

is supposedly, retired, his service to the community has continued to this day.

Seymour Goldweber continues to work for us, for the sheer love of agriculture, tropical fruits, and the growers who need and love him.

To our hero, Seymour Goldweber, and his wonderful wife, Libby, felicidades a los dos.

DO NOT POSITION USA AS A COMMON ENEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, coming from a family of combat infantry men and Marines, I must say that anytime this Congress is asked to consider the authorization for the use of force, it is a request that we consider very seriously. I might add that most of those who are making this request from the White House have never served in combat themselves. Certainly the Secretary of Defense has not. Certainly the Communications Director of the White House who made the flippant statements this week that one silver bullet is cheaper than going to war, in referencing a possible assassination in Iraq, is one of the most appalling comments I have ever heard from a White House official. If he had been in the service of Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman or John Kennedy, he would no longer have a job.

The resolution this Congress will be asked to consider next week is a work in progress. Initially it started with inspections where we had the broad support of the international community. And all we needed to do was expand that a little bit and be rigorous, as we have done before, working with our allies around the world. But, no, the ante was raised by the White House conveniently 4 weeks before an election now and the objective is regime change.

The President has said it, it is not disallowed in the resolution that is brought up to us; and I want to speak tonight a little bit about how the United States, not just through this resolution but through the rhetoric that has been spewing out of Washington here across the Islamic and Arab world, is going to increase terrorism, is going to increase hatred toward the United States of America. When the President of the United States uses terms like dead or alive, do you think General Omar Bradley would have ever said that? General Hugh Shelton, would he have ever used those terms so publicly?

When you have not been to war, you are loose with your rhetoric.

Senator Warren Rudman, who helped produce a report with Senator George Mitchell about the rising threat of terrorism around the world, sobered our membership when he came up here a few months ago and said though he had traveled the world as a Senator, he did

not realize until he got into the issue of terrorism how much he found America hated around the world.

Tonight I want to place in the RECORD a longer analysis of what is really wrong with U.S. policy towards that region of the world, but let us be clear where the hatred comes from and what spawns the terrorism.

First of all, we have the lack in the Middle East and Central Asia of a real resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This has been with us in the free world for over 50 years. We do not have a peace process under way. Every night we see in the newspapers or we see on television more killing of Israelis by Palestinians or vice versa.

There was a great cartoon, a sad cartoon, in one of the newspapers recently showing Mr. Sharon and Mr. Arafat holding hands and falling together down a deep cavern and blaming one another as they fell to their certain deaths.

We as a world need to organize in order to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Without it, terrorism will continue not only in that region of the world but will find its way creeping into our homeland as we saw on 9-11.

The other major issue deals with U.S. ties to the oil kingdoms in the Middle East on which we have become even more dependent than during the oil crises of the 1970s and the Persian Gulf War in the early 1990s, and importantly to the repressive regimes that our dollars help support. There is a very rude awakening in the Middle East and Central Asia for a different way of life and America is fast becoming the excuse for the repression under which the majority of people live all in undemocratic regimes.

So my first advice tonight is please, Mr. President, do not position the United States as the common enemy that serves as a unifying force against which all the disparate malcontents and discontents of the Middle East and Central Asia can unite. We saw a sign of that in our homeland last year. But not only our homeland, across the world American embassies are being built like bunkers. Our diplomats are being killed more and more, every 10 years more of them are killed, whether it is Africa, whether it is Malaysia, whether it is the Middle East.

To achieve long-term stability, the United States' policy toward the Arab and Islamic world must be shaped multilaterally and affirm our belief in democratic principals. Unfortunately, the Bush administration's policies continue us down this dangerous path.

ALLIES WORKING TOWARD A SECURE FUTURE

To achieve long-term stability, U.S. policy toward the Arab and Islamic world must be shaped multilaterally and affirm our nation's belief in democratic principles. The Bush Administration's initiatives will lead to neither. Indeed, it is positioning the U.S. to be the common enemy in a volatile region where terrorism grows with each passing decade of war and remembrance.

Bush policies—such as threatening regime change or the “one bullet policy” on Iraq—

are destabilizing and pose a real threat to U.S. long-term interests. These irresponsible policies inject the U.S. into the festering antipathy of disparate forces whose common denominator is growing anti-Western sentiment.

Thus, a resolution that employs all diplomatic and economic means to draw broad multilateral support to allow U.N. arms inspectors access to conduct robust investigations of Iraq's suspected weapons sites is of paramount importance. As a first step, Congress should support the recently negotiated international agreement allowing inspectors to return to Iraq after four years. Especially in this region of the world, former Senator George Mitchell emphasizes the importance of diplomacy in the Mitchell Report, “Whatever the source, violence will not solve the problems of the region. It will only make them worse. Death and destruction will not bring peace, but will deepen the hatred and harden the resolve on both sides. There is only one way to peace, justice, and security in the Middle East, and that is through negotiation.”

FIRST STRIKE

Based on the lack of verifiable evidence presented to Congress and the American people, the President's proposal to preemptively, or unilaterally, strike against Iraq is unacceptable. Due to the predictably destabilizing effect on the region, the U.S. should avoid a first strike. Dr. Mark Juergensmeyer, Director of Global and International Studies at U.C. Santa Barbara, “It is essential that a multilateral force be deployed if action is contemplated.”

If America goes to war, the cause must be just and better justified.

TOWARD A CHANGED REGION

Powerful Islamic stirrings inside undemocratic regimes in the Middle East and Central Asia, including violent forces operating outside nation-states (like Al Qaeda), create conditions for emerging revolutions. In responding to these, the U.S. must act in a manner that is true to our founding principles as the world's oldest democratic republic. We, too, have been a revolutionary people aspiring to a better way of life.

We must not wed ourselves to monarchy, dictatorship, or repression. As a superpower, the U.S. must position itself for long-term, relations with many emerging nations. The U.S. should not become the inheritor of a new world order in the Middle East and Central Asia, nor an occupying force. Simply put, U.S. dominance there is not unilaterally sustainable.

GRAVE AND GATHERING VS. IMMINENT THREAT

Congress must ask: what is the “imminent threat” to the U.S. that justifies a war resolution now? The President, in his remarks before the U.N., stated, “Iraq is a grave and gathering danger.” He did not say “an imminent threat.”

What has Iraq done differently in the last 4 months than the prior year to warrant invasion now? Yes, Iraq is a secular state that seeks greater domination over the Arab world. But intelligence briefings have indicated that Iraq has fewer military capabilities than it did 10 years ago. Secretary Rumsfeld has stated that Iraq's army is only 40% of what it was 10 years ago. The Central Intelligence Agency and Defense Intelligence Agency have verified that Iraq's chemical and nuclear capabilities are substantially less than 10 years ago. However, in the area of biologics, Iraq is likely ahead of where it was 10 years ago.

The international community has the opportunity to use its united efforts to require Iraq to abide by U.N. resolutions requiring immediate access to verify Iraq's commitment to rid itself of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles.

THERE IS A DISTINCTION BETWEEN AL QAEDA
AND IRAQ

Congress must ask the Bush Administration to distinguish between Al Qaeda and Iraq. The carnage that took place on September 11, 2001, was committed by members of the Al Qaeda terrorist network. Al Qaeda's primary objective is to rid the Middle East of all foreign influence and impose strict Islamic religious rule based on its particular interpretation of the religion. Iraq, rather, is a secular state headed by a military dictator, Saddam Hussein, holding the second largest oil reserves in the Middle East. Saddam's chief objective is to control the entire region's oil reserves and eventually gain greater power in the Arab world.

America's war on terrorism began as a clear campaign against Al Qaeda, not Iraq. Neither Congress nor the American public has been presented with any evidence of a connection between Iraq and Al Qaeda. Though some terrorists may be "present" especially in the northern zone of Iraq, which Hussein does not control, there is no linkage of evidence between them and the government of Iraq. The President asserted in his draft resolution that members of Al Qaeda are "known to be in Iraq" and that Iraq may give weapons to terrorists. His statements are filled with innuendoes, not facts. No intelligence information has been presented to Congress to add certainty to the President's statements.

OIL IS THE PRIMARY UNDERPINNING OF U.S.
"VITAL" INTEREST

Congress must ask: For how long will Americans be asked to die for "vital interests" centered in the oil kingdoms? The economic underpinning of Iraq is oil—the second largest reserves in the world. 95% of Iraq's economy is oil driven. Americans might ask the question: "Why has the U.S. become bogged down in this region so many times in modern history?" and "Why have all of America's major recessions in the past 30 years been triggered by rising oil prices?" In fact, rising oil prices triggered our current recession, and prices are rising again.

During the 1970's, two Arab oil embargoes drove the U.S. economy into deep recession. President Jimmy Carter tried to move America toward energy independence, calling the challenge the "moral equivalent of war." But as world oil prices dropped through O.P.E.C. price manipulation, America lost its edge on energy independence. Though conservation and alternative energy development progressed, their pace was not sufficient to meet demand.

In the early 1990's, America went to war over Iraq's invasion of neighboring Kuwait's oil fields and port access. In October 2000, the USS *Cole*, a Navy destroyer protecting the oil shipping lanes in the Persian Gulf, was suicide bombed in Yemen's harbor. Even now, as the President contemplates invasion, 8% of America's oil originates in Iraq.

Oil is not worth one more American soldier's life, nor any more disruption to our national economy. America needs a national commitment to become energy independent again in this decade, much like the space program of the 1960s that led America into the heavens. Ms. Robin Wright, Foreign Diplomatic Correspondent for the Los Angeles Times has stated, "To build a more peaceful world, the U.S. must deal with the oil issue. It must also deal with the political destiny of people in that part of the world who want to have some say in their futures."

NAKED AGGRESSION IS NOT THE AMERICAN WAY

Yes, Iraq is in gross violation of U.N. resolutions calling for inspections, but America should not pressure Iraq unilaterally, without maintaining that same broad-based

international support. It was proper for President Bush to deliver an address at the United Nations. Our nation has always sought to be a constructive partner among the community of nations. We need to maintain this policy of engagement with the nations of the world.

Naked aggression by a superpower with no evidence presented to its lawmakers is discomforting to the American people and not the way to forge alliances in a troubled part of the world. America, surely, does not wish to be perceived as the "bully on the block" in the most oil rich region of the world where not one democratic state exists.

A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

As a first step, we should support International Strategic Partnership to Eliminate a Common Threat (INSPECT), an alternate resolution encouraging the President to support the recently negotiated inspection plan between the Iraqi Government and international representatives calling for a robust team capable of ensuring that Iraq is no longer in violation of international agreements. The resolution rejects any unilateral military action by the U.S. until Congress is able to grant its approval. In addition, the President must submit a report to Congress, at least every 30 days, on matters relevant to this resolution. According to David Albright, President of the Institute for Science and International Security, "Nuclear threat is not imminent. Because the threat is not imminent, inspectors could be beneficial."

WITH REGARDS TO WAR: IS
CONGRESS RELEVANT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the last time Congress declared war was on December 11, 1941, against Germany in response to its formal declaration of war against the United States. This was accomplished with wording that took less than one-third of a page, without any nitpicking arguments over precise language, yet it was a clear declaration of who the enemy was and what had to be done. And in 3½ years, this was accomplished. A similar resolve came from the declaration of war against Japan 3 days earlier. Likewise, a clear-cut victory was achieved against Japan.

Many Americans have been forced into war since that time on numerous occasions, with no congressional declaration of war and with essentially no victories. Today's world political condition is as chaotic as ever. We're still in Korea and we're still fighting the Persian Gulf war that started in 1990.

The process for our entering war the past 57 years and the inconclusive results of each war since that time are obviously related to Congress' abdication of its responsibility regarding war, given to it by article I section 8 of the Constitution.

Congress has either ignored its responsibility entirely over these years, or transferred the war power to the executive branch by a near majority vote of its Members, without consideration of it by the States as an amendment required by the Constitution.

Congress is about to circumvent the Constitution and avoid the tough decision of whether war should be declared by transferring this monumental decisionmaking power regarding war to the President. Once again, the process is being abused. Odds are, since

a clear-cut decision and commitment by the people through their Representatives are not being made, the results will be as murky as before. We will be required to follow the confusing dictates of the U.N., since that is where the ultimate authority to invade Iraq is coming from—rather than from the American people and the U.S. Constitution.

Controversial language is being highly debated in an effort to satisfy political constituencies and for Congress to avoid responsibility of whether to go to war. So far the proposed resolution never mentions war, only empowering the President to use force at his will to bring about peace. Rather strange language indeed!

A declaration of war limits the presidential powers, narrows the focus and implies a precise end point to the conflict. A declaration of war makes Congress assume the responsibilities directed by the Constitution for this very important decision, rather than assume that if the major decision is left to the President and a poor results occurs, it will be his fault, not that of Congress. Hiding behind the transfer of the war power to the executive through the War Powers Resolution of 1973 will hardly suffice.

However, the modern way we go to war is even more complex and deceptive. We must also write language that satisfies the U.N. and all our allies. Congress gladly transfers the legislative prerogatives to declare war to the President, and the legislative and the executive branch both acquiesce in transferring our sovereign rights to the U.N., an unelected international government. No wonder the language of the resolution grows in length and incorporates justification for starting this war by citing U.N. resolutions.

In order to get more of what we want from the United Nations, we rejoined UNESCO, which Ronald Reagan had bravely gotten us out of, and promised millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayer support to run this international agency started by Sir Julian Huxley. In addition, we read of promises by our administration that one we control Iraqi oil, it will be available for allies like France and Russia, who have been reluctant to join our efforts.

What a difference from the days when a declaration of war was clean and precise and accomplished by a responsible Congress and an informed people.

A great irony of all this is that the United Nations Charter doesn't permit declaring war, especially against a nation that has been in a state of peace for 12 years. The U.N. can only declare peace. Remember, it wasn't a war in Korea; it was only a police action to bring about peace. But at least in Korea and Vietnam, there was fighting going on, so it was a bit easier to stretch the language than it is today regarding Iraq. Since Iraq doesn't even have an Air Force or a Navy, is incapable of waging a war, and remains defenseless against the overwhelming powers of the United States and the British, it's difficult to claim that we're going into Iraq to restore peace.

History will eventually show that if we launch this attack—just as our sanctions already have—the real victims will be the innocent Iraqi civilians who despise Saddam Hussein and are terrified of the coming bombs that will destroy their cities.

The greatest beneficiaries of the attack may well be Osama bin Ladin and the al Qaeda.