Mr. President, any

contemplation of the use of military

force is a very serious matter and calls

for the Congress, the peoples’ representatives,

to be engaged and to discuss

and debate the issue. I do not believe

the Lord is pleased when his children

fight—and according to my faith,

all people are creatures of one Lord and

precious in his sight.

In my view the resort to war can

never be considered something to glory

in but must be viewed as an act that is

taken as a result of human failure, and

where after serious consideration, it is

concluded that alternatives are worse.

When the status quo presents more

dangers than the war the most just, the

most logical, the most moral thing is

to fight. I wish it were not so but my

experience and my best judgement tells

me this is the way we live in this transitory

world. I truly respect the pacifist—

it is a position with a long and

honored tradition in my faith—but

whether it is by judgement or lack of

faith, I do not go there.

To have a just war one must reasonably

believe the ultimate goal of the

violence will be to produce a good result—

a better condition than existed

before. And while as leaders of the people

of the United States we must focus

primarily on the just national security

interests of our country, we, as enlightened,

moral and decent people,

ought to ask ourselves, whether our actions

will ultimately benefit the world

and even our adversary. Will the future

for all be better or not?

Further, we should consider our national

heritage of promoting peace,

freedom and prosperity. War obviously

destroys peace, but if the result can be

to create a safer and more peaceful

world, war can be an instrument of

peace.

Afghanistan has had two decades of

war. Our strong military action to totally

defeat the Taliban government

has given that brutalized country its

best chance for peace, freedom and

prosperity in generations. We cannot

guarantee it, but great optimism exists

for a positive future that could never

have been possible under the oppressive,

hateful, bigoted Taliban.

The practitioners of the art of

‘‘realpolitic’’ may sneer at the concept

of free countries in the Arab world, but

I am proud of the results of our military

action in Afghanistan, not only

because it represented just retribution

for their support of attacks on the

United States but also because we have

left that oppressed country better than

we found it. We liberated the people of

Afghanistan from the most brutal circumstances.

Can anyone forget the scenes of men

beating women on the streets for the

most insignificant or imagined acts?

No, I am proud of our wise and brilliant

use of force.

I also remember such actions played

a positive role in our nation’s founding.

Indeed, one can go down to Yorktown,

as I did recently, and visit the site of

the final American victory over the

British. As one considers that climactic

victory, after years of war and

many defeats inflicted by the skilled

British military, one learns that our

victory would not have been possible

but for the intervention of the large

French fleet at Yorktown, and that

fleet’s victory over the British in a

major battle.

With no ability to retreat or resupply,

the cornered General Cornwallis

had no choice but to surrender. This

French action aided our liberation immensely

and have served as a bond of

loyalty between our nations even to

this day. If the French were justified in

the use of military force to help liberate

us, may not our use of force in

years to come be seen by the world and

the people of Iraq in the same positive

way. Can such a positive result be

guaranteed? Of course not, but I and

many others believe the chances for

any improved Iraq’s government are

greater than some think.

Still, we must clearly remember that

we cannot guarantee any nation, so liberated,

future success. There are limits

on our power, our reach and our resources.

I am very pleased that under

the leadership of President Bush and

Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, we

have only a few more soldiers in Afghanistan

than we have in Kosovo. The

fate of Afghanistan will be up to their

people ultimately. We can help, and we

have, but their final fate will be in

their hands—as it should be.

It is also important to consider that

the threats to the United States do not

come from free and prosperous states

but failing ones. They fail because of

flawed governments.

Thus, I say the President is right to

reject a half century of valueless, cynical,

diplomatic wordplay, words that

sound good but are totally disconnected

from reality, and to establish a

new foreign policy based on our venerable

heritage of honest and direct discussion

of issues and values.

I am somewhat puzzled that those

who have long advocated our taking

steps to aid poor countries in the world

do not recognize the possibilities for

good that can come from a change in

government. It seems there is still a

strong strain of ‘‘blame America first’’

about. Many had rather complain

about our imperfections, real or imagined,

than to see the possibilities for a

better world.

I strongly believe that America is a

force for good in the world. The London

based ‘‘Economist’’ magazine has recently

produced a special insert for

that magazine called ‘‘Present at the

Creation: A Survey of America’s World

Role’’. It concludes that a strong

America is good for the world and

notes that America’s national interest,

‘‘offers the clearest match there is to a

world interest. The desire for

unimpeded trade, the rule of law, safety

and security, the protection of property

and the free movement of property

and capital match world needs, not just

American ones.’’

We are a good, decent and, yes, powerful

world leader. I am proud of our

history of being, time after time, on

the right side of world issues and am

very pleased we have a President that

understands the new world we are in

and who has the courage worthy of the

great people he leads.

It is important to point out that if

force cannot be avoided, our action will

not be against the people of Iraq or the

nation of Iraq, but it will be against

the brutal, illegal, Saddam Hussein regime.

It is a regime that has caused

more destruction than any existing in

the world today. The people of Iraq will

be the greatest beneficiaries of our victory.

At this moment, pursuant to U.N.

resolutions, our forces are attempting

to enforce an embargo against Iraq. It

has been only partially successful and

it is leaking more and more. The Arab

world complains, with much truth,

that the embargo only hurts the people,

the children of Iraq. Saddam Hussein

continues to build places and

weapons of mass destruction while his

people suffer.

It has been eleven years. How long

must the United States continue to

carry this burden to enforce a policy

that is not significantly hurting the regime

but hurts innocent civilians? How

can we justify this morally?

There are certainly dangers in military

action. While we can hope and believe

that if war commences it will go

well and that our people will be viewed

as liberators and that many Iraqi

forces will not fight but defect to our

side. We cannot know that. While I am

certain we will prevail, I cannot know

for certain how tough this war will be.

We must recognize there are dangers.

The American people understand there

are risks and so do all of us. One thing

is sure, our magnificent military will

work tirelessly to prevail in this conflict

with the lowest possible number of

personnel killed or injured. But, we

know the risks are great and losses

could be great. While our forces will

work to minimize civilian casualties

and to solicit Iraqi military units to

defect, such is not certain. There could

be civilian losses.

As to the risk of an attack on Israel,

cited by many, we should ask what

Israel has to say about it. They are

clear. It is a decision that is left to the

United States. If you must act, do so.

Israel is prepared to take the risk.

Well, that’s the big picture as I see

it. Our motive is good, our goals positive

and realistic, and our leaders honest,

careful, principled and have the

courage to act on those beliefs. Some

jaded politicos sneer and say that this

is just politics, but I know it is not. I

know the vision that President Bush

has to protect his people and improve

the world. His courage has already

placed him at personal risk. These people,

after all, have tried to assassinate

one former President of the United

States. In addition, in acting on his beliefs,

he is laying it all on the line. He

has told us repeatedly he would not

look to polls to decide what actions he

should take as our leader.

President Bush is acting honorably

and with integrity. He is informing the

American people, consulting with Congress,

conferring with world leaders

and trying to work with the U.N. apparatus.

He has altered his tactics to win

support from others, but his goal has

not changed. Ultimately, if his views

are proven false, and all the predicted

disasters come true then he will surely

pay the price at the ballot box. But, I

don’t think so. Neither do most of

those in this body. I think he is correct

and though the road may be difficult

and dangerous, I am confident his Iraq

policies will succeed as have his policies

in Afghanistan. I truly believe

that peace, freedom, security and prosperity

will be enhanced not reduced as

a result of our actions.

It is important to recognize that

while this resolution could lead to war,

it also offers the best chance we have

to avoid war and to achieve security.

The distinguished Democratic Chairman

of the Foreign Relations Committee

has objected to the President’s

statement that he has not decided to

go to war while he asks for a resolution

to allow war. But, this is not contradictory.

This Congress knows the

score. We know Saddam Hussein’s deceitful

manipulations, his lies, his violence

against the Iraqi people and their

neighbors, and the constant attacks

against our aircraft, even firing on

them with missiles this last week. We

know he only allowed inspectors into

Iraq in 1991 to save his regime. He did

it out of fear.

I agree with former President Clinton’s

National Security Advisor, Sandy

Berger, who said at an Armed Services

hearing, that he thinks it is unlikely

that Saddam will ever accept ‘‘unfettered’’

inspections. A strong resolution

is essential so that Saddam Hussein

knows there will not be another Congressional

session to meet and discuss

these same issues again. He must know

without the slightest doubt, that the

man he is dealing with, President

George W. Bush, has full and complete

authority, as commander-in-chief, to

use our armed forces to protect our security

and to remove him from power,

if need be, if he does not comply and

disarm.

Who knows, in that case maybe he

will relent. Nothing clears the mind so

well as the absence of alternatives.

Maybe he would choose to abdicate

and allow a new government to be

formed. Maybe parts of his army would

defect, or parts of his country would

revolt. Indeed, the ‘‘Washington

Times’’, running an article from the

‘‘London Daily Telegraph’’ reports yesterday

that

One defector came from the Iraqi security

services, which form the regime’s

nerve center. Kurdish groups

say:

today that there are many possibilities

for a regime change without a war. He

notes Idi Amin took exile. As the pressure

mounts, as the circle tightens,

these are among possibilities for

achieving our goals short of a full scale

conflict.

Yes, it is quite true that the President

has requested our authorization

to use force, but he still hopes he will

not have to use it. For us to not grant

him that authority would be only to

allow the President to continue negotiations

but require him to come back

to Congress another time (while we are

in recess perhaps) for an authorization

to use force. To state that position is

to expose its fatal flaw. Such an action

would eliminate any chance for a real

agreement.

Saddam Hussein will know what we

have done. He will know that the President

cannot until Congress meets

again. He will know that the fateful

moment has not come, and that he can

continue to delay and maneuver. Clearly,

we must authorize the use of force

if the President finds it necessary. Otherwise

this whole process is a charade.

I am confident a majority in this body

understand this fundamental concept,

or else, the strong vote that is coming

would not occur.

Some say, we are acting unilaterally,

‘‘upsetting’’ the little nations. But, it

was not the United States that invaded

Iran resulting in a prolonged and brutal

war costing over one million lives.

It was not the United States that invaded

Kuwait, precipitating an international

effort, overwhelmingly led by

America, to roll back Saddam’s conquest.

It was not the United States

that has systematically violated 16

U.N. resolutions—resolutions Saddam

Hussein agreed to in order to save his

regime.

The unilateralist is Saddam Hussein.

The United States, on the other hand,

has worked assiduously with our allies,

Arab nations, other nations and the

United Nations to develop a policy that

will end the menace presented by Saddam

Hussein.

Only the ‘‘blame America first

crowd’’ would make such an argument.

Indeed, we have been patient many

times over these eleven years. So patient,

so docile, that it has encouraged

Saddam Hussein to miscalculation.

Amazingly, several Senators have objected

to the resolution because they

believe we must have the full support

of the United Nations. This is suggested

in several ways.

They argue, ‘‘Why now?’’ Why not let

the United Nations vote first. Why not

have the Congress ‘‘come in behind a U.

N. resolution?’’

This argument is dangerous and

counter-productive to our goals. Unless,

of course, one’s real goal is simply

to wish the whole matter to go away

and to not bring it to a head.

First, a U.N. Resolution is very hard

to obtain. The primary problem is that

any resolution can be vetoed by any

one of the permanent security council

members, which includes China, Russia

and France. These countries may demand

concessions in exchange for their

votes. They may just refuse. No reason

is required.

Secondly, this is our military. Funded,

built and staffed by Americans. The

American people did not sacrifice to

create the greatest military in history

to allow China, Russia or even France

to have a veto over its use. It is no

wonder that these nations would like,

through the mechanism of the United

Nations, to seize control over our military

and to use it as they will. The

wonder is why we are even discussing it

seriously. Of course, we want to solicit

the United Nation’s support and aid.

After all, Saddam Hussein is in violation

of sixteen U.N. Resolutions. Why

is the U.N. not anxious to act to bring

him into compliance? Former Secretary

of Defense James Schlessinger

said recently in an Armed Services

hearing that,

The President has frankly and courageously

framed the question to the

U.N. He has stated plainly that Saddam

Hussein is in violation of sixteen

U.N. Resolutions and is a danger to the

region and the world. He has made it

clear that it is his duty to protect the

American people from this threat and

that he intends to do so. But, he expressed

support for the U.N. programs

and urged the U.N. to take action, to

be a relevant player in this crisis. He

urged the U.N. not to sit on the sidelines.

He made it clear that no change

was unacceptable. Since then he has

worked steadfastly to win the necessary

support in the U.N. and the Security

Council. He has humored, maneuvered,

pleaded and, I am sure

‘‘\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_promised’’ to gain support. Maybe the

U.N. will arouse itself and take action.

Nothing could do more for its credibility.

But there are limits. This Congress

must not crawfish or we will thereby

tell Russia or France that they have a

veto over our actions. It will encourage

their resistance. If Russia knows Congress

has allowed them to decide the

issue, their power is even greater—it is

absolute.

Now, if members of this body oppose

bringing the Iraq matter to a head and

oppose any use of military force then

let them come out and say so. It is

wrong, however, and harmful to America

to take an indirect approach that

gives the appearance of support but

which would undermine the execution

of our policy.

Yes, it would be very desirable to

have U.N. support to deal with the Iraq

problem. But, the best way to get it is

to let them know we will act even if

they don’t.

I agree with former Secretary of Defense

James Schlessinger that while

the doctrine of prevention is sound and

historical and has been applied in

tougher cases than this, it is not necessary

here. Schlessinger rightly says

that,

The truth is, we have been at war

with Iraq since 1991. In essence, Saddam

Hussein sued for peace to save his

regime. The world in effect said we will

end hostilities, but you must give up

your weapons of mass destruction and

agree to full inspections to prove that

you have.

Since then, we fly missions every day

to enforce the northern and southern

no-fly zones. Iraq fires surface-to-air

missiles at our planes almost daily and

we bomb in response regularly. Iraq

has shot down three of our predator,

unmanned aircraft, in recent months.

We defend the Kurds. We keep forces in

Kuwait and in the region to deter another

attack by Iraq. The war has

never ended. In 1988, the Congress

voted for the ‘‘Iraq Liberation Act’’.

We declared it U.S. policy to effect a

regime change in Iraq and authorized

the President to carry out that policy.

In fact, it gave five million dollars to

Iraqi resistance forces and called for

trying Iraqi leaders for war crimes.

Those who are reluctant to use force

have focused on concerns about the

idea of using pre-emptive force to protect

our security. They have forgotten

the war has never ended, that our aircraft

pilots are being fired at daily.

It is undisputed that our actions are

taken as part of a U.N. program to protect

the world from Saddam Hussein’s

aggression.

Thus, we have every basis to use

force to enforce the agreements Saddam

Hussein made and to react to the

hostile fire he brings to bear against

us.

My fear is that the President is being

forced to deal with the tendency to

move to the lowest common denominator

that always results from U.N. negotiations,

and will not be able to obtain

the clarity we need from any resolution

approved by the Security Council.

So far, he has been courageous and

effective. Let us stand with him so we

can enhance the chances of a good resolution,

not undermine his efforts with

a lack of support.

Regardless, it must continue to be

clear that no one nation or group of nations

will be allowed to block our duty

to defend our people. Especially when

we are dealing with a regime that violates

U.N. resolutions and continually

directs hostile fire at U.S. forces.

This is an important time for America.

We have a duty to protect our nation

and our deployed forces from attack.

We have the ability to do so. Our

superb military personnel stand ready

to put themselves at risk to promote

our just national interests.

We are fully justified in acting under

the venerable doctrine of preventing an

attack upon ourselves. When there is a

smoking gun or a mushroom cloud it is

too late.

For those who have anxiety about

the pre-emption doctrine, and I do not

in this case, I urge them to remember

that we have been in an actual state of

military hostilities with Iraq almost

since 1991. He shoots at our pilots and

aircraft regularly. He has violated, in

16 ways, the conditions that he agreed

to save his evil regime.

Let’s not waiver, let’s not delay, let’s

not go wobbly. Let us produce a strong

vote for this strong resolution. Then

the situation will become clear. We

will say to Saddam Hussein, once and

for all, you will disarm or, like the

Taliban, you will fall.

I yield the floor.