

## **Iraq Floor Speech**

### **By: U.S. Senator Sam Brownback**

Mr. President -- I rise today in support of the bi-partisan resolution to authorize the President to use force in Iraq. It is important that this body send a very clear and strong message in support of the President. It is understandable that some of my colleagues wish to narrow the scope of this resolution, but to do so risks handicapping our commander-in-chief during our nation's time of need and would give the President less power to convince the U.N. to work with us.

#### The Case for Action

Since 1998, it has been U.S. stated policy that there should be a regime change in Iraq. Because of the threat Saddam poses to his neighbors, to the U.S. and to his own people; we wisely declared that the world would be a safer place without his regime.

Yet, we continue to hear from some that Iraq poses no imminent threat to the U.S. It seems that the facts about Saddam's capabilities have not fully sunk in -- though the President has laid out the case in detail. So, let us review some of the facts:

- Gaps identified by UNSCOM in Iraqi accounting and current production capabilities strongly suggest that Iraq maintains stockpiles of chemical agents, probably VX, sarin, cyclosarin and mustard.
- UNSCOM reported to the UN Security Council in April 1995 that Iraq had concealed its biological weapons program and had failed to account for 3 tons of growth material for biological agents.
- In 2001, an Iraqi defector reported visiting some 20 secret facilities in Iraq for chemical, biological and nuclear weapons.
- Saddam continues to pursue nuclear weapons -- and has used chemical weapons against his own people as well as his neighbors.

Certainly we all hope that the United Nations will step up to its responsibility and take action with us. But unfortunately, we cannot and should not abdicate the responsibility of our national security to other nations, who frankly, are not the lead target for terrorists.

The stark reality is that the U.S. has had forces deployed in the Gulf region since 1990 to first defeat Iraqi aggression, and then to contain a genocidal dictator. For over 12 years the United States has had to deploy our sons and daughters to protect our interests in the Gulf. For over 12 years Saddam has brutalized the Iraqi population to maintain power.

The United States and the world were seemingly satisfied that the threat was contained. So what has changed?

September 11th is what has changed. The threat of terrorism is what has changed. The possible link between terrorists and weapons of mass destruction is what has changed. This nation was attacked because of what we stand for - freedom. These terrorists are committed, brutal and will never stop. Once they obtain weapons of mass destruction, they will inflict them on the most vulnerable targets: civilians.

Within the Senate last week, we authorized a committee to be established and funded to investigate how the terrorists were able to attack the United States on September 11, 2001.

My fear is that if we fail to provide the President with the clear authority to deal with Saddam - a genocidal

dictator - that in a few years we will be voting to establish a commission to determine how terrorists were able to gain weapons of mass destruction and attack this country.

The Cold War is over and we live in a new reality where terrorists seek to harm our country and are actively seeking weapons of mass destruction. We have an awful choice to make: confront this problem now, or wait until the problem matures even further. Either way, we will face uncertainties, loss and expense. But by taking action now, we give ourselves the best opportunity to avoid another Sept. 11<sup>th</sup> catastrophe. By taking action now, we send a strong message to other would-be tyrants around the world with delusions of destruction: the U.S. will stop you.

### The Day After: Re-constructing a democratic Iraq

Many of my colleagues have posed important questions about taking action in Iraq and what will happen the day after the battle is won. These questions include: who will take over the country post-Saddam? Will the country break apart into separate nation-states? How long will U.S. troops remain there and how much will it cost the American taxpayer?

These questions are important ones to consider but they are not just offered for our consideration, they are put out as rhetorical obstacles intended to dissuade the public from supporting military action should it be necessary. We are in a strange debate where even those who do not wish to advocate for force can not help but admit the evil of Saddam's regime and the threat to security that he eventually will pose.

So instead of directly opposing such action, some choose to lie out a very complex and confusing picture - one that is intended to mire us all down to the point of inaction.

I would challenge my colleagues to outline any conflict where we went in knowing all the answers. The simple truth is, we cannot know all these answers. We can only work through these problems as they arise. However, there are many reasons to be optimistic that the post-Saddam questions will have a positive outcome.

Iraq is not Afghanistan and the problems we have seen in re-constructing Afghanistan will largely not be present when it comes to Iraq for many reasons. First, Iraq is a resource-rich nation and can afford to pay for its own re-construction. Second, Iraq is not filled with religious radicals that plagued Afghanistan. And third, Iraq does not have armed warlords to settle with.

There will need to be an extensive de-Bathification of the nation, just as in Germany it was necessary to de-Nazify much of that country's leaders following WWII.

Iraq has a historical model for a federated democratic system with 2 Parliamentary bodies, much like Britain. Opposition groups are working to re-construct that model now to replace the existing regime. We need to work with all the Iraqi opposition groups (not just INC - although ramp up their funding) in order to gain the best advantage possible.

This process will be challenging, but not impossible. The rewards are great and quite frankly, we can not afford the risks of inaction.

At a time when our existence has been threatened, it is our obligation to turn our eyes and hearts back to the Source of all existence. We have witnessed the destruction of the symbols of our economic and military strength and of our technical ingenuity and we have had our complacency and sense of invincibility shattered. If in the words of a great poet, "Youth is life before tragedy," then indeed our nation is no longer young. As a youth feels that he or she is immortal and omnipotent, so we have felt the same.

This is a time for contemplation and prayer. We do not make this choice lightly nor without the understanding that with this action comes difficult consequences to some of our finest citizens in the

armed forces.

We would do well to remember the words of Psalm 140:

“Grant not, God the desires of the wicked one; do not grant his conspiracy fruition . . . As for the head of my beseigers, let the mischief of their own lips bury them.”

Once again, we have come to deal with a very difficult situation where we are called upon to stand up to the threats of evil and tyranny. As daunting as this is, it is not a responsibility we can shirk. Saddam has made the case against himself. He has buried himself with his own lips. We cannot ignore this, and we should not put off for another year or few, a difficult matter that will only get worse.

I support the bi-partisan resolution authorizing the President to use force in Iraq.