

captured banner head-lines, even though his hasty clarification said that he was merely voicing a "personal assessment" and that he meant the attack would begin at the end of November or later.

Mr. Sharon is planning to go to Washington this month, at President Bush's invitation, to discuss Iraq and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

After today's cabinet meeting, the official public summary reported tersely, "Prime Minister Sharon requested that ministers cease making remarks about Iraq."

Even as Mr. Bush has sought in recent days to play up the imminence and potency of the Iraqi threat, some of Israel's top security officials have played both down.

Lt. Gen. Moshe Yaalon, Israel's chief of staff, was quoted in the newspaper Maariv today as telling a trade group in a speech over the weekend, "I'm not losing any sleep over the Iraqi threat." The reason, he said, was that the military strength of Israel and Iraq had diverged to so sharply in the last decade.

Israel's chief of military intelligence, Maj. Gen. Aharon Farkash, disputed contentions that Iraq was 18 months away from nuclear capability. In an interview on Saturday with Israeli television, he said army intelligence had concluded that Iraq's time frame was more like four years, and he said Iran's nuclear threat was as great as Iraq's.

General Farkash also said Iraq had grown militarily weaker since the Persian Gulf war in 1991 and had not deployed any missiles that could strike Israel.

The torrent of newspaper articles continued today with Yediot Ahronot elaborating on reports in the United States about the details of American-Israeli plans for coordination in the event of war. It said that Mr. Bush would give Mr. Sharon 72 hours notice and that the two nations had agreed on targets in Iraq. It also mentioned previously published reports that the Americans would offer Israel a satellite to provide early warning of Iraqi missile strikes and that spare parts and other American equipment would be stored in Israel.

The Bush administration wants to dissuade Israel from responding should Iraq attack it after an American invasion, fearing that Israeli action would rally Arab support for the Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 2002]

A HIDDEN COST OF WAR ON IRAQ

(By Shibley Telhami)

WASHINGTON.—One of the most appealing thoughts about a possible war with Iraq is that it could help spread democracy, transforming a rotten political order in the Middle East. But more likely, such a war would render the Middle East more repressive and unstable than it is today. Democracy cannot be imposed through military force, even if force is used successfully to oust antidemocratic dictators. And our vital aims in fighting terrorism, securing oil supplies and protecting the lives of American soldiers will, in the context of the Middle East, almost certainly ensure that the spread of democracy will again take a back seat to our national priorities.

Aside from the significant challenges in Iraq itself, the picture in the rest of the region will be troubling. Regardless of our real objectives, most Arabs and Muslims will see in the war American imperialism. Governments in the region may support the war for fear of being on the losing side, or may simply stay neutral. Because support goes against the over-whelming sentiment of their citizenry, they will likely endorse our course through political repression. If King Abdullah of Jordan, like other rulers in the

Middle East, has to face a choice between supporting the war while repressing his people and yielding to Jordanian public opinion by opposing our effort, it's clear what our preference will be. For that we need not dig deep into history; our commitment to fighting al Qaeda has understandably defined our current relationship with Pakistan in a way that has caused us to put aside democratic values in order to achieve a more vital goal. These values will likely be sacrificed in our relationship with other nations in the Middle East, even with the best of intentions.

At the same time, we would not be comfortable if democratic change in the region results in the victory of radical Islamist groups, as happened in Algeria a decade ago. Nor is it likely that we would be willing to accept democratically elected militant Islamist groups to run the Saudi government and control the world's largest oil reserves as well as the pulpit of Mecca.

The political order in the Middle East is bankrupt today, and if stability means the continuation of the status quo, that would not be appealing. Change is necessary for the good of the people of the Middle East and for the good of the world. But not any change, and not through any means. The use of military force may be necessary for other reasons, but it is more likely to stifle than to nurture democracy movements in authoritarian Arab states.

America's political success has undoubtedly been bolstered by its superior military power. But our military power itself is a product of a successful economic and political system. Those around the world who sought change of their political and economic systems did so in large part on their own—and in many cases with America's political and economic success as a model. Those who want to achieve that success will have to emulate the model. And those who don't will likely fail.

Powerful ideas are willingly accepted because they inspire, not threaten. Even those who are reluctant to embrace democracy, like the leaders in Beijing, have understood the need to emulate much of America's economic approach lest they be left further behind. And in embracing a new economic approach, they have also unleashed a political process they will not be able fully to control.

Ultimately, America's role is to assist in the spread of democracy and, above all, to inspire. Wars may simultaneously open up new opportunities for change, as in Afghanistan, and close others, as in Pakistan. But democracy cannot be dictated through war, especially when war is opposed by people of the region. The thought that, because America has unequalled power, we know what is best for others—even better than they do themselves—would not be comforting to most Americans. Certainly, such a notion is not compatible with the very ideal of democracy we seek to spread.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. SOLIS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of activities in the district office.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and October 8 until 7:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. LEWIS of California (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and October 8 on account of a death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCNULTY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELLER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, October 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1210. An act to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996; to the Committee on Financial Services.

S. 1806. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to health professions programs regarding the practice of pharmacy, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 2064. An act to reauthorize the United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce; in addition to the Committee on Resources for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 3214. An act to amend the charter of the AMVETS organization.

H.R. 3838. An act to amend the charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States organization to make members of the armed forces who receive special pay for duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger eligible for membership in the organization, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes.