

We have told the government of Turkey that we will not support an independent Kurdistan, despite the fact that the Kurdish people in Iraq already have a high degree of US-supported autonomy and have even completed work on their own constitution. Do we send in our troops again to keep Iraq united?

Post-War Afghanistan is not exactly the best precedent for building democracy in Iraq. Sixteen months after the fall of the Taliban government in Afghanistan, President Hamid Karzai is still referred to as “the Mayor of Kabul”—because of the weak and fragile hold of his government on the rest of the nation. Warlords are in control of much of the countryside. The Afghan-Pakistani border is an area of anarchy—and ominous al-Qaida cells.

The U.S. military is far from equipped to handle the challenge of meeting the needs of a post-Saddam Iraq. Our government must have a plan in place to care for the population. Yet we have heard little from the administration on how they intend to meet this obligation. To succeed in winning the peace, we will need the help and support of the international community. That is a far less likely to happen if we do not have the international community with us the start.

Before the President makes the final fateful decision to go to war in Iraq, his administration must answer each of these just war questions much more convincingly than they have so far. The American people are waiting for the answers. The entire world is waiting for the answers.

We are no at a major cross-road in our history. The 9/11 atrocities has forced us all to think profoundly about what is great in America. All through our shock and grief, the people’s courage never failed. 9/11 was one of the Nation’s saddest hours, but the response was one of our finest hours.

That hour must not be lost. It can mark the beginning of a new era of common purpose—a return to policies which truly reflect America’s values, a return to the genuine pursuit of justice. The unselfishness we saw in 2001 must not give way to selfishness in 2003. The noble caring for one another that we celebrated then must not be succeeded now by a retreat from our ideals.

Yes, our country is strong but it can be stronger—not just in the power we hold, but in the promise we fulfill of a nation that truly does make better the life of the world. If we rededicate ourselves to that great goal, our achievements will reverberate around the globe, and America will be admired anew for what it must be now, in this new time, more than ever—“the last, best hope of earth.”

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO INTELLIGENCE SERVICES

Mrs. DOLE. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to the excellent work of our intelligence services in capturing Khalid Shaikh Mohammed. This is a major triumph in the war on terror. Our officers from the Central Intelligence Agency and Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Security Agency, and their counterparts in the Pakistani and intelligence services are to be highly commended.

Let there be no doubt, capturing Mohammed is a big deal. He has a long and bloody history. He has been implicated in the 1993 bombing of the Twin Towers. He played a major role in plans to hijack airliners in Asia and crash them into the sea. He may well have been a leader in the attack on the USS *Cole*, an attack that killed 17 United States sailors and wounded 39 others. He has been implicated in the attacks on the United States embassies in Kenya and Tanzania which killed hundreds and wounded thousands. And he planned the attacks of September 11.

It is not just attacks against Americans. He is now wanted by our friends, the Australians, for questioning in connection with the recent bombings in Bali which killed hundreds of those citizens. There has even been a warrant issued by our reluctant allies in France for his role in the bombing of a synagogue that killed a French citizen.

Those are the horrible acts of his past that we know about. By capturing Mohammed, what devastating plots have our intelligence services prevented? Hopefully, as they start to learn more from Mohammed, they will also be able to thwart future attacks.

Another possibility is that those who would engage in such acts will realize their secrets may now be compromised and, hopefully, they will abandon their plans.

Not only did we get Mohammed, their operations planner, we also got Hawsawi, their chief financier. The 9/11 terrorists sent their left-over money to Hawsawi. By taking him out of the al-Qaida operations, we have damaged their ability to move money into terrorists’ hands. This should hamper their ability to launch any currently planned operations.

I want to thank our intelligence services for the work they do. Yes, there have been mistakes in the past, and there will be human failures in the future. But when we learn of their victories, they should be thanked. That thanks comes with the knowledge that there must be many more instances where we have been protected and there was no public acclaim for these servants of the public. Frankly, without the publicity surrounding this

case, we might never have known all the agencies that contributed to the captures.

The Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation do not watch after us alone. We should be thankful for the hard work of the men and women of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the National Reconnaissance Office. They and others are working around the clock to defend us in the war on terror.

It is not just our intelligence agencies that should be thanked. It was our friends in Pakistan who discovered Mohammed, who arrested him, who turned him over. President Musharraf has continued his strong support for the war on terror, and we must continue to work with allies such as Pakistan to eradicate terrorism.

Yes, this is a great win in the war on terror, but it was not a victory. We may never actually realize when we have achieved victory; for the men and women who make our intelligence system work will have to continue their vigilance, that quiet and all too often unheralded vigilance.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold her suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mrs. DOLE. I withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there is an interesting turn of events. Those who were looking for a debate on the war in Iraq had best turn to C-SPAN and witness the question period in London before the British House of Commons. I have been watching it. It is a fascinating debate.

Tony Blair is defending his position in support of the United States. His own party is divided. The conservatives support him. The questioning is very tough. In the course of defending his position, some important questions are being asked and answered in the British House of Commons.

If you would expect the same thing here in the U.S. Congress, you might be surprised or disappointed to learn it is not taking place. What is taking place is speeches on the floor by individual Senators. Today, I have seen Senator BYRD of West Virginia, Senator DAYTON of Minnesota, Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Others have come to the floor to speak about the war in Iraq. But there has literally been no active debate on this issue on Capitol Hill, in the United States of America, since last October.

The reason, of course, is that last October we enacted a use of force resolution which virtually gave to the President of the United States the authority

to declare war and execute it against Iraq at the time and place of his choosing. I was one of 23 Senators who voted against that resolution, believing that there were better ways to achieve our goals, and that if Congress did that, we would be giving to this President the greatest delegation of authority to wage war ever given to a President.

The time that has intervened since the passage of that resolution has proven me right. Congress has had no voice. Oh, we have had moments of criticism, moments of comment, but we are not a serious part of this national concern and national conversation over what will happen in Iraq. That is indeed unfortunate.

There are several facts I think everyone concedes, virtually everyone, on either side of the issue. The first and most obvious is that Saddam Hussein is a ruthless dictator. His continued domination over the nation of Iraq will continue to pose a threat to the region and a concern for peace-loving nations around the world. The sooner his regime changes, the better. The sooner we control his weapons of mass destruction, the better for the region and for the whole world. No one argues that point, not even the nations in the U.N. Security Council that are arguing with the United States about the best approach.

The second thing I think should be said at the outset is no one questions the fact that the U.S. military, the men and women who make it the best military in the world, deserve our support and our praise. They deserve our continued devotion to their success, whatever our debate about the policy in the Middle East or even in Iraq. As far as those 250,000 American servicemen now stationed around Iraq, and many others on the way, whatever our position on the President's policy, that is irrelevant. We are totally committed to their safety and their safe return. That is exactly the way it should be.

Having said that, though, I think it is still important for us to step back and ask how we have possibly reached this state that we are in today. The United States finds itself in a period of anti-Americanism around the world that is almost unprecedented. I traveled abroad a few weeks ago. I was stunned to find in countries that have traditionally been our friends and allies that, although they are saying little, in private they are very critical of the United States and what we have done.

What happened between September 11, 2001, and March 13, 2003? Remember that date, after the September 11 tragedy, when nations all around the world, including some of our historic enemies, came forward and said they would stand with the United States in fighting the war on terrorism? It was an amazing moment in history. It is a moment we will never forget as Americans.

For the first time since the British came into this building in the War of

1812, the United States was invaded by an enemy. Of course, Pearl Harbor was an attack on the territories as well, but that attack on the continental United States on September 11, 2001, was one that stunned us, saddened us, shocked us as a nation, and we looked for friends and we found them in every corner of the world. They joined us in a war on terrorism, sharing intelligence resources, working together, making real progress. It was a good feeling, a feeling that many of these countries now understood how important a friendship with the United States would be for their future and for the world.

Look where we are today. We are at a point now where we are trying to win enough friends to show that we have a multilateral coalition that is going to wage this war against Iraq.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article that was published in Business Week. The edition was March 10, 2003.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Week, Mar. 10, 2003]

DOLLAR DIPLOMACY

Money, it is often said, is the mother's milk of politics. It's also turning out to be the nectar of superpower diplomacy.

As George W. Bush approaches the diplomatic climax of his arduous drive to win backing for war with Iraq, U.S. diplomats increasingly find themselves tempted to brandish Uncle Sam's checkbook—and with it, the suggestion that sticking with America now might mean rewards later. Much of this bid to win friends is playing out in the U.N. Security Council, which is grappling with a U.S.-backed resolution that could trigger military action against Saddam Hussein. But in broader terms, pressure on the White House to dangle inducements transcends the U.N. debate and goes to the heart of Washington's current dilemma—America's poverty of friendship.

For two years, Administration diplomacy has been marked by a brash Texas swagger that Bush partisans consider a refreshing exercise in plain-speaking—and which some traditional allies consider arrogance. But the differences go beyond style. In walking away from global treaties and disdaining the views of traditional allies, Bush foreign policy has also been marked by an in-your-face unilateralism that has set much of the world on edge.

Now, with the Administration struggling to round up allies and hosting the leaders of such nations as Latvia and Bulgaria to demonstrate the depth of its coalition, the price of that disdain is coming into focus. "We've made it harder than it had to be by taking a high-handed approach," says Samuel R. Berger, National Security Adviser during the Clinton Administration.

Indeed, the bill for the Administration's approach is just starting to come due—and the bottom line is breathtaking. On Feb. 25, Bush aides revealed that the cost of a military campaign could top \$95 billion. That's a far cry from what happened during the first Gulf War, when coalition partners paid some \$70 billion of the \$75 billion war tab. "Rebuilding Iraq will require a sustained commitment from many nations including our own," Bush said in speech to the American Enterprise Institute on Feb. 26. But the fact is, the U.S. will likely find itself shouldering

peacekeeping duties and much of Iraq reconstruction on its own—meaning beleaguered American taxpayers may bear the brunt of the costs.

True, a broad coalition never in the cards. Unlike Operation Desert Storm, which was a response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, this showdown looms as an exercise in preemptive action. Still, while Bush talks of a "coalition of the willing" backing a U.S. invasion of Iraq, in reality the America finds itself with precious few allies as the hour of decision approaches. And buying allegiances one country at a time is a far cry from building a cohesive group committed to a common cause.

Another consequence of the Bush Administration's Iraq policy is that it could unintentionally undermine the President's broader goal of implanting the seeds of reform in the region. If the intervention comes to be seen by Iraq's neighbors as illegitimate, the result could be more radicalism, not less. The Administration's lofty goals in the Mideast could be much harder to achieve if "Americans are seen less as a partner than as a foreign power," says Jon B. Alterman, who recently left the Bush State Department.

In a sense, the current bargaining round was heralded by the September 11 terror strike on America. In the subsequent war on the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, the White House decided it had to shore up friendship and showered largesse on new allies ranging from Tajikistan to impoverished African nations. None fared better than Pakistan, a desperately poor country that was pivotal in the anti-terror war. President Pervez Musharraf's regime suddenly found itself freed of sanctions imposed for its nuclear testing and the beneficiary of a \$12.5 billion debt restructuring from the U.S. and other nations. That helped lift Pakistan from a debtor nation to one that now runs a modest current-account surplus.

Now, the Bush team faces a far more formidable chore in mustering global support for disarming Iraq by force. With skepticism rampant, France and a big bloc of nations fear the consequences of the U.S. making preemptive attacks an acceptable policy tool. Just as important, they fear that the risks of a destabilized Mideast far outweigh the danger Saddam poses. And in the region, where Saddam has been weakened and contained since the 1991 war, resistance to a U.S. invasion has led some countries to limit the American military's rights to nearby bases.

With allies scarce, small wonder that the Bushies may be tempted to float aid promises—or be hit with a raft of "impact payment" requests from countries such as Egypt, Israel, Turkey, and Jordan, who claim their economies will be damaged by the fallout of any conflict. "When somebody knows they're necessary for your game plan, they raise the price," says former top State Dept. official Chester A. Crocker.

The Bush Administration stoutly denies it's buying U.N. support or military access. "The President is not offering quid pro quos," insists White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer. In fairness, the practice of cementing an entente with aid is hardly limited to the Bushies. The Clintonites, who currently assail Bush's need to reach for his wallet, threw billions at North Korea to keep its nuclear program shuttered. They also were forced to shrug when U.S. contributions to the International Monetary Fund were squandered by Russian kleptocrats. "Checkbook diplomacy," says former State Dept. official Helmut Sonnenfeldt, "is as old as checkbooks."

The most naked example of haggling came in the U.S.-Turkey base talks. With Turkish public opinion strongly antiwar and an economy on the ropes, the Turks sought upwards of \$35 billion in U.S. assistance for the right

to station American troops on Turkish soil for use in a pincer move against Saddam. After bitter negotiations, Ankara came away with a package that includes up to \$20 billion in cash and loans, some NATO military gear, and assurances that Iraq's Kurdish nationalists will be kept in check. Says Mehmet Simsek, a London-based analyst with Merrill Lynch & Co.: "The bottom line is, it will give Turkey some breathing room."

One reason the talks were so tough is Turkey's history with Desert Storm. After that war, the U.S. backed out of promises to compensate the country for the loss of trade with Iraq and aid to refugees. Now the Turks want money up front.

Jordan may actually be the hardest hit of Iraq's neighbors this time, so Washington is also receptive to Amman's calls for help. "Nearly a quarter of our GDP could be knocked out as a result [of a new war]," frets Fahed Faneek, a Jordanian economist. The Administration is expected to ask Congress for \$150 million in aid on top of the \$300 million a year Jordan now receives. The U.S. already has started to deliver on a deal for F-16 fighters and Patriot II missiles, likely at a discount.

Other neighbors have their hands out, too. Israel wants \$4 billion in additional military aid and \$8 billion in loan guarantees. Egypt, which sees war losses of \$1.6 billion to its tourist-dependent economy, wants faster delivery of as much as \$415 million earmarked for Cairo.

Much of the dickering has been more subtle. Key swing votes on the Security Council—Chile, Guinea, Cameroon, Angola, Mexico, and Pakistan—have growing trade ties with the U.S. that could be jeopardized by a vote against the U.S. resolution. Both France and the U.S. are vying for those votes, the U.S. by noting that the America drive to ease agriculture subsidies among rich nations could open markets to Third World farmers.

What will be most telling is how Pakistan votes. After all, U.S.-backed debt restructuring allowed the country to adopt reforms that have helped revive the economy. And President Musharraf left Washington in late 2001 with a 15% increase in clothing and textile exports to the U.S., worth \$500 million to Pakistani manufacturers. But Pakistani officials insist money won't sway their vote. "This is a matter of much greater importance than just a question of incentives," says Munir Akram, Pakistan's U.N. ambassador.

It's still far from clear whether dollar diplomacy will give Uncle Sam a clearcut victory in the U.N. But even without an affirmative vote, Bush seems intent on going ahead with plans to attack Saddam by late March. Then the questions become: What kind of alliance will Bush be heading, and how durable will such a coalition of convenience be?

If all goes swimmingly on the battle-field, some of today's qualms will surely fade—replaced by radiant TV images of liberated Iraqis and new-wave technocrats who vow to build a new nation. But if the intervention turns into the oft-predicted miasma of Middle Eastern intrigue and dashed hopes, America could find itself standing far more alone than it is today. Fast friends may be hard to come by in the self-centered world of diplomacy. Still, the kind you make because of truly shared interests seem preferable to the kind you rent.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me quote several lines from this article in *Business Week*, not known as a liberal publication:

But in broader terms, pressure on the White House to dangle inducements transcends the U.N. debate and goes to the heart

of Washington's current dilemma—America's poverty of friendship.

It goes on to say:

And buying allegiances one country at a time is a far cry from building a cohesive group committed to a common cause. Another consequence of the Bush Administration's Iraq Policy is that it could unintentionally undermine the President's broader goal of implanting the seeds of reform in the region. If the intervention comes to be seen by Iraq's neighbors as illegitimate, the result could be more radicalism, not less.

The Administration's lofty goals in the Mideast could be much harder to achieve if "Americans are seen less as a partner than as a foreign power," says Jon B. Alterman, who recently left the Bush State Dept.

What a dramatic turn of events, and from the spirit of international cooperation, fighting the war on terrorism, for the United States to be in a bidding war to try to bring the Turks into the position where they will allow us to use their country, it is just such a change from where we were. It reflects a sad decline in our diplomatic skills.

Consider at the same time what is happening in North Korea. Here we have a country which has decided to test the United States. Why they have decided is anyone's guess. But let me hazard one. They see what is happening in Iraq. Iraq is waiting for the United Nations and others to protect them from a United States invasion, and they are not being successful. North Koreans decided to take a much different course. They are confronting the United States in the crudest and most dangerous way—suggesting that they are going to build nuclear weapons; they are going to fire missiles; they are going to harass our aircraft; and they are going to defy us. They believe that is the way to hold the United States back. The process they are building up could potentially proliferate nuclear weapons around the world.

Our response there, unlike with Iraq where we are full bore with a quarter million troops and billions of dollars committed, is to not even speak to the North Koreans. I don't understand that level of diplomacy. I don't understand how that will make this a safer world.

Let us reflect for a moment, though, on what is happening in the United Nations. I have read the critics from the right who basically said we should go right over the United Nations; we no longer need them; we have the power; we don't need to wait around for small nations with populations that are a fraction of the United States to decide whether they will support us. In a way, in the world of realpolitik, that is true. But the United States, in informing the United Nations, had something else in mind. It is not just a matter of whether we have the power and a show of more strength than the United Nations as a member but whether the United States is stronger with collective security engaging other countries around the world to join us in efforts such as containing Iraq and its danger.

I happen to believe that collective security is not old fashioned and out-

moded. It is critically important for us to consider building alliances to achieve important goals for the United States and the world because in building those alliances through the collective security of the United Nations, we bring together common values, a consensus on strategy, and a world vision that will serve all of us well.

To walk away from the United Nations and say, once having engaged them in a resolution, that we may not be able to pass a use-of-force resolution and that we will do it ourselves is to walk away from an important concept which has been fostered by the United States and supported by the United States and which has been critically important to us as recently as our effort in the Persian Gulf and in Afghanistan.

But, by tomorrow, the decision may be made. If the United Nations Security Council does not support us, it is indeed possible that we will have unilateral action by the United States, with the possible support of the British.

I asked the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Rumsfeld, several weeks ago: Who are our allies in this coalition against Iraq? He said: Certainly the United States with about 250,000 troops, and the British with about 26,000 troops, and others. I said: Of the others, who would rank third? At that point, he said: The Turks.

We know what is happening. Their Parliament will not allow us to use their country as a base of operation. That may change. But it shows, when it comes to this effort, that it is by and large a bilateral effort by the United States and the British against the Iraqis. I think that is not the best approach. I think it is far better for us to acknowledge what I think is the real effective approach, and that is to engage our allies in the United Nations and in the Security Council to put meaningful deadlines on Saddam Hussein; for the inspectors to reach their goals; to let Saddam Hussein know that every step of the way, his failure to cooperate could result in the United Nations taking action against him. That does not call for an invasion, but it puts him on a tight timetable that he has to live by.

To abandon the inspections, to abandon the role of the United Nations, and to launch a unilateral invasion of this country is going to be something that I think we may regret. Will we be successful militarily? I believe we will. I can't tell you the cost in terms of American lives or in terms of Iraqis killed. But I trust our military to succeed in this mission.

Having succeeded militarily, though, what will we then face? We will face, of course, the devastation in Iraq.

This week, we learned that the United States was now soliciting bids from companies in the United States for the reconstruction of Iraq before

the bombs have even fallen. That could be momentous in terms of cost. We will face it.

As Tom Friedman of the New York Times has written, when we go into a gift shop and see the sign, "If you break it, you own it," the fact is when we invade Iraq and remove its leadership and occupy that country, it is then our responsibility. Others may help us, but it is primarily our responsibility.

The same thing is true in terms of the long-term vision of Iraq. This is a country with no history of self-government, this is a country with no history of democracy, and we want to bring certain values there. We have to concede the fact that it will take some time before they arrive at that point. We will be there in an occupational way with others perhaps, but we will have the responsibility of making that transformation a permanent or semipermanent presence of American troops in the Middle East and all that that entails.

At the same time, it is bound to enrage our enemies around the world—those who think the United States is acting unilaterally and not acting in concert with other nations, peace-loving nations that would share our ultimate goals. That, too, may complicate the war on terrorism. That has been conceded by intelligence agencies and others. Our efforts in Iraq may spread the seeds of terrorism on new ground, and maybe even here in the United States. We will have to work that much harder to protect ourselves.

I want to enter into the RECORD a letter sent to Secretary of State Colin Powell from John Brady Kiesling, who is with the United States Embassy in Athens, Greece.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. COLIN POWELL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you to submit my resignation from the Foreign Service of the United States and from my position as Political Counselor in U.S. Embassy Athens, effective March 7. I do so with a heavy heart. The baggage of my upbringing included a felt obligation to give something back to my country. Service as a U.S. diplomat was a dream job. I was paid to understand foreign languages and cultures, to seek out diplomats, politicians, scholars and journalists, and to persuade them that U.S. interests and theirs fundamentally coincided. My faith in my country and its values was the most powerful weapon in my diplomatic arsenal.

It is inevitable that during twenty years with the State Department I would become more sophisticated and cynical about the narrow and selfish bureaucratic motives that sometimes shaped our policies. Human nature is what it is, and I was rewarded and promoted for understanding human nature. But until this Administration it had been possible to believe that by upholding the policies of my president I was also upholding the interests of the American people and the world. I believe it no longer.

The policies we are now asked to advance are incompatible not only with American values but also with American interests. Our fervent pursuit of war with Iraq is driving us to squander the international legitimacy that has been America's most potent weapon of both offense and defense since the days of Woodrow Wilson. We have begun to dismantle the largest and most effective web of international relationships the world has ever known. Our current course will bring instability and danger, not security.

The sacrifice of global interests to domestic politics and to bureaucratic self-interest is nothing new, and it is certainly not a uniquely American problem. Still, we have not seen such systematic distortion of intelligence, such systematic manipulation of American opinion, since the war in Vietnam. The September 11 tragedy left us stronger than before, rallying around us a vast international coalition to cooperate for the first time in a systematic way against the threat of terrorism. But rather than take credit for those successes and build on them, this Administration has chosen to make terrorism a domestic political tool, enlisting a scattered and largely defeated al Qaeda as its bureaucratic ally. We spread disproportionate terror and confusion in the public mind, arbitrarily linking the unrelated problems of terrorism and Iraq. The result, and perhaps the motive, is to justify a vast misallocation of shrinking public wealth to the military and to weaken the safeguards that protect American citizens from the heavy hand of government. September 11 did not do as much damage to the fabric of American society as we seem determined to do to ourselves. Is the Russia of the late Romanovs really our model, a selfish, superstitious empire thrashing toward self-destruction in the name of a doomed status quo?

We should ask ourselves why we have failed to persuade more of the world that a war with Iraq is necessary. We have over the past two years done too much to assert to our world partners that narrow and mercenary U.S. interests override the cherished values of our partners. Even where our aims were not in question, our consistency is at issue. The model of Afghanistan is little comfort to allies wondering on what basis we plan to rebuild the Middle East, and in whose image and interests. Have we indeed become blind, as Russia is blind in Chechnya, as Israel is blind in the Occupied Territories, to our own advice, that overwhelming military power is not the answer to terrorism? After the shambles of post-war Iraq joins the shambles in Grozny and Ramallah, it will be a brave foreigner who forms ranks with Micronesia to follow where we lead.

We have a coalition still, a good one. The loyalty of many of our friends is impressive, a tribute to American moral capital built up over a century. But our closest allies are persuaded less that war is justified than that it would be perilous to allow the U.S. to drift into complete solipsism. Loyalty should be reciprocal. Why does our President condone the swaggering and contemptuous approach to our friends and allies this Administration is fostering, including among its most senior officials. Has "oderint dum metuant" really become our motto?

I urge you to listen to America's friends around the world. Even here in Greece, purported hotbed of European anti-Americanism, we have more and closer friends than the American newspaper reader can possibly imagine. Even when they complain about American arrogance, Greeks know that the world is a difficult and dangerous place, and they want a strong international system, with the U.S. and EU in close partnership. When our friends are afraid of us rather than for us, it is time to worry. And

now they are afraid. Who will tell them convincingly that the United States is as it was, a beacon of liberty, security, and justice for the planet?

Mr. Secretary, I have enormous respect for your character and ability. You have preserved more international credibility for us than our policy deserves, and salvaged something positive from the excesses of an ideological and self-serving Administration. But your loyalty to the President goes too far. We are straining beyond its limits an international system we built with such toil and treasure, a web of laws, treaties, organizations, and shared values that sets limits on our foes far more effectively than it ever constrained America's ability to defend its interests.

I am resigning because I have tried and failed to reconcile my conscience with my ability to represent the current U.S. Administration. I have confidence that our democratic process is ultimately self-correcting, and hope that in a small way I can contribute from outside to shaping policies that better serve the security and prosperity of the American people and the world we share.

Sincerely,

JOHN BRADY KIESLING,
U.S. Embassy Athens.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this letter is a letter of resignation. Mr. Kiesling, a career diplomat who has served in United States embassies around the world, resigned over our foreign policy in Iraq. I will not read the entire letter. But this I will read. It is the letter from Mr. Kiesling to Secretary Powell:

The policies we are now asked to advance are incompatible not only with American values but also with American interests. Our fervent pursuit of war with Iraq is driving us to squander the international legitimacy that has been America's most potent weapon of both offense and defense since the days of Woodrow Wilson. We have begun to dismantle the largest and most effective web of international relationships the world has ever known. Our current course will bring instability and danger, not security.

Those are the words of a man who was a career diplomat serving the United States with principle and convictions and who resigned from the diplomatic corps over our policy in Iraq. That is a sad commentary, but it is a reality.

The reality is that we are following a course of foreign policy that is a dramatic departure from what we have followed for almost 50 years. We are making decisions relative to this war in Iraq which are changing the rules the United States has not only lived by but preached for decades. We are confronting the world that has most recently been our allies in the war on terrorism and telling them that, with or without their cooperation and approval, we are going forward with an invasion of Iraq. We are saying to the rest of the world that the United States has the power and will to use it. It is certain that we have the power and the strength. The question is whether or not we have the wisdom—the wisdom to understand that simply having the strength is not enough.

I would like to quote a few words from a statement made on this floor on October 3 last year by a man who used

to sit directly behind me here, Paul Wellstone of Minnesota. I miss him every single day. I pulled out the statement he made relative to this use of force resolution. I can recall now when he said some of these words.

I quote from Senator Wellstone:

To act now on our own might be a sign of more power. Acting sensibly and in a measured way in concert with our allies with bipartisan congressional support would be a sign of our strength.

It is still true today. It is true so many months later.

I think the President and this administration still have a chance to take what could be a course of action that departs from a tradition in values which we have stood by and preached for so many decades, and return to those values in our efforts in Iraq.

And I hope we do it. I hope we do not discard the United Nations and all of our allies who are part of it. I hope we understand that when some of our best friends around the world question whether we are approaching this sensibly, it does not demonstrate their weakness but really calls into question whether we have the humility to step back and say: Can we do this more effectively for a more peaceful world for generations to come?

Madam President, I close by saying, I return now, in just a few moments, to my home State of Illinois. As I walk the streets of Springfield, of Chicago, and of other cities, people come up to me and say: Why don't I hear a debate in the U.S. Congress about Iraq?

Well, the fact is, that debate was waged and decided last October. I was one of 23 Members who voted against the use of force resolution because I believe there is a better way: a collective approach with the United Nations, that makes certain that the United States has a coalition of nations behind it in suppressing the evil of Saddam Hussein and his dangers to the region, rather than a coalition of nations united against us. That, sadly, is what we face today.

The vote in the United Nations tomorrow is historic. I hope we have the support of that institution. I hope, if we do not, this administration will pause before unleashing the furies of war and consider whether there is a better, more measured and sensible approach to show not only our might but our strength and clarity of purpose.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, my colleague from Illinois has been talking about foreign policy and, more specifically, about Iraq and the use of force. He touched on the issue of North Korea and terrorism.

We do need to have more debate, aggressive and thoughtful debate, about all of these issues. There is no question that North Korea, in my judgment, and

in the judgment of many in this country, is an urgent, serious threat to our country. They kicked out the inspectors. And they do have nuclear weapons, at least according to our intelligence officials. They believe North Korea does have nuclear weapons.

The threat of terrorism continues in this country. Homeland security is a top priority. And all of these issues are very important. But I want to speak about an issue here at home; that is, domestic policy, especially this country's economy.

We wake up every morning—for months in this country—hearing the lead story on the news being war with Iraq. It is the lead story every morning, bar none. It is an important story, no question about that. But there are a lot of folks who wake up in this country these days who are out of jobs. Some 8 million people—perhaps more than that, we are told—do not have work.

Madam President, 308,000 additional people lost their jobs last month alone—308,000 people. Do you know who loses their jobs first? Oh, it is not Members of Congress and it is not people who drive big cars. It is the people who know the definition of “second-hand,” “second shift,” “second jobs.” It is the people who struggle at the bottom of the economic ladder. They are the last to be hired and the first to go.

This economy of ours is in trouble. It is time to stop tiptoeing around and pretending about it. We have two Budget Committees meeting now in this Congress. We have a budget submitted by this President that is completely, in my judgment, irresponsible. That is not a partisan criticism, it is just a criticism of a budget that completely ignores what is happening in this country. It is a budget that pretends everything is just fine and all we need to do is keep doing what we have been doing and this country will see its economy come out of the doldrums. That is patently untrue, in my judgment. It is time for us to say that.

Let me talk a bit about this plan and about where we are. There is not a Democrat or Republican way to fix what is wrong with this ship of state with respect to its economy. But there are right ways and wrong ways to do it. And I know that the moment we dare criticize the administration, we have all of these strident voices from the extreme of the political system who say: Well, how dare you criticize the administration or the President.

Look, I think both parties have done plenty wrong in this country's past. But we face an intersection now that is unlike any intersection America has come to in a long time. This intersection is one where we confront both serious, urgent foreign policy problems—Iraq, North Korea, terrorism, and more—and, at the same time, confront very serious problems here at home—an economy that is languishing, without growth, an economy that, last

month, saw 308,000 people lose their jobs.

Now just think of one of those. I am not asking you to think about 1,000, 10,000, 100,000 or 300,000—just one, who comes home and says to his or her family: Something happened at work today. I lost my job. It wasn't my fault. I have done the best I could. I am a good worker, but I have lost my job because the economy is not working well. It's soft.

So what happens here in Washington, DC? Well, we act as if none of this is going on. This is a cheering section, to say: Well, things are going to be better. This is not a problem. What are you complaining about?

Let me talk, just a little, about where we are with this economy of ours.

We have a \$10 trillion economy in this country. This is the biggest, the best economy in the world. None of us would want to live elsewhere. We are lucky to be Americans, lucky to be Americans alive now. But our responsibility, as Americans, is to nurture, protect, and foster the development of this great country of ours, and that means protecting this economic engine that produces the jobs and the opportunities for the American people.

Now, in May of 2001, we had an economy that economists told us would produce budget surpluses at the Federal level as far as the eye could see. They said: I tell you, we're walking in tall clover here. There are going to be budget surpluses for 10 years, so you all ought to get about the business of providing big, big tax cuts.

President Bush came to town and said: My heavy lifting is to ask the American people to accept big tax cuts. That is the easiest lift in American politics, I guarantee you. I would like to see one politician who works up a sweat asking people to accept tax cuts.

So the President said: \$1.7 trillion in tax cuts; that's my plan. I stood at this desk then, and I said: I think we ought be a little conservative. What if something happens? What if we are giving away money we don't get? What if we don't have these surpluses? What if something that we can't predict at this point occurs and these surpluses don't exist? What you are going to do is run into big deficits and have our children shoulder the consequences of this mistake.

Well, I lost that debate. And so a \$1.7 trillion tax cut proposed by the President was pushed through this Congress. And guess what. In a matter of months—just a matter of months—we discovered our economy was in a recession. Months after that, September 11, the most devastating terrorist attack against this country in its history; months after that, a series of corporate scandals unlike any we have ever seen in this country; during all of that time, the bursting of the technology bubble and the collapsing and pancaking of the stock market; and during all of that time, the prosecution of a war against terrorism.