Mr. President, I

congratulate my friend, the Senator

from Arkansas, for an excellent presentation

covering all the points. And if I

had not been persuaded before I listened

to him tonight, I would have

been persuaded tonight.

This Nation has spent many dollars

and many lives in defense of others

around the world. Tonight, we are considering

a resolution that has to do

with the defense of ourselves.

People say that because our country

does not go against another country

without provocation that we should

make the case of the need to take action,

and that is true. We need to make

that case before the world and before

the American people.

I believe that case has been made. It

is a case that has been made upon, basically,

facts we have known for a long

time and have chosen to ignore and

sweep under the rug. It is based on a

shared history that we have had together

now for many years. And looking

back on it, we must ask ourselves,

How were we able to ignore what is so

obvious and pending for so long?

We know Saddam’s willingness to attack

sovereign nations. We know

Saddam’s willingness to murder innocent

individuals. We know he is in possession

of weapons of mass destruction.

We know he is developing missile capability

that is beyond what is allowable

by the United Nations resolutions and

will rapidly be able to reach further

and further. The only thing we do not

know is how soon it is going to take

him to develop nuclear weapons.

I think that is essentially, from a

factual standpoint, what this entire debate

is about, because if, in fact, it is

true that he, in the foreseeable future,

will have nuclear weapons, do any of

these other points that we have been

discussing really stand?

I think I have listened to many valid

points and valid arguments of problems

connected with moving against Saddam

Hussein. I think the points that

were made that the aftermath is going

to be very difficult are very valid. I

think the point that he might lash

back against us in some way is a very

valid concern. I think the point that in

some places in the world they will be

taking to the streets against us is a

valid considerations.

But if, in fact, it is true that in the

foreseeable future he might or probably

will develop nuclear weapons of mass

destruction, do any of these other considerations

really stand up or do they

together stand up to that consideration?

Can we afford not to defend ourselves

against that consideration?

What is the evidence pertaining to

that? We are debating, again, not over

whether or not he is going to have it,

but how soon he is going to have it.

Unfortunately, when we have made

estimates in times past with regard to

Saddam’s nuclear capability in the

early 1990s, with regard to missile capabilities

of rogue nations, when we

have gone back and thoroughly examined

the situation—where, in Saddam’s

case, we have gotten inspectors in

there because of defectors’ information—

we have found that we have

grossly underestimated the capability

of our adversaries, time and time

again.

Yet we are told by the entire world,

those who have looked at this, that it

is just a matter of time, a few years, if

he has to develop his own fissile material,

and perhaps as early as a few

months or a year if he can buy it on

the open market.

I was privileged to listen to some of

the weapons inspectors who went down

to Iraq. I listened to some of the experiences

they had. It caused me great

concern to hear their lament about the

way they were thwarted before and how

hopeless their mission turned out to be

because of what Saddam was doing, and

how inspections in the future really

will not work unless you actually get

active cooperation from the people you

are inspecting. I am talking about a

country, what, the size of California,

with an ability to hide anything almost

anywhere.

And they talked about the fact that

when they went in before, they did not

think Saddam had much in the way of

nuclear. And they even were almost to

the point of being able to certify that

when a defector gave them some information.

They went back. They found

that not only had Saddam developed

nuclear infrastructure, but he had a

virtual ‘‘Manhattan Project’’ is the

way they put it, a virtual ‘‘Nuclear

Manhattan Project’’ when they went in

there before.

They said they had a facility there

that was based on the facility down in

Tennessee in Oak Ridge in terms of enriching

uranium.

This is what was there before. We do

not know what he has now because he

has made the decision to keep out inspectors.

And we know from the CIA—

a letter has been introduced in this

RECORD—that the likelihood of Saddam

using weapons of mass destruction for

blackmail, deterrence, or otherwise

grows as his arsenal builds.

Now he has been down there for 4

years. We know he has the science. We

know he has the know-how. We know

he has the scientists. We know he has

the desire. We know he has a history of

knowing how to build facilities that

will ultimately produce results for

him. And we are standing here debating

as to whether or not we should do

something about that because we

might have a little more time and we

don’t have eyewitness testimony as to

precisely where he is at precisely this

particular time.

Those are things that have been on

the record along with his violation of

U.N. demands for many years. We have

taken them for granted. We have taken

for granted that hundreds of times our

airmen have been shot at in the no-fly

zone during all of this time. I have always

wondered what the parents of

someone shot down under those circumstances

must feel like, being that

far away, defending the interests of

your country. Nobody knows about it.

Nobody talks about it. Nobody seemingly

cares that much about it. That

has been going on continually ever

since we left the gulf.

These are things that are on the public

record. They have been on the public

record for a long time. We now have

some additional facts that have not

been on the public record that long,

such as the fact he is busily trying to

obtain dual-use equipment that can be

used for uranium enrichment.

We know more about his relationship

with al-Qaida than we knew in times

past.

Again, according to the CIA director:

He says:

He says:

These are recent things that are not

as well known, have not been known

over the years. Put all of that information

together and you have a consensus

spending a lot of time arguing over the

things we disagree on. They are important.

But I think we all agree the leader

of Iraq is dangerous; that he is a

threat; that that threat is growing, not

diminishing; and that he is in violation

of international law.

The real issue is whether or not it is

going to be easier to deal with this situation

once he gets stronger than he is

today. The question answers itself.

The other question is whether or not

we will show a reluctance to defend our

own interests. We are rightfully concerned

about acting precipitously. But

did we act precipitously after the first

World Trade Center bombing? Did we

act precipitously after our men and

women were killed in the Khobar Towers

bombing? What was the message we

sent after our two embassies were

bombed and hundreds of people were

killed? Were we acting precipitously

after that? What did we do to avenge

that or to set an example? What did we

do after the *Cole* incident? Were we acting

precipitously there? Or have we announced

to the world, basically, or led

Osama bin Laden to believe that we

can be attacked that the response will

not be commensurate with the attack?

That is Osama bin Laden. We are talking

about Saddam Hussein here, but

the lesson is the same for tyrants

throughout the world who pose a

threat to this country. It has been a

bad lesson that we have given for well

over a decade now.

Some say we should wait until there

is an imminent danger; that we should

calibrate carefully as to when that

danger we know is growing becomes

imminent; that we should tell Saddam

Hussein on the front end we will not

attack him until we know he poses not

only a danger but an imminent threat.

That, of course, is basically consistent

with the United Nations charter. It has

been the law of nations for a long time.

We have to recognize that. The Treaty

of Westphalia was mentioned, back in

the 1600s, where the sovereign nations

got together and decided that sovereign

nations would not be attacked.

We have perfected that somewhat.

We have talked about imminent danger

because traditionally we lived in a

world where armies amassed on a border

and that was the imminent danger.

September 11 changed all that. That is

not the kind of world we live in anymore.

The imminent danger facing this

country now does not amass itself on

the border and give everybody time to

debate and make up their minds as to

what they are going to do. The threats

we face today hide their activities. The

threats we face today are not always

apparent.

Let there be no mistake about it, the

United States is the target. It is the

primary target. No one likes the sound

of the word unilateralism. But is there

anyone who disagrees with the action

the Israelis took in 1981, when they

took out the Osiraq nuclear plant in

Iraq? I am really curious. There is a

case of unilateralism if there ever was

one. Was there any imminent threat? I

don’t even know if the plant was finished

yet. But either way, there was no

imminent threat that I know of that

they were getting ready to produce material

out of there to put in a bomb to

attack Israel.

They took it out. The United Nations

condemned them. We condemned them.

But is there anyone today who is really

regretful the Israelis took that action?

I would think under that theory, if

we had to wait for imminent danger,

we would have to ask ourselves, imminent

with regard to our allies, would

that count? With regard to our troops

in the area, would that count? With regard

to the homeland only? Those

would be questions we would have to

ask.

We would have to ask ourselves: Does

that not mean, under the philosophy of

waiting for the imminent threat, we

would have to wait not only until we

had ironclad proof Saddam had nuclear

capability and the means to deliver it,

but that he was planning on actually

hitting us with it? I don’t think we

have thought that fully through. Surely

that is not what we are suggesting,

that we almost have to have a missile

in the air before we could act.

It is somewhat of a precedent. It

would be, if it comes to that. But we

are in a position no other country has

ever been in, as the Senator from Arkansas

pointed out. We are living in a

world no one has ever lived in before,

where a handful of people can take

modern technology and create a mortal

threat to millions of people on the

other side of the world. We simply have

to address the fact that is the world we

live in.

Some say we should wait on the

United Nations. That essentially goes

to the heart of the amendment we are

considering. I respectfully suggest if we

pass this amendment, it would be a

guarantee the United Nations would

never act, because they would know

they didn’t have to. And so many who

would rather avoid this because the

United States is the target, and for

other reasons, would never, ever face

up to it, if they knew they didn’t have

to. Then I would ask: Where would we

be? Some say, come back to the Senate

in that weakened condition.

Would we be in better shape having

been turned down by the U.N. if we

then went ahead in contravention of

what they said or would it be better to

stand tall on the front end, with the assurance

that many countries in the

United Nations are going to support us

in our effort?

The President has gone there and he

has made the case. He has talked to

our allies. The Secretary of State has

been busy around the world. When people

say we are going it alone, do not

the British count? Does not Spain

count? Does not Italy count? Do not

the Arab nations I read about today in

the paper, who are reluctantly coming

along, count?

I think we should go back and look

at where former President Bush was at

this stage of the proceedings. I think

the first thing that happened there was

he said this will not stand. Then he

went internationally, and then the

British came first, and then there was

a period of time before very many people

came forward after the British.

Speaking of the British, I think it is

ironic that the head of that government,

in many respects, sees things

more clearly than many of us do.

The problem—as difficult as it is to

acknowledge, but it is the plain truth—

is we have lost the coalition we had before.

We would like to go right back

and say: Remember how we were together

before, and remember how we

made such progress, military progress,

and there for a while we had Saddam

Hussein on the ropes and we laid down

all these requirements. In order for us

to go home, he had to make all these

agreements, and he did make those

agreements. Remember how we were

together then before he violated each

and every one of them, and gradually,

year by year, we not only allowed that

to happen, but one ally after another

started doing business with him. We

are now asked to go before a Security

Council containing the country of

China, which is now furnishing

fiberoptics communications systems to

Saddam to help shoot our airplanes

down. Are they the ones we are supposed

to ask permission to defend our

self-interests?

We are looking at a Security Council

with our friends, the Russians and the

French, who want to do business with

Saddam, and Saddam owes them

money and they want that money

back. Sure, the Arabs are kind of reluctant

right now. And we are dealing

with our now German friends who are

led by an individual who will demagog

his way to reelection on the backs of

our country and, presumably, international

relations.

It is not an easy thing to say, but it

is a true thing to say. We want our

friends, our allies, and especially our

NATO partners; but as they continue

to let their defense budgets slide and

the American taxpayer continues to

have to foot the bill for the free world,

essentially, should they be given a veto

when our interests are so directly involved?

I think not.

I think we have to learn the lessons

of the past, as difficult as it is. My

friend from Arkansas mentioned

Churchill. They didn’t listen to

Churchill after World War I. The result

of their not listening to him was called

World War II. Back when Hitler was on

the move everything he did was not

sufficient in and of itself to act. The allies

thought they could always act

later, and other countries should do

other things—excuse after excuse.

That is not the message we want to

send this time, Mr. President. I think

it is clear that strength is the only

hope we have for peace, and if we cannot

have peace, we must do what is in

the vital interest of this country.

I yield the floor.