Madam President, I

rise in support of the Levin resolution.

I salute my colleague from the State of

Michigan because I think what he has

captured in this resolution is, frankly,

what the American people believe.

There is no one in this Senate Chamber

making apologies for Saddam Hussein

or his weapons of mass destruction.

There is no one who wants to ignore

the peril which that man could

pose to the Middle East or to the

United States of America. But what

Senator LEVIN is suggesting is, frankly,

to follow what the President is suggesting.

On September 12, President Bush

went to the United Nations and he said

to them, if their organization means

anything, then they have to stand up

to this man. We have to have unconditional

inspections. For 5 years we have

been standing by the sidelines, and we

want to know what is happening in

Iraq.

Senator LEVIN says that is the first

place we should go, and I agree with

him. And it is not as if the United Nations

has ignored this. Secretary of

State Colin Powell, a man I respect

very much—one of the leaders in this

administration—has been in New York

working with the United Nations for

this resolution. That is the best course

of action. To have the United Nations

behind us, as President Bush’s father

had the United Nations behind him in

the Persian Gulf war, to have a coalition

of allies representing countries

from all around the world; countries

that have joined us in the war on terrorism

would now join us in a meaningful

inspection regime in Iraq. That is

what Senator LEVIN suggests.

What a contrast it is from the President’s

own resolution. The President’s

resolution talks about continued discussion

with the United Nations. But

make no mistake, the President’s resolution

gives him unconditional, go-it alone

authority to launch a land invasion

in Iraq with or without an ally.

There is a world of difference between

what Senator LEVIN and I support and

what the President has asked for.

Doesn’t it make more sense for us to

work with the United Nations for unconditional

inspections to make certain

we have inspectors on the ground

looking at every square inch of Iraq,

and if there is resistance from Saddam

Hussein, if he obstructs us, if he creates

obstacles, we then have the force

of the United Nations behind us in enforcement?

We do not stand alone. We

stand with other nations and with the

United Nations. That is what President

Bush’s father did, and it was the right

thing to do. That is what we should do

because, frankly, bringing this force

together is a validation of this organization,

the United Nations, which the

United States, as much as any other

nation in the world, helped to create.

After World War II, we said: Let’s

come together in collective security to

work together to solve the problems of

the world and to deal with war and

peace.

Time and again, in over 100 instances,

the United Nations has risen

to that challenge. We should give them

that same opportunity and responsibility

with the Levin resolution. That

is the better course of action. As Senator

LEVIN says clearly in his resolution,

nothing in the resolution ever diminishes

in any way whatsoever the

power of the President of the United

States to defend this country, its people,

its territory, its Armed Forces,

against any threat of aggression. That

is part of what we expect of the Commander

in Chief, the President, and

Senator LEVIN preserves and protects

that.

I urge my colleagues to support the

Levin amendment. The Levin amendment

is the best way for us to approach

this challenge.

Mr. President, I call up

this amendment to the underlying resolution

presented by the President and

sponsored by Senator LIEBERMAN and

others on the floor of the Senate.

In this Capitol Building, there are

many historic rooms. There is one that

is of great significance to me. It is only

a few steps down the hall. It was in

room 219 where I gathered with about a

dozen of my colleagues among the Senate

Democrats for a meeting on the

morning of September 11, 2001. I can

still recall the meeting vividly as we

watched the television screen and its

report, as we heard of the evacuation of

the White House, as we jumped from

our chairs and looked down The Mall

to see the black smoke billowing from

the Pentagon. And then we were told

immediately to leave this great building

and rushed down the steps and far

away.

That is my image of September 11.

Everyone who is following this debate

has their own image of September 11.

My world changed. America changed.

Perhaps things changed all around the

world on that day.

I came to work on that morning

never believing that just a few days

later, on September 14, I would stand

on this floor and join every one of my

colleagues in the Senate in a unanimous

bipartisan vote of support for

President Bush’s request for war on

terrorism. I am not a person who

comes to that vote easily. I am one

who grew up with the specter of war

during our war in Vietnam. I am a person

who served in the Congress and

considered the momentous decision of

the Persian Gulf war. I always took

those votes extremely seriously. But

there was no doubt in my mind on September

14, this was the right one. The

war against terrorism was the right

one. We were going to go after those

parties responsible for what they had

done to us on that day of infamy.

Now we gather in the Senate, a little

over a year later, to face another historic

vote. The President has asked

Congress for the authority to wage another

war, a war against Iraq. It is fair

first to ask what progress we have

made on the war against terrorism.

Some things have happened for which

we can be very proud.

The Taliban is out of power in Afghanistan.

They no longer will be catering

to the kind of extremist we saw

with al-Qaida. Osama bin Laden is at

least on the run, and that is certainly

good news. Afghanistan is moving back

toward a civilized state. Women are returning

to the streets without the

burkas. Girls are going to school. Positive

things are happening. We saw an

intelligence network created around

the world to support the U.S. war on

terrorism, an amazing display of unity

and support for what we were doing.

But still, as I stand here today and

make this assessment of the war on

terrorism, the manhunt continues for

Osama bin Laden and his top lieutenants.

Afghanistan is still in its national

infancy. Hamid Karzai, leader of

Afghanistan, is a good man but barely

escaped an assassination attempt a few

weeks ago, an assassination that, had

it resulted, would have thrown that nation

into chaos. Al-Qaida is still known

to be in 60 nations around the world,

and this war is far from over.

Make no mistake, we cannot dedicate

the resources, the manpower, the

skills, and the weapons of war to a new

war in Iraq without sacrifices in our

war on terrorism. This will be a war on

two fronts; sacrifices will be made.

Let’s speak to the President’s request

for a war against Iraq. If you

have followed the comments from the

President since August until today,

you will note that his approach has

changed. In fact, this is the third

version of the resolution before us.

In one respect it is a tribute to the

President that he has worked with others

to try to improve the resolution.

We expect that. In another, it suggests

a change in attitude and philosophy

and perhaps an intent as this resolution

develops.

The speech the President gave on

Monday night I listened to, every single

word of it. I wanted to hear everything

he had to say. The speech the

President gave to the American people

was far different than the language of

the resolution before us.

What has happened since August

when the President first raised the

specter of Iraq as a threat to the

United States?

Initially the White House said: We

don’t need congressional approval. We

can move forward. They went on to

say: We can do it unilaterally. We don’t

need any allies. We can attack Iraq if

necessary by ourselves. And the President

said our goal is regime change. We

want Saddam Hussein gone. We have

had enough of him. And he went on to

say—Vice President CHENEY backed

him up—inspections by the U.N. are

worthless. We tried that.

That was the first cut, the first position

of the White House.

Last Monday, when the President

gave a speech, it was a much different

message. He is seeking congressional

approval. That is why we are here

today. He said that he is going to help

lead a coalition of forces against Saddam

Hussein, far different than what

this resolution says, far different than

what he said at the outset.

He is now working through the

United Nations; something that had

been dismissed early on in the debate

has now become a big part of it. The

President went on to say that he is now

focusing on weapons of mass destruction

and destroying them. There won’t

be any argument here. I have yet to

meet a single Member of Congress who

defends Saddam Hussein and his weapons

of mass destruction.

The President said we need an inspection

regime through the United Nations.

That is a big departure from

where he was. But that speech basically

described a process the President

suggested and endorsed, which many of

us endorse as well.

In 8 weeks the administration has

changed its rhetoric but the resolution

we have before us has not. This resolution

is important for many reasons.

First, it is a war resolution. With this

expression of authority from Congress,

the President will have what he needs

under our Constitution to move forward,

to dispatch troops, mobilize reserves,

move the men and women in

uniform into harm’s way, and be prepared

for battle. That is, of course, the

most important part of the resolution.

Another part rivals it in importance.

This resolution is historically important

because it marks a dramatic departure

in the foreign policy of the

United States of America. It is not

simply a question of our policy toward

Iraq or Saddam Hussein; it is a question

of our policy toward the world.

This resolution still authorizes a unilateral,

go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

This resolution contains no requirement

to build a coalition of allies behind

us. It has been said over and over

again, isn’t it better for the United

States to have a coalition behind us

than to have a coalition against us?

This resolution does not specify that

we are targeting weapons of mass destruction.

This resolution represents a

dramatic departure in foreign policy.

That is why I have offered this amendment.

Senator LEVIN of Michigan was here

earlier speaking about the role of the

U.N. As much as any nation, the

United States has guided and nurtured

the U.N. We have gone through painful,

frustrating moments when we have disagreed

with their actions and could not

agree with Security Council decisions,

but by and large we have stood by the

U.N. since its creation. In the words of

Kofi Annan, ‘‘The U.N. is the international

community at work for the

rule of law.’’

That is as succinct a description of

what the U.N. is all about as I have

ever read. We have been with the U.N.

through NATO, in the cold war, on

questions of post-Soviet transatlantic

order, and a variety of other issues.

Now comes the President, on September

12 of this year, who visits the

U.N. and issues a significant challenge.

He says to the U.N. on September 12: If

this organization has a backbone, it is

going to stand up to Saddam Hussein,

demand inspections for the weapons of

mass destruction, and remove or destroy

them. And if it does not, the

President basically said that the U.N.

is irrelevant; it has become the League

of Nations.

Well, since then, progress has been

made. A man whom I respect very

much, Secretary of State Colin Powell,

has been involved in shuttle diplomacy

with the Security Council to put together

U.N. support for just the very

approach the President asked. It is the

right approach—to really put our inspectors

on the ground with no holds

barred, nothing off limits, with no exemptions

for Presidential palaces, so

that we can go in and discover, with

the help of our intelligence community,

which will provide information

where we think the weapons can be

found and, in finding them, be able to

establish once and for all that Iraq is

in violation of U.N. resolutions and destroy

the weapons.

If Saddam Hussein and Iraq should

resist or stop us, consider the position

we are in. We can then turn to the U.N.

and say: We gave you your opportunity.

You know this man will not

comply with orders. Now stand together

in enforcing the U.N. inspection.

What a strong position that is—for us

to have a coalition of nations, through

the U.N., working with us, rather than

the Bush resolution, which says we will

do it by ourselves.

I think we have seen progress, but

this resolution would brush it all aside.

This resolution would say to the U.N.

and others around the world: Go ahead

and finish your debate and engage

yourself as much as you like, but in

the final analysis this Nation, the

United States of America, will do exactly

what it wants to do.

I don’t think that has been our approach

historically. We have always

said: If you attack us, expect an answer.

That is what happened on September

14, when we voted on the resolution

on the war on terrorism. But

why, if the U.N. is making progress toward

this goal, do we want to say we

are going to ignore the progress you

have made, ignore the fact that you

have accepted this challenge, we are

going to ignore the possibility of meaningful

inspections to disarm Iraq, and

we will go it alone, we will launch a

land invasion?

I think that is a mistake. This U.N.

coalition effort is very important. In

October of last year, President Bush

stated, with some pride, that we had

launched our war on terrorism, and he

said: ‘‘We are supported by the collective

will of the world.’’ And we were.

The President has a right to be proud

of that. The fact that we mobilized nations

around the world to come behind

us in the war against al-Qaida and the

terrorists meant something in the war

on terrorism.

Why, then, does it not mean something

today? Why, then, when we are

considering this war resolution, are we

not committing to build a coalition of

force to make sure we are successful?

We know what the coalition means. It

means strength in numbers. It means a

sharing of the burden. Why should it

only be American soldiers walking

through the deserts on the way to

Baghdad? Should we not have an international

force? Because the threat Saddam

Hussein poses is certainly to the

Middle East and other countries before

it threatens the United States. Why

should other nations not defray the

cost of this war? The fact that we

would spend $100 billion or $200 billion

when we are currently in deficit—why

should that not be shared? Certainly,

when we fought in the Persian Gulf,

that was what happened. There is nothing

in the Bush resolution for a coalition

of force to join us in this effort in

Iraq.

Also, the creation of a coalition establishes

vital cover for other nations

to join us. Do you recall the comments

made by Saudi Arabia a few days after

the President’s visit to the U.N.? They

had been not only cold but antagonistic

to the idea of the United States

going it alone against Iraq. They announced,

after his visit to the U.N.,

that if the U.N. took action, they

would cooperate. Why is that significant?

It is as significant today as it

was in the Persian Gulf. President

Bush’s father realized that when you

bring Arab States into the coalition, it

is critically important as we consider

action against an Arab nation, Iraq.

Think of this for a moment, too: If

our coalition includes Arab States and

countries from around the world, it

minimizes the impact this will have on

the fundamentalists and extremists

who are trying to breed and educate

and train the next generation of terrorists.

A third of the people living in the

Arab world today are under the age of

14.

If this is a coalition including Arab

States, then we are in a much stronger

position to argue that it is U.N. action,

collective action, it is not the United

States going it alone. This will help to

defuse any terrorists who might come

out and will help to establish stability

after the attack.

Let me go to the particular reason to

raise this amendment to this resolution.

The House has passed the resolution

we are considering. It tells you we

are drawing that much closer to the

possibility of war. It is a historic decision,

one which now is in this Chamber.

If this Chamber agrees to the same resolution

and presents it on the President’s

desk, my guess is it will be

signed very quickly. It is more than

just war against Iraq. Just a few weeks

ago, the administration released what

they called ‘‘The National Security

Strategy of the United States of America.’’

It is a document which outlines

what they consider to be the new parameters

of foreign policy in our Nation.

It is well worth the read.

You will find in this document, on

page 15, a significant and historic departure

from the foreign policy of the

United States. The argument is made

in this publication by the administration,

by President Bush’s White House,

that the world has changed so significantly

since September 11, 2001, that

the principles and values and norms of

conduct of our foreign policy must be

changed dramatically in this respect.

We have always said to the world: The

United States is not an aggressor nation.

We are not seeking to invade your

country for territory or treasure. But if

you threaten us, you can expect that

we will return with all the force and

power we have. We are not trying to

conquer you, but if you threaten our

territory, our people, our allies, our

Armed Forces, you can expect the

worst. That is the way it should be.

We have said historically we are a defensive

nation. Even at the height of

the cold war, we did not endorse a first

strike against the Soviet Union. No, we

are a defensive nation. This new foreign

policy reflected in the resolution

before us is a dramatic departure from

that.

The argument is made that we have

no choice. Because we are now fighting

terrorism, we can no longer wait for an

imminent threat against the United

States. We have to be able to move preemptively

for what might be, as is said

in this resolution, a continuing threat.

What does it mean? If you list the nations

of the world that pose any threat

to the United States, unfortunately the

list is fairly long. It would not just be

Iraq. The President’s ‘‘axis of evil’’ includes

North Korea and Iran. One

would certainly put Syria, Libya, and

maybe many other countries on that

list.

What the President’s foreign policy is

calling for is the right of the United

States to attack these countries without

provocation, without imminent

threat. That, I say to my friends in the

Senate, is a dramatic departure in foreign

policy. We are not just talking

about how to deal with Saddam Hussein,

how to deal with weapons of mass

destruction in Iraq, what to do through

the United Nations. The supporters of

this resolution are calling for a dramatic

departure in American foreign

policy.

From my point of view, it is a departure

which is unwarranted and unwise.

This is why I believe it: For over 50

years, with nuclear Armageddon facing

us, with nuclear missiles poised in the

Soviet Union and in the United States,

our position was one of deterrence. We

said, as I mentioned before, we would

not strike first. We held that position,

with some rare exceptions. That was

our position as a nation, and it prevailed.

It prevailed to overcome the Soviet

Union and, frankly, to bring the

Russians closer to our position in the

world and to bring the world closer to

peace.

Look what has happened in the last

10 years in our relationship with Iraq.

Since the Persian Gulf war, we have

made it clear to Saddam Hussein and

his leaders that if they make one bad

move with a weapon of mass destruction,

either through a terrorist organization

or directly against the United

States, its neighbors, or any of our allies,

frankly, they will pay a heavy

price. There has never been a doubt

about that. There is no doubt about

that today.

The establishment and maintenance

of the no-fly zone is our way of keeping

an eye on Saddam Hussein from start

to finish. There is not a tank or truck

that moves in Iraq today we do not

monitor. There is not a hole that is dug

and filled up we do not monitor. We

made that clear under existing foreign

policy, but this resolution says it is

time for us to change that policy. It is

time for us to argue we can preemptively

strike Iraq or any other country

before they pose a threat to the United

States. That is a dramatic change.

My amendment goes to this issue and

says the President has the authority to

use force. Let me read it specifically

because I do not want to misstate it for

my colleagues:

That is what my amendment says. It

spells that out in terms of foreign policy

that we have created, in many respects,

and honored throughout our

history. To state it as stated in this

resolution is to endorse this new rewrite

of American foreign policy and to

say in the age of terrorism that preemption

is the answer.

I asked Dr. Condoleezza Rice a question

when she came before us a few

weeks ago, as follows: If we are going

to argue that we have the right as a nation

to attack any nation we suspect

may be a threat to us, how then can

the United States play a role in the

world supporting diplomacy and peace?

How can we argue to countries that are

in incendiary relationships, such as

India and Pakistan over Kashmir, that

they should not do preemptive attacks

of their own? How do we make that argument?

Oh, she said, diplomacy is working in

Kashmir. It depends on what day of the

week that question is asked. I hope it

works. I hope peace comes to that region.

We really lose our right to argue

and demand more diplomacy and more

peacekeeping when we say the United

States may preempt any perceived

threat, but other nations in the world

should negotiate. The same can be said

of China and Taiwan and many other

places in the world.

To my colleagues I say this: This resolution

not only addresses Iraq, it

marks a significant departure in foreign

policy. I hope, even though we

have not had hearings, even though we

have not debated this at length, that

this amendment which I offer, with

just a handful of words, will call into

question whether this is the wisest policy,

whether this is a necessary policy.

Let me say this as well. I know the

United States is in a fearful and anxious

situation since the attacks of September

11, 2001. Though we have been

heartened by the strength of this Nation

and its unity, there is still a lingering

question as to whether we will

be struck again.

It is because of that anxiety, because

of that fear, I think many of us are

moving now to say, let’s do what is

necessary, let’s make the changes, let’s

get on with it.

I caution and beg my colleagues to

think twice about that. America has

faced periods of fear in its past, some

not from foreign threats but from domestic

situations.

One of the most noteworthy in our

history was the Great Depression

which faced our country when then-

President Franklin Roosevelt, in his

Inaugural Address, said:

I have listened to speeches on this

floor, speeches which have, frankly,

touched the anxiety, concerns, and fear

of America. I have heard people on this

floor lionize Saddam’s weapons of mass

destruction as a threat. The President’s

own resolution said Saddam

Hussein may launch a surprise attack

against the United States, language

which is almost, frankly, impossible to

understand in the world in which we

live.

I heard those same voices minimize

the impact of weapons of mass destruction

on the battlefields of Iraq if we

launch a land invasion to try to force

regime change.

As we know—it has been declassified

this week—our intelligence community

tells us the most likely scenario of

weapons of mass destruction to be used

against Americans is if we launch an

invasion of Iraq. Saddam Hussein

knows today if those weapons move or

are used in any way against us and our

allies, he will pay a terrible price.

Our foreign policy must not be driven

by fear. We must be vigilant. We must

be careful. But at this moment of national

concern over our vulnerability

of terrorism, we cannot lose sight of

the course which guided our Nation for

generations. As we search every corner

of our Nation and every corner of the

world for danger and threats, we can

never lose our sight on true north, and

that rock-solid reliable point is a commitment

to a rule of law, a commitment

to a foreign policy based on established

values and established standards

of international conduct.

We cannot now ignore the challenge

of Saddam Hussein. We need to address

it. We should push forward with inspections

through the United Nations, and

build a coalition of support to make

sure he is kept under control. The

Presidential resolution, which envisions

the United States standing alone,

is not the best course. The Presidential

resolution, which calls for a dramatic

departure in our foreign policy, is not

the best course.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder

of my time and yield the floor. How

much time do I have remaining?

I thank my colleague

from Connecticut, and I think it is an

honest answer. But let me tell you, I

serve on the Intelligence Committee

and I would not disclose anything I

learned there because it is classified

and top secret, but some things I can

say because they are public knowledge.

If you want to talk about threats to

the United States, let me quickly add

to that list North Korea. Currently,

North Korea has nuclear weapons.

North Korea has missiles that can deliver

that nuclear weapon to many

countries that we consider our friends

and allies in their region.

Iran may not have a nuclear weapon

today but could be further along than

Iraq is at this moment. There is scant

if little evidence that Iraq has a nuclear

weapon.

We do not trust Syria because it is a

harbor for some 12 or 15 different terrorist

organizations in Damascus, and

we certainly do not trust Libya because

of our fear of weapons of mass

destruction.

So now of all the countries I have

listed, Iraq is one of them for sure. But

I have given you five or six countries

which, under this resolution’s logic and

under this President’s new foreign policy,

we should be considering invading.

Which one and when?

Historically, we have said it is not

enough to say you have a weapon that

can hurt us. Think of 50 years of cold

war when the Soviet Union had weapons

poised and pointed at us. It is not

enough that you just have weapons. We

will watch to see if you make any effort

toward hurting anyone in the

United States, any of our citizens or

our territory.

It was a bright-line difference in our

foreign policy which we drew and an

important difference in our foreign policy.

It distinguished us from aggressor

nations. It said that we are a defensive

nation. We do not strike out at you

simply because you have a weapon if

you are not menacing or threatening to

us. Has September 11, 2001, changed

that so dramatically?

The words ‘‘imminent threat’’ have

been used throughout the history of

the United States. One of the first people

to articulate that was a man who

served on the floor of this Chamber,

Daniel Webster, who talked about anticipatory

self-defense, recognized way

back in time, in the 19th century. What

we are saying today is those rules don’t

work anymore; we are going to change

them.

I might also add, even though the

Senator from Connecticut didn’t address

it directly, as to whether Iraq is

an imminent threat, the minority leader,

Republican minority leader, Senator

LOTT, today on the floor came forward

and said, and I quote:

The words of Senator LOTT on the

floor today, recognizing the point I am

trying to make here. If the President

believes it is an imminent threat from

weapons of mass destruction, he should

have the authority to go forward.

But this is not just a matter of striking

a strong position and showing that

we have resolve. It is a matter of the

people of the United States, through

the Senate and the House, giving authority

to the President of the United

States to commit the lives of our men

and women in the U.S. Armed Forces.

I, for one, have thought long and

hard about voting for war. As I said on

September 14, 2001, I did. I would do it

again on the war on terrorism. I believe

every Senator—every Senator—

Republican and Democrat alike, takes

this responsibility particularly seriously.

I had a personal experience in my district

as a Congressman in the Persian

Gulf war. One of my friends had a son

who was in the Marines. She called me

and said: He has just been sent over

there, and I am worried to death about

him.

I said: Let’s wait and see how this

goes.

We engaged in a debate on the floor

of the House and Senate, and we gave

President Bush’s father, the President,

authority to go forward. If you remember,

we built up our troops and forces

for 6 months, the day came, and the

war began, and we were prepared, and

we were decisive; in a matter of 48

hours the war ended and I breathed a

sigh of relief. It was over quickly, and

there were just a handful—I think

about 200 American—of casualties out

of the thousands and thousands of

troops who were in harm’s way.

No sooner had I had this feeling of relief

than I got a call. One of the 200

killed in that 48-hour period was Christian

Porter, a lance corporal in the

U.S. Marine Corps, killed by friendly

fire—the son of my close friend. I went

to that funeral, faced his mother and

his father. There was little I could say.

I went to the veterans cemetery, the

National Cemetery, afterwards, as I am

sure all of the Members of the Senate

would do to pay their respects to his

family and respect to this man who

served his country.

The image of that funeral at that

service in that day is still in my mind

today as I think about the decision we

are making, about whether or not we

are just striking a position to show our

resolve or whether we are in fact, as

this resolution says, giving to this

President the authority to call into

combat men and women who will put

their lives on the line for the decision

we make today.

Is it unfair for us to say, on this side

of the debate, that we should exhaust

every reasonable and realistic option

before we engage in war? That we

should work through the United Nations

if we can find an inspection regime

that is honest, to try to lessen

the threat on the United States at any

time in the future? That we should

gather a coalition of forces?

I couldn’t disagree more with my colleague

from Texas. Yes, it is a threat

to the United States. All of the countries

I listed are threats. But why

should we bear this burden alone?

Should this burden not be shared by

our allies and those who agree with us

that we need a peaceful and civilized

world? Shouldn’t their troops be in the

field with American troops fighting

side by side for this cause? Only American

soldiers? Only American tax dollars?

Only America is assuming the responsibility

for stability when the war

on Iraq is over?

I don’t think it is a fair approach. It

is far better for us to have a coalition

working on it. But what triggers it,

goes to the heart of this amendment, is

that moment in time when this President—

and he is the one who has the authority

as Commander in Chief—says

we now face an imminent threat from

weapons of mass destruction.

What could that be? It could be the

identification of fissile material that is

now going into Iraq which could lead to

their development of a nuclear weapon.

That, in my mind, shows imminent

threat. It could be his using weapons of

mass destruction and sharing them

with terrorist organizations. That is

clearly an imminent threat. All of

these things would trigger the United

States to step forward and say now we

have to defend ourselves. But at this

point in time, none of that is here.

We are being asked, by voting on this

resolution, not to wait for the United

Nations, not to wait for a coalition,

but to move forward on a continuing

threat. Member after Member comes to

the floor and tells us: The threat

against the United States of weapons

of mass destruction is an imminent

threat. We have to take it seriously.

We have to vote on this before the election.

That is what the White House

says: We have to do it now, we have to

do it before we leave town.

Yet when you ask them to put the

words ‘‘imminent threat’’ in the resolution,

watch them scatter and run

when the vote comes to the desk here.

There will be a handful of us voting for

that, a handful of us who believe the

foreign policy which has guided the

United States for so many generations,

so successfully, which has brought us

peace and stability, should be honored

and respected even on this resolution

of great historic moment.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder

of my time. I don’t know if

there are others who wish to speak.

I thank the Chair.

The Senator is correct. The tools of

war, the incidence of war, the timing of

war has changed. But it has changed

throughout our history. The principles,

the rules of value, the norms and conduct

which we apply today were applied

starting in a much different era,

and applied again and again as we saw

ourselves move into an era of airplanes,

into an era of intercontinental

missiles. The same standards, principles,

norms, conduct, and value remain.

I do not believe the war on terrorism

is easy. But I also believe the United

States has established an international

reputation behind the rule of law—a

reputation which I am afraid is going

to be changed dramatically by this resolution.

No longer will we wait for that

imminent threat if this amendment is

defeated. It is enough for us to assert

that a country is a threat to the United

States and begin a land invasion. And

that, to me, is a dramatic change from

where the United States has always

been throughout its history.

I hope we will think twice about

that. I have no illusions about the result

of this vote. But to think we are

going to make this wholesale change in

foreign policy without the deliberations

and hearings and without a direct

debate, to me, is just wrong.

I think the Foreign Affairs Committee

and others should have taken

the President’s new foreign policy suggestions

directly and seriously and

gone forward with them. Instead,

through Saddam Hussein and the debate

on Iraq, we are about to make a

historic change in foreign policy which

I hope we do not do.

In the interest of moving this to a

vote, I not only yield the floor, but I

yield the remainder of my time.