Mr. President, I

thank my colleagues for their very

learned colloquy to make sure all Senators

have an opportunity to speak on

this extremely important issue.

As we debate whether to authorize

the President, basically, to use military

force to remove Saddam Hussein

from power and to neutralize his

emerging weapons of mass destruction

capability, I would like to offer several

observations.

The first is that the United Nations,

as an institution, has completely and

unequivocally failed to disarm Iraq

consistent with its own resolutions—

the resolutions agreed to also by Saddam

Hussein—following the Persian

Gulf war of 1991. The key word here is

to ‘‘disarm.’’

During debate on this very crucial

issue, I think we have concentrated too

much on the concept of ‘‘inspections’’

and the possibility of trying to really

somehow initiate a new inspections regime.

As a matter of fact, if you read

all of the newspaper accounts on this

issue, and if you pay attention to the

television, the radio, and the debate, it

seems to me ‘‘inspections’’ becomes the

key word. I don’t think that is the

case. The key issue is not inspections.

The key issue is disarmament.

Again, both Iraq, under the heavy

hand of Saddam Hussein, and the

United Nations, have failed in the

agreed-upon mandate to follow or take

action consistent with resolutions following

the Persian Gulf war over a decade

ago. And we are talking about actual,

transparent, real—real—disarmament.

The second observation I would like

to make is that one of the crucial reasons

both Houses of Congress should

support the Warner and the Lieberman

resolution, on behalf of the President,

as opposed to, I guess, 13 amendments

we are going to be considering—and I

do not challenge or wish to impugn any

intent on the part of any Member who

has an amendment on this important

issue—but basically one of the crucial

reasons we should really do our business

and support this resolution is that

it will, I think, strengthen the hand of

Secretary of State Powell—he told that

to us as of this week, both sides of the

body—in his efforts to convince the

U.N. Security Council to adopt new

resolutions, resolutions whose goal

would be to produce tangible—again,

not inspections—but inspections that

would lead to disarmament. There is

always that hope, and, obviously, that

would be the preferred outcome as opposed

to military action.

So it seems to me that is the goal of

the resolution we are now considering.

In that regard, let me stress that we

should act prior—prior—to the U.N. deliberations.

We should act first. We

should act in concert. To tie the hands

of this President, or any future President

with regard to matters of vital national

security interests where war or

peace hang in the balance, to subject

him to U.N. approval or action, will

constrain the freedom of action on the

part of the United States by the very

countries that are now responsible for

a decade of U.N.—U.N.—inaction and

almost irrelevance.

Let us be realistic. Let us be realistic.

Saddam Hussein has demonstrated

ad nauseam over the last 10

years that he will never permit the removal

or destruction of his weapons of

mass destruction capability. Here is

my personal view on this. He cannot,

and he will not. Now, why?

They are the very source of his authority

in Iraq as well as the Persian

Gulf. All of his ambitions—I perceive

that he perceives himself as perhaps

the heir apparent or maybe even the

reincarnation of King

Nebbuchadnezzar, Pan-Arabia. He has

demonstrated a willingness to use

weapons of mass destruction both

against his own countrymen and

against other nations. He is a student

and protege and follows the example of

Stalin. And he rules by fear.

So wishful thinking aside—and I have

wishful thinking—but wishful thinking

aside, I do not believe he is ever going

to give up and disarm—ever.

Third, any notion that the United

States itself is off limits to a massive

attack by groups that are cooperating

with or supported by Baghdad should

now be gone. It is called sanctuary for

further terrorist attacks against our

homeland. We are not off limits. We

are now terrorist targets, as proved by

9/11 and previous attacks.

Fourth, any notion that we have

time left to coast along as governments

in Iraq, Iran, or elsewhere continue

to pursue their weapons of mass

destruction programs with the possibility,

if not intent, to distribute these

technologies to fundamentalist terrorist

cells should be gone as well.

I know, while ‘‘hard evidence’’ of an

Iraqi role in the attacks of 9/11 may be

hard to prove—the so-called smoking

gun—I do not think we can afford to be

naive. Particularly in the Middle East,

terror groups and states work together

when and where their interests are

common. And their intent is the destruction

of the United States, the

murder of our citizens, and the elimination

of our influence, real and perceived.

Just yesterday, in the continuing investigation

of the September 11 attack,

in an unclassified—let me stress, unclassified—

and public hearing, I asked

the panel of witnesses—the expert witnesses—

what, after 9/11, still kept them

up at night. And I asked them what

policy drum they could or would beat

to bring about a change in policy to

safeguard our own country.

The answer was to take away the terrorists’

sanctuary; that we mistakenly

think that if we can only bring bin

Laden to justice, render the al-Qaida

harmless, then we can somehow go

back to business as usual.

That simply is not the case. I think

an error is being made in the debate on

this most important topic when we

say, now, on one hand, if we do not

take action in regard to Iraq we can

then continue the war against terrorism.

The action against Iraq is to

prevent further sanctuary for terrorism.

It is inseparable.

The stark fact of the matter is that

danger of another terrorist attack on

this country is still not a matter of if,

it is a matter of when. The distinguished

then-chairman of the Armed

Services Committee, Senator WARNER,

remembers full well creating a subcommittee

called the Subcommittee on

Emerging Threats. Three years ago we

predicted this would happen, citing

past attacks. It is not a matter of if,

but when. That condition still exists

today. It is transnational in terms of

the threat. It involves many terrorist

organizations and cells. And, yes, it is

ongoing.

Yesterday, under the heading of lessons

learned from past terrorist attacks,

the Intelligence Committee once

again heard from experts citing a common

thread of transnational, interconnected

terrorism. At our peril, difficult

connect-the-dots intelligence

analyses did not meet the threshold of

a threat warning and were ignored. We

were risk averse. The terrorists who

conducted past attacks attacked again.

There were warnings. They were not

heeded. They did not meet the criterion

of a threshold of a threat warning,

and we suffered the consequences.

They attacked at the 1993 World Trade

Center, Khobar Towers, our embassies,

the thwarted—thank goodness—attack

in regard to the Millennium, and, finally,

the U.S.S. *Cole*. The attacks are

a microcosm of the challenge we face.

If Iraq and, indeed, other regimes are

left unchallenged, my colleagues, it is

only a matter of time before they

transfer the capability for weapons of

mass destruction to a terrorist cell

that will use that capability against

the United States.

Now, remember, the criminal justice

model of gathering evidence and presenting

a case does not apply here. By

the time you have evidence, it is too

late. We will not lose buildings and

thousands of people when that happens.

We will lose whole cities and hundreds

of thousands of people.

Iraq is absolutely a component in the

war against terrorism. Let me try to

make that point. In light of the events

of September 11, 2001, I believe this

body has more reason to support action

against Iraq than it had in the winter

of 1991. That is a pretty strong statement.

Because preventing weapons of

mass destruction from being acquired

by terrorist cells should be the No. 1

policy priority of this Federal Government.

This means neutralizing regimes

that possess or seek such weapons and

are predisposed to harboring, assisting,

sympathizing with the bin Ladens of

the world. That is a real priority for

us.

Yes, there is more than one fundamentalist

maniac with a significant

and diverse following.

I support the resolution endorsed by

the White House and sponsored by Senators

LIEBERMAN and WARNER because I

think our President realizes—most

Senators realize—what leaders like

Abraham Lincoln and Harry Truman

realized: No matter what the shortterm

consequences would be in regards

to politics, American survival must be

assured. It is a first priority. It is our

highest agenda.

There is reasonable concern about

downside risk. You bet there is. I have

those concerns. I share those concerns.

I have been listening to these concerns

during the debate on this subject. We

have had several days of very good debate.

The President and his national

security team know that. All Members

of the House and Senate and all thinking

Americans know that. Yes, there is

real concern.

I am a member of the Armed Services

Committee and the Select Committee

on Intelligence. I have asked question

after question after question in the

‘‘what if’’ category. What if Saddam

Hussein uses his weapons of mass destruction—

of course, that means he has

reconstituted his weapons of mass destruction

capability, posing an ever-increasing

threat—what if he uses those

reconstituted weapons of mass destruction

against our troops, against Gulf

State partners that will support us,

against Israel, or against his own people?

He has done that before. Will

Israel, if attacked, simply remain on

the sidelines? Will we see prolonged

combat? Will there be a violent upheaval

in the Mideast, in the Arab nations?

What happens if we win? There has

been a lot of discussion about that.

How long will we have to stay? What

kind of infrastructure improvements

will we have to pay for if, in fact, that

is the case? What do we win? How do

you win a war against a tyrant who

may well destroy his own country and

kill his own people, blame us, or who

would launch or sponsor a terrorist attack

in the United States as a result of

our involvement, all in the name of

self-preservation?

Those are tough questions. Those are

very real concerns. The distinguished

Senator from West Virginia indicated

we need more time to answer these

concerns. How many casualties if, in

fact, we go into military action against

Iraq? Mrs. BOXER, the distinguished

Senator from California, asked the

question, how much will it cost? Maybe

it was reversed. Maybe Senator BYRD

asked that question, and Senator

BOXER asked about casualties. What

about military tactics? I must say that

is probably the last thing I hope the

Pentagon would share with the Congress,

for obvious reasons. What about

the sacrifices in regards to the American

people? How much will it cost?

All of these concerns and all of these

dangers are real. But, my colleagues,

there are no specific and easy answers

to these questions. As much as we

would like otherwise, the intelligence

community and the President and the

administration, our military cannot

provide absolute, specific answers.

They can try to be specific, but absolute

answers? I am sorry. They do provide

estimates, based upon the best collection

and analysis that is possible.

This debate and the issues at hand

demand candor. President Bush has

been candid. As the President said, the

hope is we don’t have to take military

action. But if that becomes necessary,

it will be difficult. Time after time in

history, and in repeated testimony

from those within our intelligence

community, we see the greatest risk is

to do nothing. We are not free unless

we are free from fear. Americans have

known fear—be it during the Cuban

missile crisis or in the aftermath of

Pearl Harbor or the attacks on the

World Trade Center and Pentagon. We

must not, however, accept fear as our

destiny. We must be proactive in regards

to national security.

We must be preemptive. Yes, preemptive,

that new doctrine that is causing

a rethink of our foreign policy, our

military strategy, our politics, our foreign

relations. It is a brand new world.

It is an asymmetrical world. It is a

world that was written about by Samuel

P. Huntington when he wrote the

book ‘‘The Clash of Civilizations and

the Remaking of the World Order,’’ the

preemption doctrine. Here we are and

we are debating it.

Make no mistake, this has nothing to

do with partisan rivalry. This is about

our future, both immediate and long

term. This is the state of affairs we

leave for our children and our grandchildren.

Senator WARNER just made a statement

on the floor I am going to quote

again, almost 40 years ago to this date,

when President John F. Kennedy addressed

the Nation in regard to the

Cuban missile crisis. He said:

Here is the key phrase:

In that regard, I hope we follow

President Kennedy’s advice. I urge my

colleagues to support the resolution introduced

by Senators WARNER and

LIEBERMAN and to oppose the various 13

amendments that would weaken the

resolution and our resolve.

I ask unanimous consent that an article

entitled ‘‘A Chronology of Defiance’’

by Michael Kelly; an article

called ‘‘The Myth of U.N. Support’’ by

Charles Krauthammer; and an article,

‘‘The Weight of American Empire,’’

which talks in detail about the new

policy of preemption, by John Keegan,

be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the

RECORD, as follows: