not retaliate in kind. The United States, by contrast, can retaliate with overwhelming force, including weapons of mass destruction. This is why Mr. Hussein did not use chemical or biological weapons against American forces or Israel during the 1991 Persian Gulf War. Nor has he used such weapons since, even though the United States has bombed Iraq repeatedly over the past decade.

The same logic explains why Mr. Hussein cannot blackmail us. Nuclear blackmail works only if the blackmailer's threat might actually be carried out. But if the intended target can retaliate in kind, carrying out the threat causes the blackmailer's own destruction. This is why the Soviet Union, which was far stronger than Iraq and led by men of equal ruthlessness, never tried blackmailing the United States.

Oddly enough, the Bush administration seems to understand that America is not vulnerable to nuclear blackmail. For example, Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, has written that Iraqi weapons of mass destruction ''will be unusable because any attempt to use them will bring national obliteration.'' Similarly, President Bush declared last week in his State of the Union Address that the United States ''would not be blackmailed'' by North Korea, which administration officials believe has nuclear weapons. If Iraq's chemical, biological and nuclear arsenal is ''unusable'' and North Korea's weapons cannot be used for blackmail, why do the President and Ms. Rice favor war?

But isn't the possibility that the Iraqi regime would give weapons of mass destruction to Al Qaeda reason enough to topple it? No—unless the administration isn't telling us something. Advocates of preventive war have made Herculean efforts to uncover evidence of active cooperation between Iraq and Al Qaeda, and senior administration officials have put great pressure on American intelligence agencies to find convincing evidence. But these efforts have borne little fruit, and we should view the latest reports of alleged links with skepticism. No country should weave a case for war with such slender threads.

Given the deep antipathy between fundamentalists like Osama bin Laden and secular rulers like Saddam Hussein, the lack of evidence linking them is not surprising. But even if American pressure brings these unlikely bedfellows together, Mr. Hussein is not going to give Al Qaeda weapons of mass destruction. He would have little to gain and everything to lose since he could never be sure that American surveillance would not detect the handoff. If it did, the United States response would be swift and devastating.

The Iraqi dictator might believe he could slip Al Qaeda dangerous weapons covertly, but he would still have to worry that we would destroy him if we merely suspected that he had aided an attack on the United States. He need not be certain we would retaliate, he merely has to think that we might.

Thus, logic and evidence suggest that Iraq can be contained, even if it possesses weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, Mr. Hussein's nuclear ambitions—the ones that concern us most—are unlikely to be realized in his lifetime, especially with inspections under way. Iraq has pursued nuclear weapons since the 1970's, but it has never produced a bomb, United Nations inspectors destroyed Iraq's nuclear program between 1991 and 1998, and Iraq has not rebuilt it. With an embargo in place and inspectors at work, Iraq is further from a nuclear capacity than at any time in recent memory. Again, why the rush to war?

War may not be necessary to deny Iraq nuclear weapons, but it is likely to spur proliferation elsewhere. The Bush administration's contrasting approaches to Iraq and North Korea send a clear signal: we negotiate with states that have nuclear weapons, but we threaten states that don't. Iran and North Korea will be even more committed to having a nuclear deterrent after watching the American military conquer Iraq. Countries like Japan, South Korea and Saudi Arabia will then think about following suit. Stopping the spread of nuclear weapons will be difficult in any case, but overthrowing Mr. Hussein would make it harder.

Preventive war entails other costs as well. In addition to the lives lost, toppling Saddam Hussein would cost at least $50 billion to $100 billion, at a time when our economy is sluggish and huge budget deficits are predicted for years. Because the United States would have to occupy Iraq for years, the actual cost of this war would most likely be much larger. And because most of the world thinks war is a mistake, we would get little help from other countries.

Finally, attacking Iraq would undermine the war on terrorism, diverting manpower, money and attention from the fight against Al Qaeda. Every dollar spent occupying Iraq is a dollar not spent dismantling terrorist networks abroad or improving security at home. Invasion and occupation would increase anti-Americanism in the Islamic world and help Osama bin Laden win more followers. Preventive war would also reinforce the growing perception that the United States is a bully, thereby jeopardizing the international unity necessary to defeat global terrorism.

Although the Bush administration maintains that war is necessary, there is a better option. Today, Iraq is weakened, its pursuit of nuclear weapons has been frustrated, and any regional ambitions it may once have cherished have been thwarted. We should perpetuate this state of affairs by maintaining vigilant containment, a policy the rest of the world regards as preferable and effective. Saddam Hussein needs to remain in his box—but we don't need a war to keep him there.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JAY DIX

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 2003

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of one of Colorado's accomplished sons, Dr. Jay D. Dix. A former resident of Pueblo, Colorado, Jay Dix recently passed away, leaving behind a legacy as one of our country's leading pathologists. As his family mourns their loss, I would like to take this time to highlight his life before this body of Congress and this nation.

Born in Germany to Harold Leon and Faith Louise Pfeffer Dix, Jay was raised in Pueblo, Colorado, where he graduated from Centennial High School in 1966. In 1969, he married Mary Jay Stewart and started a two-year stint in the U.S. Army. After his service, Jay went on to graduate from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1973 and then, in 1977, from the University of Missouri School of Medicine. In 1980, Jay received his certification from the American Board of Pathology and started working as the medical examiner of Missouri's Boone and Callaway counties. He also taught at the University of Missouri as an assistant professor of pathology and, in 1990, spent a year in New York City as its chief deputy medical examiner.

Beyond the recognition, education, and experience, Jay stood out for his professionalism and expertise. Investigators and law enforcement professionals credit him as a great team member, one who contributed objectively to investigations. Perhaps it was his reputation for solid work that helped make him a key player in Missouri's first criminal investigation that relied almost entirely on DNA evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor Dr. Jay D. Dix's memory before this body of Congress and this nation. Jay has made many contributions to our community. His work as an instructor and as a medical examiner has touched thousands of lives and brought closure to many cases. I extend my sincere condolences to his wife Mary, their daughters Kelsey and Melissa, and his mother Faith. Jay's lifetime of contributions to this nation and to the communities he has served is worthy of our praise, and I am proud to honor him today.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FLORINE RAITANO

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Dr. Florine Raitano for her outstanding contributions to rural Colorado. Flo will be stepping down as the Executive Director of the Colorado Rural Development Council (CRDC) at the end of January. She has been a leader in this organization for 10 years bringing new ideas and innovative solutions to Colorado's rural communities.

At this position, Flo has been a tireless advocate as working on such diverse issues as renewable energy, telecommunications, and teenage health, to name a few, in an effort to improve rural living.

Rural communities often are many miles away from urban areas and lack much of the basic infrastructure and services most of us take for granted. One of the biggest needs in these areas include access to adult education opportunities for rural citizens so that they can enhance their skills and improve the quality of their lives. Most urban residents can find classes on almost anything, from cosmetology to computer science. These opportunities are rare for rural communities whose population are spread out over wide distances. Even online computer courses can be difficult if users haven't had training on how to use computers and the Internet.

Living in Dillon, Colorado, Flo understands first hand the needs of these rural citizens and communities. Her work with the CRDC created a new volunteer program with Colorado State University Cooperative Extension to help residents learn how to use the Internet. Bringing rural areas up to speed on the information highway is critical if we are going to make sure that nobody is left behind. However, many rural areas are stuck on the information dirt road. Flo has worked with the state government to raise awareness and look for innovative solutions to ensure these communities keep pace with the rest of Colorado.

Colorado has a rich and vibrant farming and ranching history, which is also still an important part of its economy. Looking forward, Flo