Statement of Representative Peter DeFazio
Against Authorizing War with Iraq
October 10, 2002

Mr. Speaker, authorizing war is one of the most solemn of constitutional duties afforded to Members of Congress. War, by definition, alters the course of world history.

The question I've asked myself is, would war with Iraq, at this time, under the international and domestic circumstances in which we find ourselves, based on the evidence available, for the purposes articulated by President Bush, enhance our national security and alter the course of world history for the better? I've concluded the answer is no.

I supported the authorization of force resolution in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on U.S. soil. There may be circumstances in the future under which I could support military action against Iraq. But, now is not the time. The circumstances don't justify a war.

In my opinion, the Administration has failed to provide convincing evidence that Saddam Hussein poses such an imminent threat to the security of the United States that we should launch, for the first time in our history, a preemptive, possibly unilateral, invasion of another sovereign nation for the purposes of overthrowing the leader of that nation.

The questions and concerns I have raised echo those raised by the thousands of average Americans from Southwest Oregon who have contacted me to express their opposition and concerns regarding a possible war with Iraq.

They echo those raised by Members of Congress from the President's own party.

And, they echo those raised by distinguished former members of the U.S. armed forces and intelligence agencies, including Anthony Zinni, Norman Schwartzkopf, Brent Scowcroft, and Wesley Clark.

Retired Marine Corps General Zinni, who preceded Army General Tommy Franks as head of the U.S. Central Command, has said, "I'm not convinced we need to do this now. I believe he is containable at this moment." At a recent speech before the Middle East Institute in Washington, D.C., Zinni listed other priorities that should take precedent in our foreign policy, including re-energizing the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, encouraging reform in Iran, and resolving the ongoing problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan to make sure al Qaeda can't rise from the ashes. He concluded that war with Iraq should be far down the list of priorities. He said, "My personal view is I think this isn't number one; it's maybe sixth or seventh."

Questions and caution should be encouraged, not dismissed, when it comes to issues of war and peace. We cannot blithely send young Americans to die in the Iraqi desert.

As Senator Robert LaFollette said in 1917, "Our government, above all others, is founded on the right of the people freely to discuss all matters pertaining to their Government, in war not less than in peace, for in this Government, the people are the rulers in war no less than in peace."

I have concerns both with the arguments used by President Bush to justify a war with Iraq and, just as importantly, the challenges brought by war that the President and his cabinet members refuse to acknowledge.

Saddam Hussein is a tyrant. He is a brutal dictator who violates all standards of human decency. He has invaded sovereign neighbors, abused his own people, used chemical and biological weapons, attempted to develop nuclear weapons, and refused to comply with United Nations resolutions enacted in the wake of the Gulf War. But, those facts have been true for more than a decade. Has the threat posed by Hussein become more imminent in the last several months, or will it become so in the near future? I've posed that question to the Administration. I have yet to receive an answer. I have been provided with no evidence that would cause me to believe Iraq poses a more significant threat today than one or two years ago when the Bush Administration was content with containment and deterrence.

It is disingenuous for proponents to claim that the alternative to an invasion is doing nothing. I am not advocating for standing by and allowing Saddam Hussein to do as he pleases. The alternative others and myself have advocated is pushing for readmission of United Nations (UN) weapons inspectors without conditions. If that fails, we can then consider whether an invasion is worth the risk. I would note that Iraq recently agreed to weapons inspections and met with Hans Blix, the head of the UN inspection team, to discuss the details of re-admittance. While the agreement reached with the UN does not go as far as the Bush Administration would like, it represents reasonable progress.

Some have argued that Saddam Hussein would obstruct weapons inspectors to such an extent that inspections would be rendered useless. In fact, members of the Bush Administration have argued that disarming Iraq can't happen without overthrowing Hussein. I believe the weapons inspectors deserve far more credit. Previous inspections were successful in containing and destroying Iraq's nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons programs.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair recently issued a lengthy report that refutes the argument that weapons inspections cannot lead to disarmament. Page 39 of the Blair report notes, "Despite the conduct of the Iraqi authorities towards them, both UNSCOM and the IAEA Action Team have valuable records of achievement in discovering and exposing Iraq's biological weapons programme and destroying very large quantities of chemical weapons stocks and missiles as well as the infrastructure for Iraq's nuclear weapons programme." The report goes on to say that the International Atomic Energy Association succeeded in completely destroying Iraq's nuclear weapons capability by 1998.

Given the high probability that weapons inspections could keep Iraq's weapons programs in check, as previous experience confirms, I believe it is premature to conclude that a military invasion of Iraq is necessary to address any threat Iraq may pose.

The Bush Administration's case for war rests on the underlying premise that it is acceptable to attack another sovereign nation that may or may not, at some undefined time in the future, have the capability and intention of attacking us. The Bush Administration argued in favor of such preemptive attacks in the recently issued National Security Strategy of the United States. That document says, "…we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right to self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country."

The President's strategy of preemptive military invasion is unprecedented. According to the non-partisan Congressional Research Service, the United States has never launched a preemptive military invasion of this sort.

With the United States setting a precedent for preemptive military strikes, where would it end? Would Pakistan launch nuclear weapons against India in order to preempt an attack by India against Pakistan over Kashmir? Would China launch an invasion of Taiwan in order to preempt a declaration of independence by Taiwan? Would Arab states invade Israel? Would Russia invade the Republic of Georgia?

The United States must fully consider the implications of what the President is proposing. U.S. foreign policy does not exist in a vacuum.

I am not arguing that the United States must remain docile in the face of threats. What I am arguing is a nation can be proactive in combating military threats without resorting to offensive military actions to theoretically preempt a speculative future attack. As a superpower, the United States has a large menu of diplomatic, foreign policy, intelligence, legal, law enforcement and financial tools at our disposal.

Even if one agrees with President Bush's underlying premise that preemptive military action is acceptable, the question is, does Saddam Hussein and Iraq pose a significant enough threat to justify invoking the preemptive doctrine?

I believe the answer is no. I believe former Secretary of State Dean Acheson's comments about the necessity to "overdramatize a threat in order to arouse public support" are instructive for today's debate over Iraq.

President Bush charges that Saddam Hussein has invaded neighboring countries. That is obviously true. In the 1980s, Iraq was at war with Iran. Students of history, however, will recall that Hussein was an ally of the United States at the time, and received active support from the Reagan Administration for his battle against Iran.

More recently, in 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait. In response, the U.S. assembled a coalition to force Iraq to abandon Kuwait pursuant to UN Security Council Resolutions.

That record of multiple invasions certifies that Hussein poses a regional threat. But, it has not been established that Iraq intends to launch an attack against the United States. Iraq essentially has no navy and a very poor air force. Further, Hussein has been effectively contained for more than a decade from seeking territorial expansion, and has recently reconciled with Iran and Kuwait under the auspices of the Arab League. Perhaps that's why his neighbors don't view him as a threat to their territorial integrity. This charge does not justify a preemptive war.

Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Advisor to Presidents Ford and George H.W. Bush, also argued that Iraq primarily poses a regional threat. In his August 15, 2002, *Wall Street Journal* op-ed, Scowcroft wrote, "Saddam is a familiar dictatorial aggressor with traditional goals for his aggression. There is little evidence to indicate that the United States itself is the object of his aggression. Rather, Saddam's problem with the U.S. appears to be that we stand in the way of his ambitions. He seeks weapons of mass destruction not to arm terrorists, but to deter us from intervening to block his aggressive designs."

President Bush charges that Hussein has used weapons of mass destruction. Again, this charge is clearly true. Iraq used chemical weapons against Iranian troops and against Kurdish civilians more than a decade ago.

What proponents of war refuse to acknowledge is that the U.S. was an ally of Hussein when he used those weapons and likely contributed to his chemical and biological weapons capability. According to Commerce Department export-control documents, the Reagan Administration allowed Iraq to buy a number of "dual-use" items, such as helicopters and shipments of "bacteria/fungi/protozoa" that could be used to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction.

A Senate Banking Committee report from 1994 reached the same conclusion about U.S. complicity. The report noted that in 1985 - five years after the Iraq-Iran war started - and succeeding years, "pathogenic," "toxigenic" and other biological research materials were exported to Iraq, pursuant to application and licensing by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The report said, "These exported biological materials were not attenuated or weakened and were capable of reproduction."

The Senate Banking Committee report details 70 shipments, including shipments of anthrax and West Nile virus, from the United States to Iraqi government agencies over three years. The report concluded, "It was later learned that these microorganisms exported by the United States were identical to those the United Nations inspectors found and recovered from the Iraqi biological warfare program."

It is also important to keep in mind that Saddam Hussein did not use chemical, biological or nuclear weapons against U.S. troops, Israel, or our allies during the Gulf War even

though shells and warheads filled with chemical and biological agents were deployed to the front lines.

The reason is because the U.S. threatened overwhelming retaliation, including the possibility of using nuclear weapons or the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, if he did use them. A number of military analysts have concluded that Hussein's driving force is his desire to remain in power at any cost. That implies that he would not attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction because he knows he and his nation would be destroyed. Deterrence worked in 1991, and can continue to work. But, if the U.S. insists on overthrowing Hussein, then it is more likely that he will use his chemical and biological weapons capability against U.S. troops and others in the region in order to inflict the most damage possible before he is taken out.

A recent report in the *Washington Post* confirms that even the Bush Administration believes deterrence can work. The report notes that the Pentagon has plans to appeal directly to Iraqi military officers to convince them it is in their interests not to use chemical or biological weapons against U.S. troops. The Pentagon may offer roles in a post-Hussein government to officers that can be deterred.

The pursuit of chemical and biological weapons, with at least tacit support of the U.S., and the use of such weapons more than a decade ago against regional enemies does not justify a unilateral invasion of Iraq by the U.S. today. It would justify a war crimes tribunal to convict and imprison Saddam Hussein. The U.S. Congress is already on record in favor of such a tribunal for Hussein and his top deputies.

As for Iraq's chemical and biological weapons capabilities in 2002, the bottom line is the international community has no idea what Iraq's capabilities are since there have been no weapons inspectors on the ground since 1998, when they were removed by the UN prior to a U.S.-Britain bombing campaign.

President Bush, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, Defense Policy Board Member Richard Perle, and others claim to know with certainty that Saddam Hussein has successfully reconstituted his chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons programs. There is no definitive intelligence supporting that claim. It is speculation.

In fact, the recent report issued by British Prime Minister Tony Blair concedes this point. The Blair report says on page 9, "Since UN inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq in 1998, there has been little overt information on Iraq's chemical, biological, nuclear and ballistic missile programs."

The lack of concrete information argues in favor of the need to get weapons inspectors back into Iraq, not in favor of an unprecedented military invasion based on a hunch about Iraq's weapons capability.

I would also point out that even if Hussein had reconstituted his prohibited weapons programs, he does not have a delivery system capable of reaching the U.S. He can't even

reach Europe with a missile. He may have some unconventional means of delivery, such as unmanned aircraft, but these too do not pose a threat to the domestic security of the U.S. The Blair report acknowledged as much.

On page 28, the Blair report stated, "Iraq has retained up to 20 al-Hussein missiles, in breach of Security Council Resolution 687…with a range of up to 650 kilometers, are capable of reaching a number of countries in the region, including Cyprus, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Israel." While this missile capability means Hussein could pose a regional threat, it does not mean the only response to this limited threat is a military invasion.

Similarly, Bush charges that Iraq is close to acquiring nuclear weapons. As with the possibility of reconstituting his chemical and biological weapons program, this is pure speculation.

The Blair report documents the significant success of UN weapons inspectors in spite of Hussein's obstructions. Therefore, the fact that Hussein may try to set up roadblocks again is not a sufficient reason to abandon an effort to reinsert inspectors into Iraq. The President, Secretary Rumsfeld, some Members of Congress, and dozens of media pundits have ridiculed the previous weapons inspection regime. But, the documented results clearly refute the argument that weapons inspections are worthless.

Here are a few telling excerpts from the Blair report:

On page 16, "Between 1991 and 1998 UNSCOM succeeded in identifying and destroying very large quantities of chemical weapons and ballistic missiles as well as associated production facilities. The IAEA (International Atomic Energy Association) also destroyed the infrastructure for Iraq's nuclear weapons programme and removed key nuclear materials. This was achieved despite a continuous and sophisticated programme of harassment, obstruction, deception, and denial."

On page 19, "Following the ceasefire UNSCOM destroyed or rendered harmless facilities and equipment used in Iraq's chemical weapons programme. Other equipment was released for civilian use either in industry or academic institutes, where it was tagged and regularly inspected and monitored, or else placed under camera monitoring, to ensure that it was not being misused."

On page 25, "The IAEA dismantled the physical infrastructure of the Iraqi nuclear weapons programme, including the dedicated facilities and equipment for uranium separation and enrichment, and for weapon development and production, and removed the remaining highly enriched uranium."

On page 27, "In early 2002, [British intelligence] judged that while sanctions remain effective Iraq would not be able to produce nuclear weapons."

On page 27, "In early 2002, [British intelligence] concluded that Iraq had begun to develop missiles with a range of over 1,000 kilometers. [British intelligence] assessed that if sanctions remained effective the Iraqis would not be able to produce such a missile before 2007. Sanctions and the earlier work of inspectors had caused significant problems for Iraqi missile development."

On page 30, "The success of UN restrictions means the development of new longer-range missiles is likely to be a slow process."

On page 38, "Monitoring teams were at the same time finding undisclosed equipment and materials associated with the past [biological weapons] programme. In response, Iraq grudgingly provided successive disclosures of its programme…"

On page 40, the Blair report summarized the major achievements of the previous weapons inspection regime:

"The destruction of 40,000 munitions for chemical weapons, 2,610 tonnes of chemical precursors and 411 tonnes of chemical warfare agent;

The dismantling of Iraq's prime chemical weapons development and production complex at Al-Muthanna, and a range of key production equipment;

The destruction of 48-SCUD type missiles, 11 mobile launchers and 56 sites, 30 warheads filled with chemical agents, and 20 conventional warheads;

The destruction of the Al-Hakam biological weapons facility and a range of production equipment, seed stocks and growth media for biological weapons;

The discovery in 1991 of samples of indigenously-produced highly enriched uranium, forcing Iraq's acknowledgement of uranium enrichment programmes and attempts to preserve key components of its prohibited nuclear weapons programme;

The removal and destruction of the infrastructure for the nuclear weapons programme, including the Al-Athir weaponisation/testing facility."

The bottom line is that President Bush's charges that Saddam Hussein possesses biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons cannot be confirmed without UN weapons inspectors on the ground. Congress should not be authorizing war based on speculation.

While Hussein does not have a delivery system for delivering weapons of mass destruction to U.S. shores, the President has warned that Iraq could give any chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons he may possess to terrorist organizations like al-Qaeda and allow them to strike the United States.

Which brings me to President Bush's next charge: that Iraq has cooperated with al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations that target Americans. A number of Administration

officials have asserted that Hussein has been or is cooperating with al-Qaeda. Tellingly, however, no Administration official has backed up these allegations with concrete evidence.

According to the State Department's annual terrorism report, Iraq continues to sponsor terrorist organizations that target Israel and Iran. But, none of the terrorist organizations supported by Iraq have targeted Americans for more than a decade. Further, the State Department report makes no mention of links between al-Qaeda and Iraq. Such links or material support is unlikely.

It is important to remember that Osama bin Laden offered to field thousands of troops to force Hussein out of Kuwait. At that time, Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, now in prison in the United States, said, when asked what should happen to Muslims who supported the United States in the Gulf War, "Both [those] who are against and the ones who are with Iraq should be killed."

As Brent Scowcroft wrote in a *Wall Street Journal* op-ed, "There is scant evidence to tie Saddam to terrorist organizations, and even less to the Sept. 11 attacks. Indeed Saddam's goals have little in common with the terrorists who threaten us, and there is little incentive to make common cause with them."

Daniel Benjamin, former member of the U.S. National Security Council, pointed out in a recent *New York Times* op-ed the implausibility of a Hussein-bin Laden alliance. Benjamin said, "Iraq and al-Qaeda are not obvious allies. In fact, they are natural enemies. A central tenet of al-Qaeda's jihadist ideology is that secular Muslim rulers and their regimes have oppressed the believers and plunged Islam into historic crisis."

He went on to note, "Mr. Hussein has remained true to the unwritten rules of state sponsorship of terror: never get involved with a group that cannot be controlled, and never give a weapon of mass destruction to terrorists who might use it against you."

If terrorists wanted to obtain weapons of mass destruction, there are a multitude of sources, and more plausible sources, than Iraq. Pakistan, Syria, Libya, Iran, and North Korea are just a few countries that come to mind. Further, these countries have a far more extensive history of supporting terrorism. Even poorly secured nuclear, chemical, and biological facilities in Russia and Eastern Europe pose a more inviting target for terrorists than cooperation with Hussein. Unfortunately, the Bush Administration is squeezing funding for non-proliferation programs that could secure precursor materials. In fact, a recent operation to secure nuclear materials in Belgrade was paid for entirely by a private non-profit organization. Non-proliferation programs must be a higher priority of this Administration. It is pathetic to rely on charity to deal with such a grave threat.

President Bush charges that Hussein violates the human rights of Iraqi citizens. There is no doubt that Hussein is an oppressive dictator. That fact has been well documented in reports issued by the State Department, Amnesty International and others. He was an oppressive dictator in the 1980s when he was an ally of the U.S. However, there are

dozens of despots around the world who brutalize their own citizens. China, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Burma, and North Korea are just a few that come to mind. Does the United States plan on invading all of these countries to liberate their citizens? I doubt that is the policy of President Bush. After all, he recognizes that human rights violations, while they are despicable and the U.S. should always use every means at our disposal – short of military force – to combat them, rarely do they rise to a level that threatens our national security so severely that U.S. military force is required. In fact, during the 2000 presidential campaign, President Bush specifically said he didn't want the U.S. to be the world's policeman. The human rights violations in Iraq are not a sufficient reason for the U.S. to launch a preemptive invasion of another sovereign nation.

President Bush charges that Iraq has failed to return assets stolen from Kuwait, and has failed to account for all prisoners of war from previous conflicts, including those with Iran and Kuwait. However, at the March 2002 Arab League Summit, every Arab state, including Kuwait, signed agreements with Iraq that included specific arrangements for the return of Kuwait's stolen National Archive and prisoner exchanges. Even if this March 2002 rapprochement had not occurred, failing to return stolen assets of a foreign country or failing to account for all prisoners of war is not sufficient reason to launch an invasion of Iraq.

The bottom line is that I have not been shown any evidence that would cause me to believe that Iraq poses more of a threat to the United States today than two years ago when then-candidate George W. Bush said the U.S. can't be the world's policeman, or more of a threat than at the beginning of this year when Secretary of State Colin Powell was shopping around a proposal to ease sanctions against Iraq in order to address the humanitarian crisis in that country.

Just as important as what the Bush Administration has said regarding Iraq, is what the Bush Administration has not said.

In early September, I sent a letter to President Bush posing a number of questions about the Administration's planning for a war with Iraq and its aftermath. I have yet to receive a response from the Administration.

What is the evidence that Iraq poses an imminent threat to the United States? Why would a policy of enforcing no-fly zones, vigorous weapons inspections, and military sanctions not be effective at containing the perceived threat as it has been for the last decade?

How does the Iraqi threat compare with the threat posed by other nations with weapons of mass destruction, including Iran, Pakistan, China, North Korea, Libya, Syria and others? Is the administration considering preemptive strikes against these nations as well? If not, would removing Saddam Hussein actually provide any significant increase in our national security given the numerous other sources of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons?

Doesn't an invasion of Iraq make it more likely that Saddam Hussein will feel compelled to use weapons of mass destruction, or to give them to terrorist groups, in an effort to save his own hide?

According to a recent letter from the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to Congress, Hussein is <u>unlikely</u> to attack the United States with conventional weapons, or chemical and biological weapons, in the foreseeable future. However, the CIA concludes Hussein would be **<u>more likely</u>** to use chemical or biological weapons against the United States, or to distribute them to terrorist groups, if the U.S. attacked Iraq. The CIA stated, "Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he probably would become much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions...Saddam might decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorists in conducting a W.M.D. [weapons of mass destruction] attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him."

If Saddam Hussein is removed from power, then what? Does the administration plan on occupying Iraq indefinitely? At what cost financially and in terms of military power? Would such an occupation threaten our ability to continue aggressively pursuing al-Qaeda?

I would point out that Brent Scowcroft has written "An attack on Iraq at this time would seriously jeopardize, if not destroy, the global counterterrorist campaign we have undertaken."

Does war with Iraq increase the likelihood that nominally pro-Western regimes in Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia will be overthrown by Islamic radicals? If so, wouldn't that represent a step backwards for our national security since we'd be exchanging a regime that wants to develop nuclear weapons - Iraq - for a newly radicalized regime that already possesses nuclear weapons - Pakistan?

What potential disruptions to the U.S. economy could result from a war with Iraq? Would war lead to the disruption of oil supplies? What would war do to the confidence of consumers and investors?

How much would the war and its aftermath cost U.S. taxpayers? Median estimates indicate the war could cost $80 billion, and rebuilding Iraq could cost upwards of $150 billion. How would this be paid for when the federal budget is hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit and our allies have not indicated they will provide any financial support? Would these expenses threaten other portions of the military budget?

Without a response to these and other questions that have been raised by a variety of sources, I believe it is premature for Congress to authorize war.

Finally, I want to briefly talk about the danger of the wording of the resolution on which we will soon vote.

Section 3 of the resolution, which is the key section since it authorizes military force, represents an extraordinarily broad grant of authority to President Bush. And, we know from experience with the post September 11 resolution that the President would interpret this language in the broadest way possible. Remember, the White House Counsel, Alberto Gonzales, tried to argue that the post September 11 authorization of force resolution allowed President Bush to order an invasion of Iraq without any further authorization from Congress.

Section 3 of the resolution reads, "The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to (1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq, and (2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions regarding Iraq."

This language places no meaningful restrictions on the President's authority to wage unilateral, preemptive war as he sees fit.

It is up to the President to determine whether Iraq poses a "continuing threat." There is no requirement for convincing evidence to be provided to Congress or anyone else. The language essentially allows Bush to wage war against Iraq in perpetuity if he considers Iraq a "continuing threat."

There is nothing in the bill that limits the authority to disarming Iraq. Therefore, this language authorizes the President to use the U.S. military to overthrow a sovereign leader of another country. In his 1998 book, President Bush's father explained why he didn't seek regime change following the Gulf War. All of his concerns are valid today: it would lead to a long occupation, UN Security Council resolutions didn't authorize it, the Arab coalition was opposed, there was no exit strategy, and it could lead to the breakup of the country.

The language about enforcing "all" relevant Security Council Resolutions means the U.S. Congress would be authorizing war with Iraq for the purposes of ensuring all Kuwaiti and Iranian prisoners of war are returned, to ensure Iraq pays reparations to Kuwait, to ensure Hussein complies with the rules of the oil-for-food program, and to stop Hussein from violating the human rights of Iraqi citizens. Those are inappropriate reasons to wage war.

There are no limitations on the force the President could use, which means nuclear weapons are not even out of the question.

Section 3 also contains a Presidential Determination requirement. That language says, "In connection with the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) to use force the President shall, prior to such exercise or as soon there after as may be feasible, but no later than 48 hours after exercising such authority, make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate his determination that (1) reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either (A) will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq or (B) is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant

United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq, and (2) acting pursuant to this resolution is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorists attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001."

Again, this language provides no meaningful limitation on the President's ability to wage war for virtually any reason. The language "his determination that" guarantees that it is completely up to the President whether U.S. diplomatic means have been exhausted. It is clear from Administration statements and actions to date that Bush could certify both clause (1) and (2) today if he wanted to go ahead and launch a war. He clearly believes going through the UN and relying on weapons inspectors "will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq or (B) is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

There are a number of problematic "whereas" clauses in the authorization of force resolution as well, but, given that they are not legally binding, I won't take the time to critique those.

Senator Mark Dayton recently wrote in a *Washington Post* op-ed that the congressional strategy on Iraq seems to be "Vote quick, pass the buck, head for home and wish 'em luck." I concur with his disappointment with the congressional performance on this issue.

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution clearly delegates war powers to the U.S. Congress. The resolution being debated today abdicates that solemn responsibility.

A unilateral, preemptive war with Iraq will alter the course of world history, quite possibly for the worse. Congress is doing a disservice to the American people by rushing to authorize an unjustified war.