

Asad, and others, all pose threats or

have posed threats to American interests.

All are known for their human

rights abuses.

American troops stand eye to eye

with North Korean troops on the DMZ.

Libyan agents blew up an American

commercial aircraft; Iran has imprisoned

American diplomats; and Syria

has supported terrorist groups who

have attacked and murdered Americans.

All have or are developing weapons

of mass destruction, including nuclear

weapons and missiles to deliver

them. Some of these countries may already

have nuclear weapons. Some

have attacked—directly or indirectly

through support for terrorist groups—

their neighbors. In the case of Iran, recent

reports indicate that it is sheltering

and assisting al-Qaida leaders.

In the case of other countries, we are

working diligently, through bilateral

and multilateral diplomacy, to constrain

their efforts to develop weapons

of mass destruction. However, in regard

to Iraq, the President argues that

Saddam poses a unique threat. His argument

is convincing concerning the

extent of devastation that Saddam has

wreaked on his own people and his

neighbors. He is truly, as the President

notes, a ‘‘homicidal dictator,’’ but he is

not the only dictator addicted to developing

weapons of mass destruction. Nor

is the policy solely a choice between

invading Iraq or standing hopelessly by

while Saddam becomes ever stronger.

Since the Persian Gulf War, we and our

allies have worked to make Saddam

weaker and, according to all reports,

including that of our own military,

Saddam’s military capability is much

less now than it was in 1991.

Congressional testimony, reports by

the intelligence community and outside

analysts, state that Iraq’s WMD

capability is much less now than it was

before the Gulf War. A recent CIA public

report states that Iraq’s chemical

weapons capability ‘‘is probably more

limited now than it was at the time of

the Gulf war . . . ’’ Although it is probable

that Iraq’s biological weapons program

is more advanced than it was before

the war, its delivery capability,

according to the respected Londonbased

International Institute for Strategic

Studies, ‘‘appears limited.’’

I agree that we must neutralize

Iraq’s WMD threat. The question is

how to do that most effectively while

minimizing the loss in American lives.

The argument that an inspection system

cannot guarantee the elimination

of Iraq’s WMD program is certainly

true but misses the point. There are

few absolutes in this world. Defense

Secretary Rumsfeld insists that we

need American troops on the ground,

rummaging through every Iraqi nook

and cranny for evidence of WMD. Even

with our troops doing so, there would

be no guarantee that every item would

be uncovered or how long it would

take. We are still finding traces of

chemical weapons left over from World

War I in the backyards of homes in

Washington, D.C. Nor have our troops

in Afghanistan, despite heroic efforts,

been able to eradicate every al-Qaida

operative.

But what aggressive inspections can

do is destabilize the Iraqi WMD program,

keep it bottled up, frustrate efforts

at gaining new technologies and

additional supplies, and force Iraqi

technicians to hide and keep moving

constantly. It will not be disarmament,

but, if implemented effectively, it will

be dismemberment of the Iraqi WMD

program, splitting it in parts and preventing

it from becoming whole.

A new inspection regime has to be

very aggressive, receive considerable

support from the United States and its

allies, have a fixed set of dates for

marking compliance, and be backed by

the threat of war. Iraq’s record of evading

inspections is well documented.

Benchmarks for compliance will remove

wiggle room for countries who

argue for a softening of sanctions provisions.

Putting in place an aggressive

new inspection regime is not an insubstantial

achievement, and it does not

undermine necessary preparations to

develop an effective war-fighting strategy

and strengthen international backing

for a conflict.

Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and others

in the administration tell us that

time is not on our side. But we must

make the time to ensure that we minimize

American casualties. Time is not

on Saddam Hussein’s side either. Our

patience has been exhausted and a new

U.N. resolution must be firm in its

deadlines. Some in the Administration

believe Saddam’s hold on those responsible

for guarding him is so tenuous

that in the event of an attack, they

will turn on him and overthrow him.

The current discussion about Iraq

has obscured the successes of American

policy toward Iraq. A recent Congressional

Research Service report by its

distinguished Middle East expert, Kenneth

Katzman, observes, the United

States ‘‘has largely succeeded in preventing

Iraq from reemerging as an immediate

strategic threat to the region.’’

A British Government intelligence

report notes that the ‘‘success

of U.N. restrictions means the development

of new longer-range missiles is

likely to be a slow process.’’

If war becomes inevitable because

Iraq refuses to give inspectors the liberty

they need to perform their mission,

then the United States must have

an effective military strategy for fighting

a war.

Great uncertainty surrounds the

President’s post-war strategy. Remember

the day the war ends, Iraq becomes

our responsibility, our problem. The

United States lacks strategic planning

for a post-conflict situation. Retired

General George Joulwan recently said

that the U.S. needs ‘‘to organize for the

peace’’ and design now a strategy with

‘‘clear goals, milestones, objectives.’’

General Joulwan argues we did not

have such a plan for Bosnia and we are

late to develop one in Afghanistan. Our

objectives in Iraq have not yet been

made clear: is it our goal to occupy

Baghdad and if so, for how long? A rush

to battle without a strategy to win the

peace is folly.

General Hoar observed that ‘‘there

has been scant discussion about what

will take place after a successful military

campaign against Iraq. The term

‘‘regime change’’ does not adequately

describe the concept of what we expect

to achieve as a result of a military

campaign in Iraq. One would ask the

question, ‘‘Are we willing to spend the

time and treasure to rebuild Iraq and

its institution after fighting, if we go it

alone during a military campaign? Who

will provide the troops, the policemen,

the economists, the politicians, the judicial

advisors to start Iraq on the road

to democracy? Or are we going to turn

the country over to another thug, who

swears fealty to the United States?’’

As General Shalikashvili stated in

testimony before the Armed Services

Committee, ‘‘we were very fortunate in

Afghanistan that in fact a government,

interim government, emerged that

seemed to have a modicum of support

from its people. . . . We should not

count on being lucky twice.’’ Nor can

we count on Iraq’s oil funding reconstruction

if wellheads are blown up as

they were by retreating Iraqi forces in

Kuwait.

Experts indicate that American

troops will need to remain inside Iraq

for many years in order to ensure stability.

Iraq will require extensive economic

assistance. As the current situation

in Afghanistan indicates, the process

of restoring viability to a nation—

nation-building—after years of repression

is a difficult one and made more

difficult by the inability of other nations

to sustain their support in the effort.

Violent attacks are on the increase

in Afghanistan. Afghan officials

have received only about half of the

$1.8 billion in aid promised last January.

A study by the Army’s Center of

Military History has concluded that we

would need to commit 300,000 peacekeeping

troops in Afghanistan and

100,000 in Iraq if we are to have an impact

comparable to that which we had

in reconstructing Japan and Germany

after the war.

The consequences of a long-term

American occupation of Iraq needs to

be carefully weighed. Anthony

Cordesman, an analyst with the Center

for Strategic and International Studies,

has observed, ‘‘there has been a

‘deafening silence’ from the Administration

about how Iraq will be run

after Hussein.’’ Historically, the

United States has had a poor record in

the Middle East. We supported Iraq in

its war against Iran.

Nor does eliminating Saddam necessarily

mean that the Iraqi people will

welcome American occupiers or that

they will have democratic leaders to

govern. Secretary Rumsfeld asserts

that he trusts the Iraqi people will be

inspired to form a new government.

But can we be assured that it would be

a democratic government or a democratic

government that is pro-American?

Can we be assured that the new

regime will be committed to getting

rid of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction,

especially as Iraq’s traditional adversary,

Iran, has an even more advanced

program of weapons of mass destruction?

Even though our military forces may

be equipped to fight a war in Iraq and

a war on terrorism in Afghanistan,

there is a significant price to be paid.

In his testimony before the Senate

Armed Services Committee, General

Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint

Chiefs, noted that certain unique units,

such as intelligence platforms, command

and control assets, and Special

Operations Forces would need to be

prioritized if the war on terrorism expanded.

Richard Solomon, former Assistant

Secretary of State in the first

Bush Administration, refers to the

‘‘danger of over-stretch’’ in which the

United States assets are deployed in

multiple nation-building enterprises

and are not able to respond if another

crisis erupts.

All of these concerns point to the importance

of international support as a

critical ingredient of both our warfighting

and our peace-making strategy.

Without the imprimatur of the

international community, the President’s

war will be seen as a private

vendetta by the United States.

The President was right to frame his

speech at the United Nations in the

context of restoring credibility to the

United Nations through enforcement of

its resolutions. This is the essential

context of this conflict but it can be

validated as such only if the international

community joins it. Regional

support will provide an allied force

with the forward basing needed to

mount a large-scale attack. Right now

no country in the region contiguous to

Iraq is volunteering to host American

troops in a war. International support

will help dampen hostility toward the

United States by the peoples of the region

and help build support among the

Iraqi people. International support for

the post-war, peace-making phase of

the operation will reduce the American

military’s footprint and decrease the

need for American financial resources.

Secretary Rumsfeld has testified that

the United Nations or an international

coalition will run Iraq after Saddam.

For that to be the case, the United Nations

or some ad hoc international coalition

will have to be formed before the

war.

The President also must ensure our

troops are properly prepared. Recently,

the Pentagon’s Deputy Assistant Secretary

for Chemical and Biological Defense

stated that American troops are

not ‘‘fully equipped and prepared’’

against a bio-chem attack. Decontamination

shelters are reported to be

in short supply as is the

decontaminant foam used to clean up

following an attack. The General Accounting

Office recently testified that

250,000 defective protective suits

against a chemical or biological attack

cannot be located and may remain in

current Pentagon inventories.

We must take the threat of an Iraqi

chemical or biological attack very seriously.

According to the British Government’s

White Paper on Iraq, Iraq chemical

weapons caused over 20,000 casualties

in the Iran-Iraq War. Iraq used

sprayers, bombs, artillery rockets, and

artillery shells to deliver these weapons.

Thousands of rockets and artillery

shells filled with chemical weapons remain

hidden in Iraq’s arsenal.

Haste makes waste, affirms the

adage, and in this case, haste means a

waste of American lives. We may have

an all-volunteer force but they are not

mercenaries; they are citizen-soldiers

and we owe it to each and every one of

them and their families to proceed

carefully when endangering their lives.

Preparation is not the same as procrastination.

Constituent opinion in my home

state is running strongly against any

authorization of the use of force

against Iraq. The President and his Administration

need to make a clear and

compelling case to the American people

and to our allies abroad as to why

this confrontation is necessary now.

For that reason, Mr. President, I support

efforts to frame a multilateral approach

to rid Iraq of its weapons of

mass destruction. I support action by

the United Nations in the form of a resolution

calling for unconditional and

unfettered inspections in Iraq. Only

after we exhaust all of our alternative

means should we engage in the use of

force, and before then, the President

must ensure we have a strategy and

plans in place for winning the war and

building the peace.

I yield the floor.