1016-A

CONFLICT WITH IRAQ: AN ISRAELI PERSPECTIVE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 12, 2002

Serial No. 107–139

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/congress/house
http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
83–514 PDF WASHINGTON : 2003

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES
FEB 26 2003
DEPOSITED BY UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The University of Michigan Documents Center

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
STEVEN C. LaTOURETTE, Ohio
BOB BARR, Georgia
DAN MILLER, Florida
DOUG OSE, California
RON LEWIS, Kentucky
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
DAVE WELDON, Florida
CHRIS CANNON, Utah
ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida
C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER, Idaho
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, Virginia
JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr., Tennessee
JOHN SULLIVAN, Oklahoma

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
JIM TURNER, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
DIANE E. WATSON, California
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
(Independent)

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*
DANIEL R. MOLL, *Deputy Staff Director*
JAMES C. WILSON, *Chief Counsel*
ROBERT A. BRIGGS, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on September 12, 2002	1
Statement of:	
Netanyahu, Benjamin, former Prime Minister of Israel	39
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Burton, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of	3
Clay, Hon. Wm. Lacy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri, prepared statement of	12
McHugh, Hon. John M., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, backgrounder entitled, "A Decade of Deception and Defiance"	18
Morella, Hon. Constance A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland, prepared statement of	9

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CONFLICT WITH IRAQ: AN ISRAELI PERSPECTIVE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2002

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:08 p.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dan Burton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Burton, Barr, Morella, Shays, McHugh, Horn, Mica, Tom Davis of Virginia, LaTourette, Lewis, Platts, Weldon, Cannon, Waxman, Lantos, Norton, Kucinich, Davis of Illinois, Tierney, Turner, Clay, and Watson.

Staff present: Kevin Binger, staff director; James C. Wilson, chief counsel; David A. Kass, deputy chief counsel; Chad Bungard, Pablo Carrillo, and Jennifer Hall, counsels; S. Elizabeth Clay and Caroline Katzin, professional staff members; Blain Rethmeier, communications director; Allyson Blandford, assistant to chief counsel; Robert A. Briggs, chief clerk; Robin Butler, office manager; Joshua E. Gillespie, deputy chief clerk; Nicholis Mutton, deputy communications director; Corinne Zaccagnini, systems administrator; Phil Barnett, minority chief counsel; David Rapallo, minority counsel; Ellen Rayner, minority chief clerk; and Jean Gosa and Earley Green, minority assistant clerks.

Mr. BURTON. Good afternoon. A quorum being present, the Committee on Government Reform will come to order. I ask unanimous consent that all Members' and witnesses' written and opening statement be included in the record.

Without objection, so ordered.

I ask unanimous consent that all articles, exhibits, and extraneous or tabular material referred to be included in the record.

Without objection, so ordered.

Today we are privileged to have former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, one of the leading experts on the Middle East, here to testify and we really appreciate his being here.

I have an opening statement I would like to make but I am going to submit it for the record and just make a couple of brief comments.

President Bush appeared before the United Nations today and I think he made a very strong case for holding Saddam Hussein accountable for his actions and inactions.

The President stated—and I think most of my colleagues and I saw this speech—the President stated in no uncertain terms that almost every one of the U.N. resolutions that had been agreed to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

by Saddam Hussein has been violated by him. I won't enumerate all of them, but I think the President made a very, very strong case.

I know there is a lot of concern about the problems in the Middle East and Iraq and whether or not we should take military action to eliminate the threat by Saddam Hussein. And so today I hope that listening to one of the foremost experts on the Middle East, Benjamin Netanyahu, we will be able to have a lot of those questions answered.

I have had the privilege of meeting with Benjamin Netanyahu on a number of times, a number of occasions, and heard him speak on issues concerning the Middle East and in particular Iraq, and I am convinced he is one of the most knowledgeable people on this issue that I have had the pleasure to talk to. And with that, I want to welcome Mr. Netanyahu.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Dan Burton follows:]

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Opening Statement
Chairman Dan Burton
Committee on Government Reform
"Conflict with Iraq – An Israeli Perspective"
September 12, 2002

One year ago, America suffered the horrible events of September 11.

Yesterday, we paused to remember.
We remembered those who died at the Pentagon.
We remembered those who perished in New York.
We remembered those who died in that field in Pennsylvania.

There were moving ceremonies all over the country.

That morning, I stood in the basement of the Capitol Building. I was at a breakfast with colleagues and constituents. If it hadn't been for the heroism of the people on Flight 93, our names might have been added to the long list of victims. So I want to pay special tribute to those brave Americans.

Yesterday was a day to remember.
Today is a day to go back to work.

We've accomplished a great deal in the last year.
We've driven the Taliban from Afghanistan.
We've disrupted terrorist networks.
We've rebuilt the Pentagon.

But we have much more to do.

One of the unfinished pieces of business we have is Iraq. In my opinion, this is a problem we can't continue to ignore. Saddam Hussein is a menace. He has chemical weapons. He has biological weapons. He's working hard to acquire nuclear weapons. He's used chemical weapons in the past. We should have no doubt that he'll use them again. And if he succeeds in developing nuclear weapons, we could have a catastrophe on our hands.

This morning the President made a strong case for taking action. Now we need to see how the world responds. I hope that our friends and allies around the world will join us. I hope that we can assemble a strong coalition that will stand up to this dangerous regime. However, if we can't, my view is that we have to do what's in our own best interest. If we determine that Saddam Hussein is a serious national security threat, then we have to act – alone if necessary. I hope it won't come to that, but I think the threat is very serious, and we have to treat it seriously.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

There's been a lot of second guessing after September 11. Our intelligence agencies have been accused of being asleep at the switch. Many people have said that if we had responded to the evidence we had, we could have prevented September 11. I don't know if we could have prevented that tragedy or not, but I think we find ourselves in a similar situation today.

We know that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction.
We know he's used them before.
We know he's trying to get more.
We know he's unstable.

If we don't act to eliminate this threat, one way or another, there will be terrible consequences somewhere down the road. Saddam Hussein is developing those weapons for a reason, and I don't think it's to promote world peace. If we don't respond to that threat now, somewhere down the road, I think the second-guessing is going to be about us.

Today, we're very fortunate. For the second time in less than a year, we have with us a very distinguished statesman – Former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.. Last year, Mr. Netanyahu appeared before us one week after September 11 to talk about terrorism. It was the only time in my twenty years in Congress that I've seen a witness get a sustained round of applause from the entire committee. Mr. Netanyahu, welcome back.

Mr. Netanyahu is going to speak to us today about Iraq. He's going to talk about the Israeli perspective on the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. The Israelis have some experience in this area. During the Persian Gulf War, Iraq fired more than 40 Scud missiles at Israeli cities. So Mr. Netanyahu can speak from experience.

Mr. Prime Minister, thank you for being here today. We're honored. You have a long and distinguished record in fighting terrorism. We look forward to hearing what you have to say.

That concludes my opening statement. I now yield to Mr. Waxman for his statement.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BURTON. I will now yield to Mr. Kucinich who is going to make an opening statement on behalf of Mr. Waxman.

Mr. KUCINICH. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I am making this statement on my behalf. Mr. Waxman, I think, will have a statement which his staff will submit for the record.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection, we will put it in the record.

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you. I appreciate the Prime Minister's presence here today and his willingness to speak to our committee. It seems to me, and to many others, that one of the largest threats that Israel faces is terrorism. Israelis have repeatedly been victims of the tactics of terrorism and intimidation. A year ago the United States truly felt the brunt of this tactic, but our Nation has shown determination in bringing to justice those responsible for this attack. And as Prime Minister Netanyahu stated last year to this very committee on September 20, 2001, at a meeting I was pleased to attend: There are many terrorist militants all over the region that continue to operate terrorist missions to attack the United States, Israel, and other nations.

For the past few months, the rationale for linking Iraq and Saddam Hussein was supposed to link to terrorist attacks against the United States. Iraq at this moment to the best of our knowledge does not harbor terrorists who threaten the United States. The U.S. administration recently admitted, after months and months of talk, that there is no evidence of Iraq being tied to September 11th. So one of the questions I hope that we can get to today is why is the Iraq threat more severe now than ever before?

One of the questions that has been raised is exactly what are the military capabilities of Iraq. Yesterday's Washington Post noted that senior intelligence officials did not have an up-to-date assessment of Iraq's nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons capacities. The administration so far has not presented credible evidence of a threat to the American people, or this Congress.

I wonder if Prime Minister Netanyahu will be able to present us with tangible evidence of Iraq's present nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons capabilities.

Now, I believe that our Nation should work with Israel to focus efforts to bring about a solution to the crisis in the Middle East between Israel and the Palestinians. I think the United States is in a role to serve as an honest broker in working with both parties to bring about a resolution of that very tragic condition.

Diplomatic efforts, I believe, have not been fully examined in the case of Iraq. And while Iraq is in defiance of certain U.N. orders, no one can seem to prove to this point that Iraq poses an imminent threat to this country or to any other Nation.

If the real worry is that Iraq is seeking weapons of mass destruction and may in the future plan to use them against its neighbors and the United States, then it would follow that inspections need to resume. Inspections have been proven to be effective in the elimination of Iraq's weapons. This is called preventive diplomacy, not preventive war. Israel, I believe, would benefit considerably from a commencement in the United-Nations-led inspections in Iraq. If the threat that the United States and Israel faces is the capability of Iraq to deliver weapons of mass destruction, if they

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

have them and the ability to deliver, we should of course eliminate those weapons; find them and dismantle them.

But I would hope that as we proceed with the considerable intelligence of Mr. Netanyahu, that we not lose an opportunity to make still one more effort in trying to resolve our conditions of dispute with Iraq through the international community without the United States taking unilateral action and with an intention that we might be able to resolve this without resorting to war.

I thank Mr. Netanyahu for being here and I look forward to his testimony.

Mr. BURTON. Are there other Members that wish to make an opening statement? Mr. Barr.

Mr. BARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you set the example, I will submit a written statement in more detail. But I also want to thank the Prime Minister for being here today.

I also want to draw attention to the President's speech today which included very important elements in the war against terrorism. I think the President did a masterful job of laying out a sound basis for any number of options in the interest both of the United States and the world against terrorism and despotism. I think the President's message left the United States in a very solid position to exercise perhaps one of the most important tools in the fight against terrorism, and that is flexibility; not to tie oneself down to outside factors, but to always remain focused on maintaining maximum number of options with which to deal with terrorism, which itself maintains by its definition tremendous flexibility.

So I want to take this opportunity to commend President Bush for a masterful job of laying out the case for military action should it become necessary, but at the same time leaving options open and, at least by his actions today before the United Nations, preventing anyone from raising legitimate concerns or criticisms of the President for not making every effort to secure the backing of international organizations and our allies.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you Mr. Barr.

Mr. Waxman.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to welcome our witness, former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, to our hearing. It is good to see you again. The last time we met was in this room on September 20, 2001, right after the horrible terrorist attacks of September 11th. At that time, Prime Minister Netanyahu conveyed the grief, empathy, and the solidarity of the entire world when he said, "Today we are all Americans." And he spoke with great force and eloquence about the need to confront terrorism.

Now we are considering a different question: whether the United States should take military action against Iraq. This question is not an easy one and it raises complex issues to which Congress has not yet received answers. Should the United States push for the return of the international inspectors? Should we seek from the Security Council a resolution authorizing the use of force? What effects will a war on Iraq have on the war against terrorism, and what is the plan for Iraq after hostilities end?

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Nation and the world were united in pursuing al Qaeda, but this consensus is lacking on Iraq. There are significant differences of opinion in the international community. There are differences of opinion within the United States. There are even differences of opinion within the Bush administration itself.

It is appropriate for us to give special attention to the implications for Israel of war against Iraq. As the Gulf war demonstrated, Israel will most likely be the first target of an Iraqi regime bent on retaliation. Iraq fired over 40 Scud missiles at Israel during the Gulf war, causing severe damage, casualties, and deaths. Throughout that conflict, Israeli citizens lived under the daily threat of chemical and biological warfare. Israelis will face similar risks and challenges if there is another war against Iraq.

But while the topic of this hearing is important, I regret that the minority was not consulted in advance about witnesses for today's hearing. This hearing is entitled: "Conflict with Iraq: An Israeli Perspective." Yet to the best of my knowledge the chairman did not send invitations to a single member of the current Israeli Government. Moreover, the chairman did not agree to invite other experts in Israeli foreign policy until yesterday, which was not sufficient notice to allow other witnesses to attend.

Although Mr. Netanyahu was indeed Prime Minister of Israel and is respected widely for his expertise, I am sure he would agree that he represents his point of view and maybe a point of view that is widespread, but it is one point of view, and there are other witnesses as well that we should have before this committee.

I wrote to Chairman Burton on Monday, asking him to invite administration witnesses so that we could find out how the Bush administration plans on working with Israel and our allies in the region, but we have no witnesses from the administration.

We also do not have witnesses who can testify about the implications of military action in Iraq on other countries in the Middle East.

Military confrontation with Iraq may well be necessary, but it is a decision fraught with consequences for the United States, the Mideast, and the rest of the world. We need to hear the broadest possible spectrum of views so that we can make as informed a decision as possible about this vital issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Morella.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will submit my full statement for the record, but I just wanted to welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu and point out what we all know, and that is today's hearing is a topic of central importance both to the American people and to the world. And it is necessary, I believe, that Congress debate the merits of an invasion of Iraq, learn the perspective of our allies, determine whether an imminent attack is the wisest course of action. And I do indeed have serious reservations about an attack, but I look forward to hearing from Prime Minister Netanyahu, particularly in regards to the ramifications for Israel.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

If we do not attack, what may happen to Israel? If we do attack, what may happen to Israel?

And I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you Mrs. Morella.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Constance A. Morella follows:]

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Lynne Morella

Opening Statement for Constance Morella for Sept. 12 Hearing

I want to begin by thanking Chairman Burton and Ranking Member Waxman for holding this hearing today. Today's hearing is a topic of central importance both to the American people and the world. It is absolutely essential that Congress debate the merits of an invasion of Iraq, learn the perspectives of our allies and determine whether an imminent attack is the wisest course of action.

Currently, I have serious reservations about attacking Iraq for two reasons. One, I feel the Bush Administration has not demonstrated what it would do *after* we ousted Saddam Hussein and two, I have concerns about the ramifications of an attack for Israel.

An invasion of Iraq and the replacement of Saddam's Hussein regime by a democratic government would cost tens of billions of dollars and years of U.S. effort to occupy and reconstruct the large and diverse country. While the United States could undoubtedly win a war against Iraq on its own, it is difficult to imagine remaking Iraq on our own. The fact is, in Thomas Friedman's words, "if we invade Iraq; we own Iraq. And once we own it, we will have to rebuild it." There will be no avoiding nation-building. It would dwarf the Balkan interventions that President Bush once portrayed as stretching the U.S. military too thin. When the United States committed militarily in that conflict, then Governor Bush supported the mission but once the Serbs withdrew, Bush disagreed with the idea of using American troops to help redevelop the region.

Currently, in Afghanistan, the United States has not only mostly passed off the responsibility on rebuilding Afghanistan to other countries but we have provided very little desperately needed reconstruction aid. The majority of the disbursement, which totaled $505 million in 2002, has been for humanitarian aid such as food, medicine, potable water, shelter, and refugee care and support. Unfortunately, a minimal amount of aid has been supplied for agriculture and basic reconstruction. We have given only $12 million for vital agricultural improvements, like the rehabilitation of wells and seed multiplication, we have provided almost no money for an irrigation system even though Afghanistan is suffering from a three year drought, and no funds for repair of the major highways.

Added to this list is the fact that in June, the Bush Administration announced it would close the Army Peacekeeping Institute (PKI), which is the military's central authority for planning peacekeeping strategies.

Considering the Bush Administration has not demonstrated it has altered its views on nation-building, a war with Iraq without the necessary commitment to rebuild would only exacerbate tensions within Iraq and inflame the conflicts within the Middle East. We simply cannot invade without acknowledging what is required once our military victory is achieved. And what will be required is a nation building effort unlike any the United States has ever led.

We have never attempted to rebuild a region surrounded by so many countries diametrically opposed to everything we support. The history of the Iraqi people and the nations that surround it are inhabited by persons who have never known a true democracy of any kind. Installing a new

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

form of government and a rule of law may even be more difficult than the rebuilding of Europe after World War II–an undertaking that took several years and over 13 billion dollars. That effort succeeded because it was aimed at aiding an industrialized people temporarily down but not out. This is clearly not the case in Iraq. This is a country divided by the Kurds in the north, the Shi'as in the south and the Sunnis in the center. It's infrastructure was decimated by the Persian Gulf war, there is an exceedingly high poverty rate due to Hussein's dictatorship and only a small percentage of the population has had any formal education. Therefore, our invasion of Iraq entails, at the very least, a *discussion* of an Iraqi Marshall Plan by the Bush Administration.

The fact is a successful invasion of Iraq would be contingent upon the support of those we are helping and a firm resolve to fully commit and fund the rebuilding effort. It is my fervent hope that the Bush Administration will prove those could exist because without them, the defeat of Iraq would be the most hollow of victories.

My second concern has to do with Israel and I hope Mr. Netanyahu can enlighten me in regards to my concerns. Much of the debate on invading Iraq is unavoidably focused on conjecture. If we do not attack, what may happen. My concern is that if we do attack, what will happen, specifically to Israel. I feel Iraq will almost assuredly attack Israel in someway if the United States invaded. If Saddam Hussein knows his ouster is the goal of any invasion, which he would not have assumed during the Persian Gulf conflict, I fear he would do anything in his power to strike at Israel. There would probably be no rational reason, in his mind, not to if he felt he would be losing power anyway.

I welcome Mr. Netanyahu's views on this subject and the views of my colleagues and look forward to our discussion today.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Clay.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman. I too will deliver an abbreviated opening statement and submit its entirety to the record.

I too would like to welcome our distinguished guest, former Prime Minister Netanyahu, to this panel. I certainly appreciate having your perspective on this highly contentious issue, the conflict with Iraq.

This issue has spawned many different points of view. There is, however, a consensus that exists between our two countries. We both believe without question that Saddam Hussein must be removed. Saddam's continued existence in the region serves to further aggravate an opportunity for real peace and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

I realize that for the present moment, many questions still remain unanswered. Prime Minister Netanyahu, I am very interested to learn your opinion on how a new Iraqi regime might be different from the one that is currently in place. Additionally, I am interested in knowing your thoughts about the impact of regional destabilization and the potential loss of additional American and Israeli lives.

And, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to submit my statement into the record.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Clay, without objection, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Wm. Lacy Clay follows:]

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Statement of the
Honorable William Lacy Clay
Before the
Government Reform Committee

Thursday, September 12, 2002

"Conflict with Iraq – An Israeli Perspective"

Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman, I too would like to welcome our distinguished guest, former Prime Minister Netanyahu to this panel. I certainly appreciate having your prospective on this highly contentious issue, conflict with Iraq. This issue has spawned many different points of view. There is however, a consensus that exists between our two countries. We both believe, without question, that Saddam Hussein must be removed. Saddam's continued existence in the region serves to further aggravate an opportunity for real peace and cooperation between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

There is no doubt in the minds of Americans that there is a clear indubitable connection between the government of Saddam Hussein and state sponsored terrorism. Hence, the argument to remove him has been made and is fully understood. Now comes the hard part. How can he be removed and most of all when?

I realize that for the present moment many questions will remain unanswered. Prime Minister Netanyahu, I am very interested to learn your opinion on how a new Iraqi regime might be different from the one that is currently in place.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Additionally, I am interested in knowing your thoughts about the impact of regional destabilization, and the potential loss of additional American and Israeli lives.

Thomas L. Friedman, the New York Times journalist asked a tough question recently, he wanted to know, "Is Iraq the way it is because Saddam Hussein is the way he is? Or is Saddam Hussein the way he is because Iraq is the way it is? Clarifying his statement Friedman asked, is Iraq a totalitarian dictatorship under a cruel, iron-fisted man because the country is actually an Arab Yugoslavia – a highly tribalized, artificial state, drawn up by the British, consisting of Shiites in the south, Kurds in the north and Sunnis in the center – whose historical ethnic rivalries can be managed only by a Saddam-like figure? Or, has Iraq, by now, congealed into a real nation?" My hope is that you will find time to present to us your views regarding that question. Your opinion is valued.

Finally, your colleague, Ehud Barak, former primer minister of Israel in a recent New York Times article stated that, " For a successful invasion of Iraq, two operational options are basically valid: a surgical operation to hit the core of the regime, and a full-scale operation to include major airborne and ground forces, perhaps 300,000 soldiers. He says that the interrelationship between these two options should be well understood. The surgical operation needs high-quality and timely intelligence and superb quick-response operational capabilities. He states further that, " If a surgical operation is launched and somehow fails, the point of no return has been reached. The United States will need to launch the wider operation immediately. When you launch a surgical operation, you must have contingency plans for a full-fledge campaign on the operational level and have the diplomatic backing lined up as well." Do you agree with Mr.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Barak's premise of two operational options? Again thank you for agreeing to address our committee today. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to submit my statement into the record.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In April, Netanyahu told the Senate ….

Clearly, the urgent need to topple Saddam is paramount. The commitment of America and Britain to dismantle this terrorist dictatorship before it obtains nuclear weapons deserves the unconditional support of all sane governments.

Questions

1 - If Saddam is toppled, what role can and should the U.S. play in establishing a new Iraqi regime.

2- What is your vision for a new Iraqi regime and how might it be expected to achieve better relations with Israel?

3– Many analysts believe that the Gulf War ignited Islamic terrorists groups. If Saddam is toppled, will this action inflame Arab animosity toward the West and serve to empower terrorist groups throughout the Middle East?

4 -Do you really believe that Saddam can be removed from office without compounding the terrorist forces?

5- Do you believe that the lack of economic opportunity is what fuels the ongoing social unrest and turmoil in Israel, the occupied territories and throughout the region? Do you believe U.S. policy should be as forceful in addressing economic development as it has been in defending Israel's right to exist?

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BURTON. Are there further statements? Mr. Mica. It is nice to see you, Mr. Mica.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is always good to be with you. And welcome, former Prime Minister Netanyahu.

Just a very brief statement that while I welcome the Prime Minister's advice and counsel, I think that we all need to remember that it is the responsibility under the Constitution of the United States for the President of the United States to make a decision in our national security.

Now, I know war does require some advice and consent of the Congress, but we have to remember what we are dealing with here: someone who has gassed his own population; someone that a little over a decade ago lobbed missiles into Israel, killing people. And at that time, he did not have the technology that he may have today. And whether it is delivered by a missile or some other means, we have seen that his goal is to destroy not only Israelis but destroy world peace and the United States in the process.

So I think it is time that we get a little starch in our spines and realize the threat that we face, that we back the President of the United States. It is nice to have this discussion, but only he is provided with the intelligence and the information on proceeding, and he should make that decision and we should support that decision.

At Memorial Day, I visited Europe and followed the President through the graves at Normandy and visited other of our cemeteries. The landscape of Europe is littered with the American dead who have gone in to bail out our weak-kneed allies who have slept while there have been holocausts, who have delayed taking action when others have been slaughtered. And I don't think this is the time—we know the terrorists were not interested in killing 2,800 in the World Trade Center. They wanted to kill 28,000 in each tower.

And, again, it is nice to have this debate, this discussion, but I think we need to back the President of the United States, and I would strongly support his action based on what we now know to go after Saddam Hussein.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Mica.

Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I simply want to welcome the Prime Minister to this committee. You have been here before. I had the opportunity to visit with you in Jerusalem shortly after you assumed the position of Prime Minister. We welcome your input and your counsel, and I admire you greatly for your advocacy of democracy which I have heard you speak of on many occasions. So thank you for being with us.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Turner. Since that was so short, we will go to Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will forgo my remarks and just welcome the witness here, and thank him for his time and his perspective on that. I suspect that these hearings will be broadened out and we will hear other perspectives also that we will all benefit from. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you Mr. Tierney.

Any other comments on our side?

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. MCHUGH. I apologize, Mr. Chairman. I was not going to make a statement, and I will still try to be brief. I certainly want to add my words of welcome to the former Prime Minister. As I hope you can tell, sir, you have many admirers, amongst whom I count myself, and many, many admirers as well for the great spirit and the great determination of the Israeli people.

As you have also probably heard, we have some disagreements on some of the particulars that lie behind this issue, while we are particularly interested in hearing your comments and your very unique perspective and expertise. And I am just going to make a simple request of my colleagues. All of us who have the honor of serving here, of course, are very busy, but I have heard some remarks here today about what we do and what we do not know about what are allegations and what are not.

I had an opportunity this morning to go to a meeting with some other members where we were given a document that I see is amongst those in our briefing booklets here today. And it is the backgrounder that the administration put out: "A Decade of Deception and Defiance" that I think every Member, as we face this weighty issue, would serve themselves and their Nation well by reviewing very carefully; because as you look through it, it details not based on supposition, not based on unconfirmed intelligence reports, not based upon opinion, but based upon a very clear record of deception, very clear record of the kinds of capabilities that we know for a fact, confirmed by the United Nations, that Saddam Hussein has developed. It confirms the enormous amounts of armaments, of chemical weapons, and precursors that are unaccounted for, and that any reasonable person would have to assume are still in existence.

You can draw your own determinations from that, my colleagues, but I think that as we deliberate on this issue, the facts are probably the most persuasive argument and the facts are established. I think we should all do our best to familiarize ourselves with them. So I would just make that respectful—I hope respectful—suggestion to all of us, myself included. And again Mr. Prime Minister, welcome.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHUGH. I am happy to.

Mr. MICA. I ask unanimous consent that this document be made part of the record. I think that is very important. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A DECADE OF DECEPTION AND DEFIANCE

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S DEFIANCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

SEPTEMBER 12, 2002

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PREFACE

A Decade of Deception and Defiance serves as a background paper for President George W. Bush's September 12th speech to the United Nations General Assembly. This document provides specific examples of how Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has systematically and continually violated 16 United Nations Security Council resolutions over the past decade. This document is not designed to catalogue all of the violations of UN resolutions or other abuses of Saddam Hussein's regime over the years.

For more than a decade, Saddam Hussein has deceived and defied the will and resolutions of the United Nations Security Council by, among other things: continuing to seek and develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, and prohibited long-range missiles; brutalizing the Iraqi people, including committing gross human rights violations and crimes against humanity; supporting international terrorism; refusing to release or account for prisoners of war and other missing individuals from the Gulf War era; refusing to return stolen Kuwaiti property; and working to circumvent the UN's economic sanctions.

The Administration will periodically provide information on these and other aspects of the threat posed to the international community by Saddam Hussein.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Saddam Hussein's Defiance of United Nations Resolutions	4
Saddam Hussein's Development of Weapons of Mass Destruction	8
Saddam Hussein's Repression of the Iraqi People	11
Saddam Hussein's Support for International Terrorism	18
Saddam Hussein's Refusal to Account for Gulf War Prisoners	19
Saddam Hussein's Refusal to Return Stolen Property	20
Saddam Hussein's Efforts to Circumvent Economic Sanctions	21

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S DEFIANCE OF UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS

Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated sixteen United Nations Security Council Resolutions (UNSCRs) designed to ensure that Iraq does not pose a threat to international peace and security. In addition to these repeated violations, he has tried, over the past decade, to circumvent UN economic sanctions against Iraq, which are reflected in a number of other resolutions. As noted in the resolutions, Saddam Hussein was required to fulfill many obligations beyond the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. Specifically, Saddam Hussein was required to, among other things: allow international weapons inspectors to oversee the destruction of his weapons of mass destruction; not develop new weapons of mass destruction; destroy all of his ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers; stop support for terrorism and prevent terrorist organizations from operating within Iraq; help account for missing Kuwaitis and other individuals; return stolen Kuwaiti property and bear financial liability for damage from the Gulf War; and he was required to end his repression of the Iraqi people. Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated each of the following resolutions:

UNSCR 678 – NOVEMBER 29, 1990

- Iraq must comply fully with UNSCR 660 (regarding Iraq's illegal invasion of Kuwait) "and all subsequent relevant resolutions."
- Authorizes UN Member States "to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area."

UNSCR 686 – MARCH 2, 1991

- Iraq must release prisoners detained during the Gulf War.
- Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.
- Iraq must accept liability under international law for damages from its illegal invasion of Kuwait.

UNSCR 687 – APRIL 3, 1991

- Iraq must "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" of all "chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities."
- Iraq must "unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear-weapons-usable material" or any research, development or manufacturing facilities.
- Iraq must "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" of all "ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 KM and related major parts and repair and production facilities."
- Iraq must not "use, develop, construct or acquire" any weapons of mass destruction.
- Iraq must reaffirm its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Creates the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) to verify the elimination of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs and mandated that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) verify elimination of Iraq's nuclear weapons program.
- Iraq must declare fully its weapons of mass destruction programs.
- Iraq must not commit or support terrorism, or allow terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq.
- Iraq must cooperate in accounting for the missing and dead Kuwaitis and others.
- Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

UNSCR 688 – APRIL 5, 1991

- "Condemns" repression of Iraqi civilian population, "the consequences of which threaten international peace and security."
- Iraq must immediately end repression of its civilian population.
- Iraq must allow immediate access to international humanitarian organizations to those in need of assistance.

UNSCR 707 – AUGUST 15, 1991

- "Condemns" Iraq's "serious violation" of UNSCR 687.
- "Further condemns" Iraq's noncompliance with IAEA and its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Iraq must halt nuclear activities of all kinds until the Security Council deems Iraq in full compliance.
- Iraq must make a full, final and complete disclosure of all aspects of its weapons of mass destruction and missile programs.
- Iraq must allow UN and IAEA inspectors immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.
- Iraq must cease attempts to conceal or move weapons of mass destruction, and related materials and facilities.
- Iraq must allow UN and IAEA inspectors to conduct inspection flights throughout Iraq.
- Iraq must provide transportation, medical and logistical support for UN and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 715 – OCTOBER 11, 1991

- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 949 – OCTOBER 15, 1994

- "Condemns" Iraq's recent military deployments toward Kuwait.
- Iraq must not utilize its military or other forces in a hostile manner to threaten its neighbors or UN operations in Iraq.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors.
- Iraq must not enhance its military capability in southern Iraq.

UNSCR 1051 – MARCH 27, 1996

- Iraq must report shipments of dual-use items related to weapons of mass destruction to the UN and IAEA.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1060 – JUNE 12, 1996

- "Deplores" Iraq's refusal to allow access to UN inspectors and Iraq's "clear violations" of previous UN resolutions.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

UNSCR 1115 – JUNE 21, 1997

- "Condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access" to UN inspectors, which constitutes a "clear and flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687, 707, 715, and 1060.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.
- Iraq must give immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom UN inspectors want to interview.

UNSCR 1134 – OCTOBER 23, 1997

- "Condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access" to UN inspectors, which constitutes a "flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687, 707, 715, and 1060.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.
- Iraq must give immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom UN inspectors want to interview.

UNSCR 1137 – NOVEMBER 12, 1997

- "Condemns the continued violations by Iraq" of previous UN resolutions, including its "implicit threat to the safety of" aircraft operated by UN inspectors and its tampering with UN inspector monitoring equipment.
- Reaffirms Iraq's responsibility to ensure the safety of UN inspectors.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1154 – MARCH 2, 1998

- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access, and notes that any violation would have the "severest consequences for Iraq."

UNSCR 1194 – SEPTEMBER 9, 1998

- "Condemns the decision by Iraq of 5 August 1998 to suspend cooperation with" UN and IAEA inspectors, which constitutes "a totally unacceptable contravention" of its obligations under UNSCR 687, 707, 715, 1060, 1115, and 1154.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA weapons inspectors, and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1205 – NOVEMBER 5, 1998

- "Condemns the decision by Iraq of 31 October 1998 to cease cooperation" with UN inspectors as "a flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687 and other resolutions.
- Iraq must provide "immediate, complete and unconditional cooperation" with UN and IAEA inspectors.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

UNSCR 1284 – DECEMBER 17, 1999

- Created the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspections Commission (UNMOVIC) to replace previous weapon inspection team (UNSCOM).
- Iraq must allow UNMOVIC "immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access" to Iraqi officials and facilities.
- Iraq must fulfill its commitment to return Gulf War prisoners.
- Calls on Iraq to distribute humanitarian goods and medical supplies to its people and address the needs of vulnerable Iraqis without discrimination.

ADDITIONAL UN SECURITY COUNCIL STATEMENTS

In addition to the legally binding UNSCRs, the UN Security Council has also issued at least 30 statements from the President of the UN Security Council regarding Saddam Hussein's continued violations of UNSCRs. The list of statements includes:

- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, June 28, 1991
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, February 5, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, February 19, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, February 28, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, March 6, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, March 11, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, March 12, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, April 10, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, June 17, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, July 6, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, September 2, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, November 23, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, November 24, 1992
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, January 8, 1993
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, January 11, 1993
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, June 18, 1993
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, June 28, 1993
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, November 23, 1993
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, October 8, 1994
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, March 19, 1996
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, June 14, 1996
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, August 23, 1996
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, December 30, 1996
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, June 13, 1997
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, October 29, 1997
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, November 13, 1997
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, December 3, 1997
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, December 22, 1997
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, January 14, 1998
- UN Security Council Presidential Statement, May 14, 1998

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S DEVELOPMENT OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Saddam Hussein has continued to defy UN weapons inspectors for more than a decade, and he continues his efforts to develop or acquire weapons of mass destruction – including biological, chemical and nuclear weapons, and prohibited long-range missiles – and other means to deliver them.

BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

- In 2001, an Iraqi defector, Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri, said he had visited twenty secret facilities for chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Mr. Saeed, a civil engineer, supported his claims with stacks of Iraqi government contracts, complete with technical specifications. Mr. Saeed said Iraq used companies to purchase equipment with the blessing of the United Nations – and then secretly used the equipment for their weapons programs.[1]

- Iraq admitted to producing biological agents, and after the 1995 defection of a senior Iraqi official, Iraq admitted to the weaponization of thousands of liters of anthrax, botulinim toxin, and aflatoxin for use with Scud warheads, aerial bombs and aircraft.[2]

- United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) experts concluded that Iraq's declarations on biological agents vastly understated the extent of its program, and that Iraq actually produced two to four times the amount of most agents, including anthrax and botulinim toxin, than it had declared.[3]

- 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.[4]

- The Department of Defense reported in January 2001 that Iraq has continued to work on its weapons programs, including converting L-29 jet trainer aircraft for potential vehicles for the delivery of chemical or biological weapons.[5]

- The al-Dawrah Foot and Mouth Disease Vaccine Facility is one of two known biocontainment level-three facilities in Iraq that have an extensive air handling and filtering system. Iraq has admitted that this was a biological weapons facility. In 2001, Iraq announced that it would begin renovating the plant without UN approval, ostensibly to produce vaccines that it could more easily and more quickly import through the UN.

- Saddam Hussein continues its attempts to procure mobile biological weapons laboratories that could be used for further research and development.

---

[1] "Secret Sites: Iraqi tells of Renovations at Sites for Chemical and Nuclear Arms," *The New York Times*, December 20, 2001
[2] UNSCOM Report, January 25, 1999
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] *Proliferation: Threat and Response*; Department of Defense; January 2001

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Saddam Hussein launched a large-scale chemical weapons attack against Iraq's Kurdish population in the late 1980s, killing thousands. On at least 10 occasions, Saddam Hussein's military forces have attacked Iranian and Kurdish targets with combinations of mustard gas and nerve agents through the use of aerial bombs, 122-millimeter rockets, and conventional artillery shells. Saddam Hussein continues his efforts to develop chemical weapons:

- 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.

- Iraq has not accounted for hundreds of tons of chemical precursors and tens of thousands of unfilled munitions, including Scud variant missile warheads.[6]

- Iraq has not accounted for at least 15,000 artillery rockets that in the past were its preferred vehicle for delivering nerve agents, nor has it accounted for about 550 artillery shells filled with mustard agent.[7]

- Iraq continues to rebuild and expand dual-use infrastructure that it could quickly divert to chemical weapons production, such as chlorine and phenol plants.

- Iraq is seeking to purchase chemical weapons agent precursors and applicable production equipment, and is making an effort to hide activities at the Fallujah plant, which was one of Iraq's chemical weapons production facilities before the Gulf War.

- At Fallujah and three other plants, Iraq now has chlorine production capacity far higher than any civilian need for water treatment, and the evidence indicates that some of its chlorine imports are being diverted for military purposes.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Saddam Hussein had an advanced nuclear weapons development program before the Gulf War and continues his work to develop a nuclear weapon:

- A new report released on September 9, 2002 from the International Institute for Strategic Studies – an independent research organization – concludes that Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear bomb within months if he were able to obtain fissile material.[8]

- Iraq has stepped up its quest for nuclear weapons and has embarked on a worldwide hunt for materials to make an atomic bomb. In the last 14 months, Iraq has sought to buy thousands of specially designed aluminum tubes which officials believe were intended as components of centrifuges to enrich uranium.

---

[6] UNSCOM Report, January 25, 1999

[7] Ibid.

[8] *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Net Assessment*; September 9, 2002; The International Institute for Strategic Studies

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- Iraq has withheld documentation relevant to its past nuclear program, including data about enrichment techniques, foreign procurement, weapons design, experimental data, and technical documents.

- Iraq still has the technical expertise and some of the infrastructure needed to pursue its goal of building a nuclear weapon.

- Saddam Hussein has repeatedly met with his nuclear scientists over the past two years, signaling his continued interest in developing his nuclear program.

BALLISTIC MISSILES

- Iraq is believed to be developing ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers – as prohibited by the UN Security Council Resolution 687.

- Discrepancies identified by UNSCOM in Saddam Hussein's declarations suggest that Iraq retains a small force of Scud-type missiles and an undetermined number of launchers and warheads.[9]

- Iraq continues work on the al-Samoud liquid propellant short-range missile (which can fly beyond the allowed 150 kilometers). The al-Samoud and the solid propellant Ababil-100 appeared in a military parade in Baghdad on December 31, 2000, suggesting that both systems are nearing operational deployment.

- The al-Rafah-North facility is Iraq's principal site for testing liquid propellant missile engines. Iraq has been building a new, larger test stand there that is clearly intended for testing prohibited longer-range missile engines.

- At their al-Mamoun facility, the Iraqis have rebuilt structures that had been dismantled by UNSCOM that were originally designed to manufacture solid propellant motors for the Badr-2000 missile program.

---

[9] UNSCOM Report

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S REPRESSION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE

UNSCR 688 (April 5, 1991) "condemns" Saddam Hussein's repression of the Iraqi civilian population – "the consequences of which threaten international peace and security." UNSCR 688 also requires Saddam Hussein to end his repression of the Iraqi people and to allow immediate access to international humanitarian organizations to help those in need of assistance. Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated these provisions and has: expanded his violence against women and children; continued his horrific torture and execution of innocent Iraqis; continued to violate the basic human rights of the Iraqi people and has continued to control all sources of information (including killing more than 500 journalists and other opinion leaders in the past decade). Saddam Hussein has also harassed humanitarian aid workers; expanded his crimes against Muslims; he has withheld food from families that fail to offer their children to his regime; and he has continued to subject Iraqis to unfair imprisonment.[10]

REFUSAL TO ADMIT HUMAN RIGHTS MONITORS

- The UN Commission on Human Rights and the UN General Assembly issued a report that noted "with dismay" the lack of improvement in the situation of human rights in Iraq. The report strongly criticized the "systematic, widespread, and extremely grave violations of human rights" and of international humanitarian law by the Iraqi Government, which it stated resulted in "all-pervasive repression and oppression sustained by broad-based discrimination and widespread terror." The report called on the Iraqi Government to fulfill its obligations under international human rights treaties.

- Saddam Hussein has repeatedly refused visits by human rights monitors and the establishment of independent human rights organizations. From 1992 until 2002, Saddam prevented the UN Special Rapporteur from visiting Iraq.[11]

- In September 2001 the Government expelled six UN humanitarian relief workers without providing any explanation.[12]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

- Human rights organizations and opposition groups continued to receive reports of women who suffered from severe psychological trauma after being raped by Iraqi personnel while in custody.[13]

- Former Mukhabarat member Khalid Al-Janabi reported that a Mukhabarat unit, the Technical Operations Directorate, used rape and sexual assault in a systematic and institutionalized manner for political purposes. The unit reportedly also videotaped the rape of female relatives of suspected oppositionists and used the videotapes for blackmail purposes and to ensure their future cooperation.[14]

---

[10] *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[11] Page 2-3, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[12] Ibid, Page 6
[13] Ibid, Page 5
[14] Ibid, Page 5

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- In June 2000, a former Iraqi general reportedly received a videotape of security forces raping a female family member. He subsequently received a telephone call from an intelligence agent who stated that another female relative was being held and warned him to stop speaking out against the Iraqi Government.[15]

- Iraqi security forces allegedly raped women who were captured during the Anfal Campaign and during the occupation of Kuwait.[16]

- Amnesty International reported that, in October 2000, the Iraqi Government executed dozens of women accused of prostitution.[17]

- In May, the Iraqi Government reportedly tortured to death the mother of three Iraqi defectors for her children's opposition activities.[18]

- Iraqi security agents reportedly decapitated numerous women and men in front of their family members. According to Amnesty International, the victims' heads were displayed in front of their homes for several days.[19]

TORTURE

- Iraqi security services routinely and systematically torture detainees. According to former prisoners, torture techniques included branding, electric shocks administered to the genitals and other areas, beating, pulling out of fingernails, burning with hot irons and blowtorches, suspension from rotating ceiling fans, dripping acid on the skin, rape, breaking of limbs, denial of food and water, extended solitary confinement in dark and extremely small compartments, and threats to rape or otherwise harm family members and relatives. Evidence of such torture often was apparent when security forces returned the mutilated bodies of torture victims to their families.[20]

- According to a report received by the UN Special Rapporteur in 1998, hundreds of Kurds and other detainees have been held without charge for close to two decades in extremely harsh conditions, and many of them have been used as subjects in Iraq's illegal experimental chemical and biological weapons programs.[21]

- In 2000, the authorities reportedly introduced tongue amputation as a punishment for persons who criticize Saddam Hussein or his family, and on July 17, government authorities reportedly amputated the tongue of a person who allegedly criticized Saddam Hussein. Authorities reportedly performed the amputation in front of a large crowd. Similar tongue amputations also reportedly occurred.[22]

---

[15] Page 7, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[16] Ibid, Page 5
[17] Ibid, Page 2
[18] Ibid, Page 3
[19] Ibid, Page 3
[20] Ibid, Page 4
[21] Ibid, Page 6
[22] Ibid, Page 4-5

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- Refugees fleeing to Europe often reported instances of torture to receiving governments, and displayed scars and mutilations to substantiate their claims.[23]

- In August 2001 Amnesty International released a report entitled *Iraq -- Systematic Torture of Political Prisoners*, which detailed the systematic and routine use of torture against suspected political opponents and, occasionally, other prisoners. Amnesty International also reports "Detainees have also been threatened with bringing in a female relative, especially the wife or the mother, and raping her in front of the detainee. Some of these threats have been carried out."[24]

- Saad Keis Naoman, an Iraqi soccer player who defected to Europe, reported that he and his teammates were beaten and humiliated at the order of Uday Saddam Hussein for poor performances. He was flogged until his back was bloody, forcing him to sleep on his stomach in the tiny cell in Al-Radwaniya prison.[25]

EXECUTIONS AND REPRESSION OF POLITICAL OPPOSITION

- Former UN Human Rights Special Rapporteur Max Van der Stoel's report in April 1993 stated that Iraq had executed at least 1,500 people during the previous year for political reasons.

- The government continues to execute summarily alleged political opponents and leaders in the Shi'a religious community. Reports suggest that persons were executed merely because of their association with an opposition group or as part of a continuing effort to reduce prison populations.[26]

- In February 2001, the Government reportedly executed 37 political detainees for opposition activity.[27]

- In June 2001, security forces killed a Shi'a cleric, Hussein Bahar al-Uloom, for refusing to appear on television to congratulate Qusay Saddam Hussein for his election to a Ba'th Party position. Such killings continue an apparent government policy of eliminating prominent Shi'a clerics who are suspected of disloyalty to the government. In 1998 and 1999, the Government killed a number of leading Shi'a clerics, prompting the former Special Rapporteur in 1999 to express his concern to the government that the killings might be part of a systematic attack by government officials on the independent leadership of the Shi'a Muslim community. The government did not respond to the Special Rapporteur's letter.[28]

- There are persistent reports that families are made to pay for the cost of executions.[29]

- Saddam Hussein destroyed the southern Iraqi town of Albu 'Aysh sometime between September 1998 and December 1999.[30]

---

[23] Page 4, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[24] *Iraq – Systematic Torture of Political Prisoners*; Amnesty International; web.amnesty.org
[25] Page 4, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[26] Ibid, Page 1
[27] Ibid, Page 2
[28] Ibid, Page 2
[29] Ibid, Page 4
[30] *Iraq – Systematic Torture of Political Prisoners*; Amnesty International; web.amnesty.org

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- Iraq has conducted a systematic "Arabization" campaign of ethnic cleansing designed to harass and expel ethnic Kurds and Turkmen from government-controlled areas. Non-Arab citizens are forced to change their ethnicity or their identity documents and adopt Arab names, or they are deprived of their homes, property and food-ration cards, and expelled.

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S ABUSE OF CHILDREN

- Saddam Hussein has held 3-week training courses in weapons use, hand-to-hand fighting, rappelling from helicopters, and infantry tactics for children between 10 and 15 years of age. Camps for these "Saddam Cubs" operated throughout the country. Senior military officers who supervised the courses noted that the children held up under the "physical and psychological strain" of training that lasted for as long as 14 hours each day. Sources in the opposition report that the army found it difficult to recruit enough children to fill all of the vacancies in the program. Families reportedly were threatened with the loss of their food ration cards if they refused to enroll their children in the course. The Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq reported in October 1999 that authorities were denying food ration cards to families that failed to send their young sons to Saddam Cubs compulsory weapons-training camps. Similarly, authorities reportedly withheld school examination results to students unless they registered in the Fedayeen Saddam organization.[31]

- Iraq often announces food ration cuts for the general population, blaming US or UK actions. Among the most controversial have been cuts in baby milk rations. Iraq has blamed the shortages on US and UK contract rejections, although the UN has approved all baby milk contracts submitted.

- Child labor persists and there are instances of forced labor.

- There are widespread reports that food and medicine that could have been made available to the general public, including children, have been stockpiled in warehouses or diverted for the personal use of some government officials.[32]

DISAPPEARANCES

- Amnesty International reported that Iraq has the world's worst record for numbers of persons who have disappeared or remain unaccounted for. [33]

- In 1999, the UN Special Rapporteur stated that Iraq remains the country with the highest number of disappearances known to the UN: over 16,000.

BASIC FREEDOMS: FREEDOM OF SPEECH, FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

- In practice, Saddam Hussein does not permit freedom of speech or of the press, and does not tolerate political dissent in areas under its control. In November 2000, the UN General Assembly criticized Saddam Hussein's "suppression of freedom of thought, expression, information, association, and assembly." The Special Rapporteur stated in October 1999 that citizens lived "in a climate of fear," in

---

[31] Page 1, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[32] Ibid, Page 16
[33] Ibid, Page 3

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

which whatever they said or did, particularly in the area of politics, involved "the risk of arrest and interrogation by the police or military intelligence." He noted that "the mere suggestion that someone is not a supporter of the President carries the prospect of the death penalty."[34]

- In June 2001, the Human Rights Alliance reported that Saddam Hussein had killed more than 500 journalists and other intellectuals in the past decade.[35]

- Saddam Hussein frequently infringes on citizens' constitutional right to privacy. Saddam routinely ignores constitutional provisions designed to protect the confidentiality of mail, telegraphic correspondence, and telephone conversations. Iraq periodically jams news broadcasts from outside the country, including those of opposition groups. The security services and the Ba'th Party maintain pervasive networks of informers to deter dissident activity and instill fear in the public.[36]

- Foreign journalists must work from offices located within the Iraqi ministry building and are accompanied everywhere they go by ministry officers, who reportedly restrict their movements and make it impossible for them to interact freely with citizens.[37]

- The Iraqi Government, the Ba'th Party, or persons close to Saddam Hussein own all print and broadcast media, and operate them as propaganda outlets. They generally do not report opposing points of view that are expressed either domestically or abroad.[38]

- In September 1999, Hashem Hasan, a journalist and Baghdad University professor, was arrested after declining an appointment as editor of one of Uday Hussein's publications. The Paris-based Reporters Sans Frontieres (RSF) sent a letter of appeal to Uday Hussein; however, Hassan's fate and whereabouts remained unknown at year's end.[39]

- Saddam Hussein regularly jams foreign news broadcasts. Satellite dishes, modems, and fax machines are banned, although some restrictions reportedly were lifted in 1999.[40]

- In government-operated Internet cafes, users only are permitted to view web sites provided by the Ministry of Culture and Information.[41]

- In 1999, Uday Hussein reportedly dismissed hundreds of members of the Iraqi Union of Journalists for not praising Saddam Hussein and the Government sufficiently.[42]

---

[34] Page 9, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[35] Ibid, Page 9
[36] Ibid, Page 7
[37] Ibid, Page 9
[38] Ibid, Page 9
[39] Ibid, Page 10
[40] Ibid, Page 10
[41] Ibid, Page 10
[42] Ibid, Page 10

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

WITHHOLDING OF FOOD

- Relatives who do not report deserters may lose their ration cards for purchasing government-controlled food supplies, be evicted from their residences, or face the arrest of other family members. The Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq reported in October and December 1999 that authorities denied food ration cards to families that failed to send their young sons to the "Saddam's Cubs" compulsory weapons training camps.[43]

CRIMES AGAINST MUSLIMS

- The Government consistently politicizes and interferes with religious pilgrimages, both of Iraqi Muslims who wish to make the Hajj to Mecca and Medina and of Iraqi and non-Iraqi Muslim pilgrims who travel to holy sites within the country. For example, in 1998 the UN Sanctions Committee offered to disburse vouchers for travel and expenses to pilgrims making the Hajj; however, the Government rejected this offer. In 1999 the Sanctions Committee offered to disburse funds to cover Hajj-related expenses via a neutral third party; the Government again rejected the offer. Following the December 1999 passage of UN Security Council Resolution 1284, the Sanctions Committee again sought to devise a protocol to facilitate the payment for individuals making the journey. The Sanctions Committee proposed to issue $250 in cash and $1,750 in travelers checks to each individual pilgrim to be distributed at the U.N. office in Baghdad in the presence of both U.N. and Iraqi officials. The Government again declined and, consequently, no Iraqi pilgrims were able to take advantage of the available funds or, in 2000, of the permitted flights. The Government continued to insist that these funds would be accepted only if they were paid in cash to the government-controlled central bank, not to the Hajj pilgrims.[44]

More than 95 percent of the population of Iraq are Muslim. The (predominantly Arab) Shi'a Muslims constitute a 60 to 65 percent majority:

- The Iraqi government has for decades conducted a brutal campaign of murder, summary execution, and protracted arbitrary arrest against the religious leaders and followers of the majority Shi'a Muslim population. Despite nominal legal protection of religious equality, the Government has repressed severely the Shi'a clergy and those who follow the Shi'a faith.[45]

- Forces from the Mukhabarat, General Security (Amn Al-Amm), the Military Bureau, Saddam's Commandos (Fedayeen Saddam), and the Ba'th Party have killed senior Shi'a clerics, desecrated Shi'a mosques and holy sites, and interfered with Shi'a religious education. Security agents reportedly are stationed at all the major Shi'a mosques and shrines, where they search, harass, and arbitrarily arrest worshipers.[46]

---

[43] Page 8, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[44] Ibid, Page 11-12
[45] Ibid, Page 11
[46] Ibid, Page 11

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- The following government restrictions on religious rights remained in effect during 2001: restrictions and outright bans on communal Friday prayer by Shi'a Muslims; restrictions on the loaning of books by Shi'a mosque libraries; a ban on the broadcast of Shi'a programs on government-controlled radio or television; a ban on the publication of Shi'a books, including prayer books and guides; a ban on funeral processions other than those organized by the Government; a ban on other Shi'a funeral observances such as gatherings for Koran reading; and the prohibition of certain processions and public meetings that commemorate Shi'a holy days. Shi'a groups report that they captured documents from the security services during the 1991 uprising that listed thousands of forbidden Shi'a religious writings.[47]

- In June 1999, several Shi'a opposition groups reported that the Government instituted a program in the predominantly Shi'a districts of Baghdad that used food ration cards to restrict where individuals could pray. The ration cards, part of the UN oil-for-food program, reportedly are checked when the bearer enters a mosque and are printed with a notice of severe penalties for those who attempt to pray at an unauthorized location.[48]

---

[47] Page 11, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[48] Ibid, Page 11

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Iraq is one of seven countries that have been designated by the Secretary of State as state sponsors of international terrorism. UNSCR 687 prohibits Saddam Hussein from committing or supporting terrorism, or allowing terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq. Saddam continues to violate these UNSCR provisions.[49]

- In 1993, the Iraqi Intelligence Service (IIS) directed and pursued an attempt to assassinate, through the use of a powerful car bomb, former U.S. President George Bush and the Emir of Kuwait. Kuwaiti authorities thwarted the terrorist plot and arrested 16 suspects, led by two Iraqi nationals.

- Iraq shelters terrorist groups including the Mujahedin-e-Khalq Organization (MKO), which has used terrorist violence against Iran and in the 1970s was responsible for killing several U.S. military personnel and U.S. civilians.[50]

- Iraq shelters several prominent Palestinian terrorist organizations in Baghdad, including the Palestine Liberation Front (PLF), which is known for aerial attacks against Israel and is headed by Abu Abbas, who carried out the 1985 hijacking of the cruise ship *Achille Lauro* and murdered U.S. citizen Leon Klinghoffer.[51]

- Iraq shelters the Abu Nidal Organization, an international terrorist organization that has carried out terrorist attacks in twenty countries, killing or injuring almost 900 people. Targets have included the United States and several other Western nations. Each of these groups have offices in Baghdad and receive training, logistical assistance, and financial aid from the government of Iraq.[52]

- In April 2002, Saddam Hussein increased from $10,000 to $25,000 the money offered to families of Palestinian suicide/homicide bombers. The rules for rewarding suicide/homicide bombers are strict and insist that only someone who blows himself up with a belt of explosives gets the full payment. Payments are made on a strict scale, with different amounts for wounds, disablement, death as a "martyr" and $25,000 for a suicide bomber. Mahmoud Besharat, a representative on the West Bank who is handing out to families the money from Saddam, said, "You would have to ask President Saddam why he is being so generous. But he is a revolutionary and he wants this distinguished struggle, the *intifada*, to continue."[53]

- Former Iraqi military officers have described a highly secret terrorist training facility in Iraq known as Salman Pak, where both Iraqis and non-Iraqi Arabs receive training on hijacking planes and trains, planting explosives in cities, sabotage, and assassinations.

---

[49] *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001: Overview of State-Sponsored Terrorism*; US Department of State; May 21, 2002.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.
[53] "Jenin Families Pocket Iraqi Cash"; *The Washington Times: London Daily Telegraph*; May 31, 2002.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S REFUSAL TO ACCOUNT FOR GULF WAR PRISONERS

UNSCRs 686, 687 and others require Saddam Hussein to release immediately any Gulf War prisoners and to cooperate in accounting for missing and dead Kuwaitis and others from the Gulf War. Saddam has continued to violate these resolutions.

- Saddam Hussein has failed to return, or account for, a large number of Kuwaiti citizens and citizens of other countries who were detained during the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and continues to refuse to cooperate with the Tripartite Commission to resolve the cases.

- Of 609 cases of missing Gulf War POWs/MIAs representing 14 nationalities – including one American pilot – under review by the Tripartite Commission on Gulf War Missing, only 4 have been resolved. Because of continued Iraqi obfuscation and concealment, very few cases have been resolved since the Gulf War. Saddam Hussein denies having any knowledge of the others and claims that any relevant records were lost in the aftermath of the Gulf War.

- In a December 2001 report to the UN Security Council, the UN Secretary-General criticized the Iraqi Government's refusal to cooperate with the U.N. on the issue of the missing POWs/MIAs citizens. Iran reports that the Iraqi Government still has not accounted for 5,000 Iranian POW's missing since the Iran-Iraq War.

- "Secretary General reiterates little progress on the issue of repatriation or return of all Kuwaiti and third country nationals or their remains, as Iraq refused to cooperate with the Tripartite Commission."[54]

- In August 2001, Amnesty International reported that Saddam Hussein has the world's worst record for numbers of persons who have disappeared and remain unaccounted for. [55]

- The Iraqi Government continued to ignore the more than 16,000 cases conveyed to it in 1994 and 1995 by the UN, as well as requests from the Governments of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia to account for the whereabouts of those who had disappeared during Iraq's 1990-91 occupation of Kuwait, and from Iran regarding the whereabouts of prisoners of war that Iraq captured in the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq War.[56]

- "Security Council regrets that no progress made on return of Kuwaiti national archives, reiterate need for Iraq to immediately fulfill all requirements under the relevant resolutions, including repatriation or return of all Kuwaiti and third country nationals or their remains."[57]

---

[54] Vorontsov Report; UN SG/2002/931 on Iraqi Non-Compliance With UNSCR 1284
[55] Page 3, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – Iraq*, March 4, 2002; US Department of State; www.state.gov
[56] Ibid, Page 3
[57] Vorontsov Report; UN SG/2002/931 on Iraqi Non-Compliance With UNSCR 1284

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S REFUSAL TO RETURN STOLEN PROPERTY

Iraq destroyed much stolen property before it could be returned, and Kuwait claims that large quantities of equipment remain unaccounted for:

- The UN and Kuwait say Iraq has not returned extensive Kuwaiti state archives and museum pieces, as well as military equipment, including eight Mirage F-1 aircraft, 245 Russian-made fighting vehicles, 90 M113 armored personnel carriers, one Hawk battery, 3,750 Tow and anti-tank missiles, and 675 Russian-made surface-to-air missile batteries.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S EFFORTS TO CIRCUMVENT ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AND IMPEDE THE OIL-FOR-FOOD PROGRAM

- Saddam Hussein has illegally imported hundreds of millions of dollars in goods in violation of economic sanctions and outside of the UN's Oil-for-Food program. For example, Iraq has imported fiber optic communications systems that support the Iraqi military.

- Iraq has diverted dual-use items obtained under the Oil for Food program for military purposes. For example, Iraq diverted UN approved trucks from humanitarian relief purposes to military purposes, and has used construction equipment to help rebuild WMD-affiliated facilities.

- The Iraqi regime illicitly exports hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil each day in flagrant violation of UNSCRs and blatant disregard for the humanitarian well-being of the Iraqi people. In so doing, it has deprived the Iraqi people of billions of dollars in food, medicine, and other humanitarian assistance that would have been provided if the regime had exported the oil under the UN Oil-for-Food program. Instead, Saddam Hussein has used these billions to fund his WMD programs, pay off his security apparatus, and supply himself and his supporters with luxury items and other goods.

- In January 2002, President Bush reported to Congress that "as most recently stated in a November 19 UN report, the government of Iraq is not committed to using funds available through the Oil for Food program to improve the health and welfare of the Iraqi people...Iraq's contracting delays, cuts in food, medicine, educational and other humanitarian sector allocations, government attempts to impede or shut down humanitarian NGO operations in northern Iraq, and Baghdad's delays in the issuance of visas for UN personnel demonstrate that the Iraqi regime is trying to undermine the effectiveness of the program."[58]

- Saddam Hussein spends smuggled oil wealth on his lavish palaces and inner circle, rather than on the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people.

- Saddam Hussein has used water pumps, piping, and other supplies that could have been used to repair urban sewer and water systems in order to construct moats and canals at his palaces.

---

[58] President's Report to Congress; January 2002; under P.L. 102-1

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. MCHUGH. I yield back my time. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you Mr. McHugh. Are there further comments by the members of the committee?

If not, it was asked of me how this meeting came about. I was in Israel last week. I had the opportunity to talk, along with my colleagues in our CODEL, with Shimon Perez, the Foreign Minister, as well as Mr. Netanyahu. And I would like the former Prime Minister to comment on this, but it was my impression and I think the impression of my colleagues, both Democrat, Republicans and Independents who were on the trip with us, that there is—while the Likud and Labor do have differences of opinion, they seem to be of one mind regarding the threat that emanates from Iraq regarding Saddam Hussein. So, if you would illuminate on that, Mr. Netanyahu, I would appreciate it.

You are welcomed to address the committee.

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN NETANYAHU, FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you, Chairman Burton. It is a pleasure being with all of you, and I appreciate the thoughtful remarks and thoughtful questions from all of you distinguished Representatives. I will try to address your questions in the course of my opening remarks and in the question and answer session that will follow it, because I think they are valid and important, all of them, and I think the world needs this discussion and other discussions that will be taking place in this capital of liberty.

Last year, a few days after September 11th, I was given the privilege of appearing before this committee to discuss the issue of terrorism. But I have to tell you that had I been given the opportunity to speak before September 11th, I believe I would have offered pretty much the same suggestions about how the war on terrorism should be fought and how it can be won.

What I would have pointed out is that the key to defeating terrorism lies in deterring and destroying the regimes that harbor, abet, and aid terror.

I would have argued that to root out terror, the entire network of terror—that is, the network that consists of some half a dozen terrorism regimes and two dozen terror organizations affiliated with them—that this entire terror network had to be brought down. And most important, I would have warned that the greatest danger facing our world is the ominous possibility that any part of this terror network would acquire nuclear weapons.

Now, I have to be candid and say that even had I presented my views in the most coherent and persuasive fashion, I have no doubt that some of you, and perhaps most you, would have regarded them as exaggerated and even alarmist. But then came September 11th and fiction turned into fact and the unimaginable became real.

That single day of horror alerted most Americans to the grave dangers that are now facing our world. And many Americans understand today that, had al Qaeda possessed nuclear weapons last September, that the city of New York would not exist today. And they realize that we could all have spent yesterday grieving not for thousands of dead, but for millions.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

But for others around the world, I suppose the power of imagination is not so acute. It appears that some people will have to once again see the unimaginable in front of their eyes before they are willing to do what must be done, because how else can one explain the violent opposition, the insistent opposition to President Bush's plan to dismantle Saddam Hussein's regime?

Now, I do not mean to suggest for a moment that the questions raised here and other questions are not relevant; that is, that there are not legitimate questions about a potential operation against Iraq. Indeed there are. But the question of whether removing Saddam's regime is itself legitimate is not one of them. And equally immaterial in my mind is the argument that America cannot oust Saddam without prior approval of the international community because this is a ruler who is rapidly expanding his arsenal of biological and chemical weapons. This is a dictator who has used these weapons of mass destruction against his subjects and his neighbors and this is a tyrant who is feverishly trying to acquire nuclear weapons.

The dangers posed by a nuclear-armed Saddam is understood by my country. Two decades ago, well before September 11th, in 1981, Menachem Begin dispatched the Israeli Air Force on a predawn raid that destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor at Osirak. This probably took place months away from Saddam's ability to assemble the critical mass of plutonium for the first atomic bomb, or more than one.

Now, at the time, Israel was condemned by all the world's governments, even the government of our closest friend, the United States. But I think that over time, history has rendered a far kinder judgment on that act of unquestionable foresight and unmistakable courage.

And I believe that it is history's judgment that should inform our own judgment today. Did Israel launch that preemptive strike because Saddam had committed a specific act of terror against us? Did we accord our actions with the international? Did we condition this operation on the approval of the United Nations? No, of course not. Israel acted because we understood that a nuclear-armed Saddam would place our very survival at risk.

And today the United States must destroy the same regime because a nuclear-armed Saddam will place the security of our entire world at risk. And make no mistake about it, if and once Saddam has nuclear weapons, the terror network will have nuclear weapons. And once the terror network has nuclear weapons, it is only a matter of time before those weapons will be used.

You cannot prevent a dictator who has used terrorism in the past, who cavorts and supports and encourages terror organizations, from using this weapon by giving it to someone, by having them threaten to use it against his enemies. Once one of the terror regimes, once one of the principal regimes in the terror network has nuclear weapons, you cannot prevent the terror network from having nuclear weapons.

Two decades ago, it was possible to thwart Saddam's nuclear ambitions by bombing a single installation. But today, nothing less than dismantling his regime will do, because Saddam's nuclear program has fundamentally changed in those two decades. He no

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

longer needs one large reactor to produce the deadly material necessary for atomic bombs. He can produce it in centrifuges the size of washing machines that can be hidden throughout the country. And I want to remind you that Iraq is a very big country. It is not the size of Monte Carlo. It is a big country.

And I believe that even free and unfettered inspections will not uncover these portable manufacturing sites of mass death. So knowing this, I ask all the governments and others who oppose or question the President's plan to look at it from the other end of the logic: Do you believe that action can be taken against Saddam only after he builds nuclear bombs and uses them? And do the various critics, especially overseas, believe that a clear connection between Saddam and September 11th must be established before we have a right to prevent the next September 11th?

I think not.

I will try to give an analogy. All analogies are imperfect, but here is one. If you try to defeat the Mafia, you do not just go after the foot soldiers who carried out the last attack, or even stop with the apprehension of the particular Don who sent them; you go after the entire network of organized crime, all the families, all the organizations, all of them.

Well, likewise, if you intend to defeat terror, you do not just go after the terrorists who carried out the last attack or even the particular regime that sent them; you go after the entire network of terror, all the regimes that support terror, all the organizations that they harbor. All of them.

And doing this always entails the need to act before additional attacks are carried out. When the security of a nation is endangered, a responsible government has to take the actions that are necessary to protect its citizens and eliminate the threat that confronts them. And sometimes this requires preemption.

I have to say that in the history of democracies, preemption has been, in my mind, the most difficult choice for leaders to make because at time of the decision, you could never prove the critics wrong. You could never show them the great catastrophe that was avoided by preemptive action. And yet we now know that had the democracies taken preemptive action to bring down Hitler in the 1930's, the worst horrors in history could have been avoided. And we now know—and we know this from defectors and from other intelligence—that had Israel not launched its preemptive strike on Saddam's atomic bomb factory, recent history would have taken a turn to catastrophe.

But the most compelling case for preemption against Saddam's regime I believe was not made by the President's powerful words this morning, but by the savage action of the terrorists themselves on September 11th. Their wakeup call from hell has opened our eyes to the horrors that await us all tomorrow if we fail to act today.

Now, I was asked by one of you about the sentiment of Israelis in the face of the palpable risks involved. My friends, I want to say that I am here today as a citizen of a country that is most endangered by a preemptive strike. For it is I think clear that in the last gasps of Saddam's dying regime, he will attempt to launch his remaining missiles, his remaining payloads, including biological and

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

chemical payloads, at the Jewish state. And though I am speaking here today as a private citizen, I believe and I know that I speak and reflect the sentiment of not just the majority, but the overwhelming majority of Israelis in supporting a preemptive strike against Saddam's regime, and this cuts across political lines in Israel. We support this preemptive American action even though we stand on the front lines, while others criticize it as they sit comfortably on the sidelines. But we know that their sense of comfort is an illusion, for if action is not taken now, we will all be threatened by a much greater peril.

We support this action because it is possible today to defend against chemical and biological attacks. We have gas masks that are available. We have vaccinations. They are available. There are other means of civil defense that can protect our citizens and reduce the risk to them.

And indeed, a central component of any strike on Iraq must be to ensure that the Israeli Government, if it so chooses, has the means to vaccinate every citizen of Israel before action is initiated. And I want to stress that ensuring this is not merely the responsibility of the Government of Israel but also the responsibility of the Government of the United States.

Let me repeat this: The Government of Israel and the Government of the United States must jointly ensure that the people of Israel have all the available means of civil defense before action begins.

But equally I can say that no gas mask and no vaccine can protect against nuclear weapons. Science has not yet invented such a device. And this is why regimes that have no compunction about using weapons of mass destruction and will not hesitate to give these weapons to their terror proxies must never be allowed to acquire nuclear weapons. These regimes must be brought down before they possess the power to bring us all down.

If a preemptive action would be supported by a broad coalition of free countries—and if it is the United Nations, all the better—but if such support is not forthcoming, then the United States must be prepared to act without it. International support for actions that are vital to a Nation's security is always desirable, but it must never constitute a precondition. If you can get it, fine. If not, act without it.

I don't want to sound like something familiar to you, but I would say, if you can't get it, just do it.

Now, my friends, under exceptional circumstances, public figures may sometimes be forgiven for quoting themselves, and I hope today that you will indulge me and grant me this privilege, because nearly two decades ago I wrote the following. I said that:

The West can win the war against terrorism. It can expose its duplicity and punish its perpetrators and its sponsors. But it must first win the war against its own inner weakness, and that will require courage. We shall need at least three types of courage.

First, statesmen must have the political courage to present the truth, however unpleasant, to their people. They must be prepared to make difficult decisions, to take measures that may involve great risks and subject them to public criticism.

Second, the soldiers who will be called upon to combat terrorists will need to show military courage.

Third, the people will have to show civic courage. The citizens of a democracy threatened by terrorists must see themselves in a certain sense as soldiers in a com-

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

mon battle. They must not pressure their government to capitulate or surrender to terrorism. If we seriously want to win the war against terrorism, people must be willing to endure sacrifice and even if there is the loss of loved ones, immeasurable pain. Terrorism is a phenomenon which tries to invoke one feeling: fear. It is therefore understandable that the one virtue necessary to defeat terrorism is the antithesis of fear: courage.

Courage, said the Romans, is not the only virtue, but it is the single virtue without which all other virtues are meaningless. The terrorist challenge must be answered. The choice is between a free society based on law and compassion and barbarism in the service of brute force and tyranny. Confusion and vacillation facilitated the rise of terrorism. Clarity and courage will ensure its defeat.

My friends, though I wrote these words almost 20 years ago, they were never as pertinent, I think, as they are today. A year after September 11th, I am certain that this great Nation possesses the three types of courage needed to defeat the monstrous evil that now confronts us. President Bush has shown courage by boldly charting a court to victory. The American military is once again prepared to shoulder the burden of defeating the enemies of freedom. And most of all, the American people have shouldered the courage to fight back and win.

For me that courage was most pointedly manifested last year on Flight 93, because right there in the eye of the storm, ordinary citizens displayed extraordinary heroism and rose to thwart the murderous designs of the terrorists. They thereby saved an unknown number of lives, including perhaps the lives of some people in this very room.

It is, I believe, that same civic courage that has been displayed this past year and the willingness of Americans to rally behind their government to wage war on terror. I recognize this courage, ladies and gentlemen, because I see it on the faces of my countrymen every day. Every day, millions of Israelis who have been subjected to an unprecedented campaign of terror have stood—and stand—firmly behind our government in the war against Palestinian terror. We have not crumbled. We have not run. We have stood our ground and fought back.

You see, the terrorists and the tyrants of the world, they always get it wrong. They were wrong about Churchill's England. They are woefully wrong about Israel. And they are wrong, dead wrong, about America.

I think they simply do not have the means to understand the power of freedom. They think that by bombing our free societies we will collapse. They see our free debate as debilitating. They would see a hearing of this kind, the questions that are raised here, as a sign of weakness. They don't understand it is a sign of enormous strength. They think our open discourse is a sign of that weakness.

They believe that their cult of death is stronger than our love of life. But of course they are wrong. There is nothing stronger than the will of a free people united to protect its life and its liberty. And now it is up to us to prove the terrorists and the tyrants wrong once again.

I am not saying it will be easy, and it certainly will demand some sacrifice, but it must be done today because tomorrow's sacrifice will be infinitely greater. Sixty years ago Winston Churchill put it this way: "if you will not fight terror when your victory will be sure and not too costly," he said, "you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you. There

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

may even be a worst case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory."

My friends, this is the heart of the fact. What I said before this committee 1 year ago holds true today. Today the terrorists have the power—or rather have the will to destroy us, but not the power. Today we have the power to destroy them. Now we must summon the will to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you all.

Mr. BURTON. You know, Mr. Netanyahu, in the late 1930's, the Churchill voice was a voice in the wilderness, and all the world, including the Prime Minister of Great Britain, did not buy it. And it was not until the ax finally fell that they realized that they should have listened in the first place.

I think your message today is very clear. I think it is just as clear as what Winston Churchill was trying to get across in the late 1930's and unfortunately was not able to convince the world of until it was involved in World War II.

I think your statement, which was very eloquent, boils down to one thing, and that is do we react to another attack on America after hundreds of thousands or millions of lives have been lost, or do we preempt that kind of action from happening in the first place? And I think you made a very strong case today that we should support President Bush and respond before it happens.

There are many of my colleagues, many of the people in this country that say, you know, to declare war on Iraq would be a mistake, and we should wait and check and wait and check. But we are at war. Three thousand people lost their lives last September 11th at the Pentagon, in Pennsylvania and at the World Trade Center. And we are at war. And I think people tend to forget that. We are not waiting for a war to begin; we are at war right now. And it seems to me that the terrorist network to which you referred needs to be attacked and needs to be attacked as quickly as possible so that we do not have more severe losses than we have already experienced.

With that, let me ask a few questions here. To your knowledge, has Iraq kept its team of nuclear scientists together? And is that an indication that they are going to continue to develop nuclear weapons? Also what nations are aiding Iraq, if you know, in the nuclear program? And, of course, finally, if you might elaborate a little bit further on what you think the first use of nuclear weapons might be.

Mr. NETANYAHU. I can only give you the information that I can divulge from my tenure as Prime Minister, and it is 3 years old. The information we had was that Saddam was pursuing all avenues of developing weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. I have to say that he was enjoying in this effort the support of Russian technology and I should say Russian technologists onsite. They were a principal source. And other regimes including North Korea were supporting that effort as well.

There is no question that he had not given up on his nuclear program, not whatsoever. There is also no question that he was not satisfied with the arsenal of chemical and biological weapons that he had and was trying to perfect them constantly, if "perfect" is the word to describe this ghoulish enterprise.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

So I think, frankly, it is not serious to assume that this man who 20 years ago was very close to producing an atomic bomb spent the last 20 years sitting on his hands. He has not. And every indication that we have is that he is pursuing, pursuing with abandon, pursuing with every ounce of effort, the establishment of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons.

If anyone makes an opposite assumption, or cannot draw the lines connecting the dots, that is simply not an objective assessment of what has happened. Saddam is hell-bent on achieving atomic bombs—atomic capabilities as soon as he can.

Mr. BURTON. Let me ask you a question regarding chemical and biological weapons. We have been told that the Scud missiles that were launched at Israel during the Persian Gulf war, if they had been tipped with chemical or biological weapons, the weapons would have been destroyed when they hit the ground. But we have been told that there are drones that he has had in his possession that had in the nose of those drones the ability to spray chemical or biological weapons when they flew over a given target. Are you familiar with that? Can you elaborate on that?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I am familiar with some of this, yes. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is very hard to say what the effectiveness of chemical and biological warheads will be when they actually impact on the ground. It is very hard to say. They might be intercepted in the air. We have some capability to that effect in the form of the Arrow antiballistic missile, which was jointly developed by Israel and the United States. That is a very important development to stop missiles before they get there. But, again, these missiles would explode in midair, and it depends what residual parts of the warhead materialize on the grounds. Probably not much.

But suppose some of these missiles are not intercepted. Suppose they come in. It is impossible right now, to the best of my knowledge from the information that we now have, to say what the extent of the damage would be. Hence the emphasis, and the emphasis in my remarks, on civil protection. Assume the worst, prepare for the worst, and you will come out the best. We have to assume that he will fire the missiles. We cannot assume that we will intercept all the missiles, and we cannot assume that the warheads will not distribute chemical and, what is worst, biological material. So we must take all the precautions, and it is possible, as I said, to reduce—substantially reduce the risk of such attacks even if they get through.

And this I think should be the focus of Israel and the United States before action is taken. I don't think this is an ancillary part of the war aims. I think this should be built into the war aims. Israel, as the most likely target of Saddam, as has been demonstrated once, must be protected.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Turner.

Mr. Kucinich.

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you.

Mr. Prime Minister, when you were Prime Minister, did you identify the nuclear capabilities of Iraq, if any?

Mr. NETANYAHU. We could not place an exact time. We knew that he was developing these nuclear capabilities. We could not, Mr. Kucinich, say exactly how long it would take him to complete

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the engineering of an effective nuclear device. But our assessments kept shrinking; that is, our Intelligence Community, as we moved along the axis of time, the time that we assumed it would take him to create nuclear weapons was constantly shrinking, but we couldn't say with absolute precession how long it would take him.

Mr. KUCINICH. Do you have any new evidence of Iraq's weapon capabilities—nuclear capabilities?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I cannot give you even an oblique reference to information in the last 3 years because I am busy going around the world, visiting Washington. I am not prying into privileged dossiers. There is this thing, "need to know," and I do not really need to know right now. But I think you can be sure that when I did need to know, there was a constant upgrading of these weapons. Constant upgrading of these weapons. Constant efforts to make them more lethal and to expand the reach of the delivery systems to deliver them.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would respectfully suggest to the Prime Minister, notwithstanding the great affection I have for Mr. Prime Minister, that there is a need to know if the United States is being called upon to launch preemptive action against Iraq. There is a need to know the evidence. I share the concern that other Members have articulated here about the effect that a preemptive attack on Iraq by the United States would have not only on the people of our country who would be called upon to wage that, and innocent civilians, but also the effect that it would have on Israel.

Now, you stated in your remarks that if the United States launched a preemptive attack on Iraq, that Iraq in Saddam Hussein's—as you described it—dying gasp would be expected to launch a counterattack on Israel.

If the United States does not launch a preemptive attack on the State of Iraq, do you see any indication that Iraq is prepared to launch an attack on Israel?

Mr. NETANYAHU. First of all, let me comment on when I said I do not need to know, I meant I do not need that kind of detailed information. It always involves, just by the nature of the information, some indication of source, and I for one try to avoid that when I am not in office. That is what I meant.

But I also say that if you connect the dots, here is a man who from the minute he achieved power is trying to create a nuclear weapon. Twenty years ago he is very close to producing it. He is foiled. He changed the technology to centrifuges that will prevent him from being foiled again. We know that he is taking in nuclear technologists and nuclear technologies from various countries. We know that he is developing the means to deliver these weapons. We have defectors who describe how committed he is to this above all else. So we have all of these dots, and we say, well, we do not know exactly what is happening.

You know, it is like you are about to see somebody plunging a knife into someone, you look in a keyhole, you followed a murderer. You know that he has already killed a few people, and you see him trail somebody, and you are trailing him. He shuts the door, you are looking through the keyhole, and you see him grasping the throat of this person, raising the knife, and then the light goes out,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

and the next thing you know is a body is found. And you can say, well, I did not actually see him in flagrante, in the act, if you will.

But I think, Mr. Kucinich, that it is simply not reflecting the reality to assume that Saddam is not feverishly working to develop nuclear weapons as we speak.

Mr. KUCINICH. The question I asked is do you have any indication that Saddam is going to attack Israel, absent a preemptive launch by the United States?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I cannot tell you that he will attack Israel at a particular time. I think what you have to assume—and this is a fair assumption—that he does not have to necessarily directly attack Israel. What you can do, what these people do, for example, the Taliban regime did not directly attack the United States. It harbored a terrorist group that did the job for them. The Taliban regime did not have its intelligence officers casing the joint, so to speak. Somebody else did it for them.

If Saddam has a nuclear weapon, he could use it to threaten or to actually detonate a nuclear regime directly or indirectly. He does not necessarily have to do it and undertake the risk of a response by Israel or by anyone else. And this is precisely the problem. You are not dealing with Iraq alone. You are dealing with a terror network. You are dealing with a system where you have proxies. We now live in a world where these people have proxies.

Mr. KUCINICH. I know my time is up. Mr. Netanyahu, thank you.

I want to ask one last question, and that is you talk about a network of terror. Are there any other nations that you would recommend that the United States launch preemptive attacks upon at this point?

Mr. NETANYAHU. No, the issue is not—the issue is not—first of all are there other Nations that are developing nuclear weapons, yes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Should we launch any other preemptive attacks?

Mr. NETANYAHU. First let me say what they are, and then I will make a suggestion on how to proceed. The answer is categorically yes. The nations that are vying who will be the first to achieve nuclear weapons is Iraq and Iran, and Iran, by, the way is also outpacing Iraq in the development of ballistic missile systems that they hope would reach the eastern seaboard of the United States within 15 years. I guess that does not include California, but includes Washington.

A third nation, by the way, is Libya as well. Libya, while no one is watching, under the cloak, is trying very rapidly to build an atomic bomb capability. So you have here now three nations. Not surprisingly all three have been implicated in the past in terrorist activity using the clandestine means of terror and proxies.

Now, the question that you asked is vital, it is important, and that is what do you do about it? You can fight all of them—you have to dismantle the network. And the question is do you dismantle all of it at once? No, you did not. The first thing you did after the wakeup call of September 11th was that you took on the first regime that directly perpetrated that catastrophe. You removed the Taliban regime, and you scattered al Qaeda, although it has not been completely destroyed yet.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Now what is your next step? Knowing that three of these nations are developing nuclear weapons, this is not a hypothesis. It is fact. Iraq, Iran, and Libya are racing to develop nuclear weapons. So now what is the next step? I believe that the next step is to choose—it is not a question of whether you have to take action or what kind of action and against whom.

I think of the three, Saddam is probably in many ways the linchpin because it is possible to take out this regime with military action, and the reverberations of what happens with the collapse of Saddam's regime could very well create an implosion in a neighboring regime like Iran for the simple reason that Iran has—I don't want to say a middle class, but it has a large population that is—that might bring down the regime just as it brought down the Shah's regime.

So I think that the choice of going after Iraq is like removing a brick that holds a lot of other bricks and might cause this structure to crumble. It is not guaranteed. The assumption of regime removal in Iraq and implosion in Iran and implosion in Libya is an assumption. It is not guaranteed. But if I had to choose should there be military action first against Iraq or first against Iran, I would choose exactly what the President has chosen to go after Iraq.

Mr. KUCINICH. What would you choose second?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I would wait and see what the effects are, and I think the effects could be quite mighty and startling. The political culture in this region is not one—in these societies is not one of respecting force, it is worshipping force. And the determination, resolution of the United States in applying it, I think that this could have beneficial effects that might preclude the application of further military action. I am not saying that you should disavow it from the start, but I am saying that the more resolutely and quickly you act now, the more victories you gain up front, the more victories you might again later without needing to apply such overt military power.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Horn.

Mr. HORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you.

We have seen you in Israel, and we have seen you here, and you are very rational about these issues.

So I would like to ask a couple of things. You have a peace movement in Israel. We have peace movements in the United States. And we talk about inspectors that might do something if Saddam does let us in. Could you tell me what you would tell those people in both Israel and the United States? Are they just naive or what? A lot of them mean very well, I am sure, but that does not solve the problem.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, I think there is a confluence of opinion right now in Israel, Mr. Horn. I think there has been a sea of change in opinion in Israel over the last 2 years. There was never a peace camp because the entire country was united in the desire for peace, but there were different ideas on how to achieve it.

The idea that animated Oslo was that the peace with our Palestinian neighbors would be achieved not by the traditional method of deterrence, which is what I think you can do with a dictatorial society opposite you, or a dictatorial regime. It was based on the idea that you could develop trust with a dictatorship and forgo de-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

terrence. And in order to develop this trust, we gave—the Israeli Government at the time gave Arafat a large swath of territory girding and overlooking our major cities; gave him a small army; gave him 50,000 rifles; gave him international recognition and access to a great deal of money. And in exchange he made two promises. One is that he would recognize Israel and forgo the propaganda for its destruction, and the second was that he would abandon terror.

He pocketed all of these benefits and then proceeded to summarily violate these two commitments. His State-controlled press, every word, every image that you hear and see in the Palestinian media is controlled by Arafat; was propounding day in and day out in Arabic the doctrine of policide, the destruction of the State, our State, Israel, to a generation of Palestinian youngsters, to every one; and second, of course, proceeded to launch the worst and most consistent campaign of terror that the world has seen.

Nothing compares to the horror of September 11th. No single terrorist action in history has compared to it, and I hope nothing will ever compare to it again. But there is equal unprecedence, lack of precedence, for the day-in and day-out carnage that Arafat had meted on us with the savagery of suicide bombings carried out by people who graduated his suicide kindergarten camps, suicide universities, who visited his suicide museums and so on.

So people woke up. They now say we were wrong. Many people. I cannot say all, but I can say just by reading the public opinion polls and talking to people in Israel, there is a tremendous unanimity in the country. They are not fooled. They understand that Arafat is essentially an Osama bin Laden with good PR. Well, medium PR. It is not that good. At least in America it does not go that far. It has a wider reach in Europe. But I think many in America have seen through him. I don't think he gets the time of day here, and I think it is a question of time before he is ousted. He should have been ousted in my opinion right at the start of this outrage 2 years ago.

But I fully agree with President Bush when he says that Arafat has to go. There has to be the opportunity for other leaders to rise.

So I think in Israel today actually, I see a lot more unanimity than before. And I see, frankly, notwithstanding the confines of a debate in a democratic society, I see a similar process here in the United States following September 11th. My friend whom I respect a great deal, the Pulitzer Prize-winning writer, Charles Krauthammer, said in the 1990's, America slept and Israel dreamed. And he said that on September 2000, Israel woke up with the beginning of the terror campaign launched against it. And a year later in September 2001, America woke up with the bombing of New York and Washington. I think that reflects what has taken place in our democratic societies.

I am not sure the same applies with equal vigor to other parts of the democratic world, but I think it does not matter. Europe never had a stellar record in understanding global threats, threats to Europe itself, and acting in time to thwart them. But the United States and Israel have a pretty good record, and it is because the people unite in their understanding of the danger and their willingness to act against it.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HORN. What do you think of the inspectors' approach? Did it do much before he just moves things around?

Mr. NETANYAHU. It did some, but it is a cat and mouse game, and he is the cat, and he is successful, a successful cat. It is not very difficult to deceive inspectors. It is not even difficult to deceive satellite inspection. You can burrow tunnels and hide—did you ever see the Great Escape? Remember that movie where all these guys come out, and they have the sand which they distribute through the trousers while they are walking in the yard? That is essentially what dictators do. They can create tunnels and labyrinths that you never discover that are impervious to radar and other means.

When you have an entire country to hide portable centrifuges that are a little bigger than those two cameras, it is not very difficult. You can get away with it, and he has gotten away with it, frankly.

Mr. HORN. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to revisit something that Mr. Kucinich brought up earlier. You mentioned in your own comments that Iran is much further along in the path of throw power ability to move a nuclear or other rocket toward the United States than is Iraq; am I right?

Mr. NETANYAHU. More developed than Iraq, yes. But Iraq is trying to catch up.

Mr. TIERNEY. Right. Well, we also know that there is speculation that Iran may have nuclear weapons, but we know that Iraq is still floundering around looking for materials, moving in that direction.

Mr. NETANYAHU. I don't know that Iran has nuclear weapons.

Mr. TIERNEY. No, I don't think anybody does. There is speculation on that. But at least as certain as we can possibly know, Iraq is still looking for some materials in order to try to get to that point.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Right.

Mr. TIERNEY. We have information reported in the Washington Post and other papers that Iran shelters dozens of al Qaeda fighters, identifying the cities of Mashhad and Zabol, yet we have the Bush administration telling us they do not have any firm evidence that there is any connection between al Qaeda or the acts of September 11th and Iraq. So I guess I want to ask you again in light of those comparisons, why is it that you think that if all of these countries in your words are "problems" for us, why would you pick Iraq first as opposed to Syria, Iran or the others?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I think that it is not first. It is second. The first one is the Taliban. Now the question is what is the second?

Mr. TIERNEY. Excuse me 1 second. You are making the connection between the Taliban and Iraq?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes, I am. I am saying if you look at those who harbor terrorists and those who support terrorists——

Mr. TIERNEY. I guess I was looking for a connection between September 11th, and my understanding why we went to the Taliban was there was a connection. They were harboring someone who we believe did the act of September 11th.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes, that is the first reason.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. TIERNEY. Now you will take me from September 11th to Iraq somehow?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes, but I am saying something else. I am saying that the question is not whether Iraq was directly connected to September 11th, but how do you prevent the next September 11th? You have a subset of the international system that disavows any constraints on the use of power. These handful of regimes and the terrorist organizations that they harbor are fueled by a terrible anti-Western zealotry, a militancy that knows no bounds and does not respect any force, knows no limits to the uses of power.

Mr. TIERNEY. And one would be Iran? More rocket capacity than Iraq and harbors al Qaeda people, or at least——

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes. Now the question you have is this: This is now a question of not of values. Obviously, we would like to see a regime change, at least I would like to, in Iran, just as I would like to see in Iraq. The question now is a practical question. What is the best place to proceed? It is not a question of whether Iraq's regime should be taken out, but when should it be taken out. It is not a question of whether you would like to see a regime change in Iran, but how to achieve it.

Iran has something that Iraq does not have. Iran has, for example, 250,000 satellite dishes. It has Internet use. I once said to the heads of the CIA when I was Prime Minister that if you want to advance regime change in Iran, you do not have to go through the CIA cloak-and-dagger stuff. What you want to do is take very large, very strong transponders and just beam Melrose Place and Beverly Hills 90210 into Teheran and Iran. That is subversive stuff. The young kids watch it, the young people. They want to have the same nice clothes and houses and swimming pools and so on. That is something that is available, and internal forces of dissention that are available in Iran—which is paradoxically probably the most open society in that part of the world. It is a lot more open than Iraq, which is probably the most closed society, and therefore you have no ability to foment this kind of dynamic inside Iraq.

So the question now is choose. You can beam Melrose Place, but it may take a long time. On the other hand, if you take out Saddam's regime, I guarantee you that it will have enormous positive reverberations on the region. And I think that people sitting right next door in Iran, young people and many others will say the time of such regimes of such despots is gone. There is a new age.

Mr. TIERNEY. Is that raw speculation on your part, or do you have some evidence to that effect?

Mr. NETANYAHU. You know, I was asked the same question in 1986. I had written a book in which I had said that the way to deal with terrorist regimes—well, with terror was to deal with the terrorist regimes. And the way to deal with the terrorist regimes among other things was to apply military force against them.

Mr. TIERNEY. The way we did in Afghanistan.

Mr. NETANYAHU. The way—I want to answer your question.

Mr. TIERNEY. I am running out of time, so I was quickly trying to get to that I think we have done what you proposed in Afghanistan, yet I haven't seen that neighborhood effect.

Mr. NETANYAHU. I think there has been an enormous effect. The effect was—we were told that there would be a contrary effect. Peo-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ple said that there would be tens of thousands of people streaming into Afghanistan, zealots outraged by America's action, and this would produce a counterreaction in the Arab world——

Mr. TIERNEY. But I think you were saying when we take an action like we did in Afghanistan, we would see all the other countries fold.

Mr. NETANYAHU. No, what we saw was something else. What we saw was everybody streaming out of Afghanistan. The second thing we saw was all the Arab countries and many the Muslim countries trying to side with America, to be OK with America.

The application of power is the most important thing in winning the war on terrorism. If I had to say what are the three principles of winning the war on terror, it is like what are the three principles of real estate: location, location, location. The three principles of winning the war on terror are the three Ws: winning, winning, and winning.

The more victories you amass, the easier the next victory becomes. The first victory in Afghanistan makes a second victory in Iraq that much easier. The second victory in Iraq will make the third victory that much easier, too, but it may change the nature of achieving that victory.

Mr. TIERNEY. May.

Mr. NETANYAHU. It may be possible to have implosions take place. I don't guarantee it, Mr. Tierney, but I think it makes it more likely, and therefore I think the choice of Iraq is a good choice, it is the right choice.

Mr. BURTON. Mrs. Morella.

Mrs. MORELLA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Prime Minister Netanyahu. I am wondering about your understanding, sir, of the enmity among the main Iraqi factions, Shia, the Sunnis, the Kurds, and how difficult do you think that rebuilding Iraq would be, given these particular factions? And I wonder, do you think that a U.S.-led redevelopment of Iraq would significantly further destabilization in the Middle East?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I was asked by you and by others what would happen after the ouster of Saddam, and I think that this is a vital question because I think it depends what the United States does.

If the United States merely goes in, throws out Saddam, and walks away, I think it will miss an important opportunity and actually not effect the true means of regime change. When I use the words "regime change," I mean those words in their most fundamental meaning. Regime change. Change the nature of the regime. That is, not replace one dictator with another, but replace dictatorship with democracy or at least with democratization. This is the great opportunity that would be afforded to the Middle East, to the prospects of peace and development, to the Iraqi people themselves, and to others.

That is, if the United States, after ousting Saddam, seeks to advance a democratized Iraq, couples those political goals with an economic package to rebuild the infrastructure of Iraq, to advance it, to create small business grants and loans to create the spirit of entrepreneurship that very much characterized Iraq for many, many decades, actually for many centuries, then Iraq could be transformed. It may not be and may not become a Western democ-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

racy. I am not Pollyannaish about it, but when people say it is not possible to have democracy in a Muslim country, I say, oh, really? What about Turkey? And I say, well, OK, Turkey is not necessarily Luxembourg. That is true, but if I have to choose between Turkish-style democracy and Iranian-style theocracy or Saddam-style democracy where he gets 99 percent of the vote, I know what I would choose, and I know what you would choose, too.

That is really the task. The task and the great opportunity and challenge is not merely to effect the ouster of the regime, but also to transform that society and thereby begin the process of democratizing the Arab world. That is essential.

We can draw lessons from the struggle that the democracies led by the United States waged against another unreformed despotism with a militancy that knew no bounds through the use of force. I am talking about, of course, the battle against Hitlerism. Now, America, the first thing it said was, we have to oust Hitler. They did not ask what would happen afterwards, how will we deal with Germany, all the questions that come to mind later. They never asked that. The first thing—the palpable danger of this regime acquiring nuclear weapons was in their minds, and the threat to our civilization was in their minds. So first he had to go.

But they did not stop there. They went in there and imposed limitations on German sovereignty, some of which last to this very day. This put in the Marshall Plan. They had democratic elections, transition to the permanent democratic political system that we have in Germany today. And five, six decades later when you say, what is the protection against neonaziism, the reemergence of a new Hitler in Germany, is not American tanks or NATO soldiers; it is German democracy. There are neonazis there, but they are simply washed away by democracy.

We have a situation where the Arab world is cloistered. It does not have that ventilation. It has to choose between Saddam and the ayatollahs, between Arafat and the Hamas. And I think that the greatest achievement, the greatest change would take place and the greatest long-term protection against the return of another Saddam, another bin Laden, another Mullah Omar and, after Arafat is ousted, another Arafat, I think the greatest protection is to ventilate these societies with winds of freedom, democracy, or if I want to be realistic, democratization coupled with an economic package.

I think that should be the step against afterwards in Iraq, and I think it would actually stabilize Iraq. It might send a message. I think it will, to neighboring Iran, to neighboring Syria, and the people will wake up, and they will say, we can have a real life. We can have choice. Our children can have a future, that is not a bad idea.

Mrs. MORELLA. Can we do it alone?

Mr. NETANYAHU. If you want to, you can do it alone, but I don't think you will do it, frankly. You will not do it alone for the simple reason that in these circumstances when you lead, others will follow. If you wait for them to join you, you will never lead. Lead, and they will follow.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Clay.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Netanyahu, you said earlier that you did not like to be quoted, but I am going to quote you from a speech you gave before a Senate committee in April. "Clearly the urgent need to topple Saddam is paramount. The commitment of America and Britain to dismantle this terrorist dictatorship before it obtains nuclear weapons deserves the unconditional support of all sane governments."

Many analysts believe that the Gulf war ignited Islamic terrorist groups. If Saddam is toppled, will this action inflame Arab animosity toward the West and serve to empower terrorist groups throughout the Middle East? And in your opinion, do you really believe that Saddam can be removed from office without compounding terrorist forces?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Mr. Clay, I happen to be one that thinks that, of what is spread and inflamed, Islamic fundamentalism or the twin events that took place 20 years ago, one is the establishment of the overtly Islamic Republic of Iran that fanned the flames of militant Islamism from the Philippines to Los Angeles worldwide and affecting, fortunately, a minority of Muslims but in many, many communities.

The second event was the victory of the Mujaheddin in Afghanistan over a superpower, thereby convincing, if you will, this brotherhood of Islamic fighters of which bin Laden was one, that the power of fanatic Islam could overcome any power, including that of a superpower.

I think these are the things that fueled, that rocketed Islamic fundamentalism and militant Islamic terror to their present proportions. I think that what compresses it is exactly the opposite of what fueled it. What fueled it was a sense of victory. What compresses it is a sense of defeat.

The crucial thing that drives the spread of militant Islam and militant Islamic terrorism is hope. It is hope that the doctrine will be able to achieve its designs of world domination and the crushing of enemies. The more that hope grows, the more militant Islam and militant Islamic terror grows. The more it is crushed, the more it compresses, the more, in the same proportion, the ability of these terrorists and these militants to recruit new recruits to their cause, that, too, is reduced proportionately.

I began to say to Mr. Tierney I think that—or to—I think it was Mr. Tierney. He asked me, well, you know, how do you know? I said that in 1986 I wrote a book that said you should take action against terror regimes, and that would tend to compress them and their activities. Apparently, it turns out that President Reagan had read this book. I don't know if he read it before he decided to strike Libya or after, but, nevertheless, Secretary Shultz wrote to me and he said that this made a profound impression on him. Somehow word got out that I was advocating this.

So after the United States bombed Libya, I was interviewed by CBS, by Mr. Rather. Dan Rather interviewed me, and he interviewed a noted Arabist analyst, and he asked what would happen now after this American bombing of Libya? And the Arabist—I think it was Patrick Seal—said there will be more terrorism, terrorism will grow, the Islamic masses will be inflamed, American embassies would be burned, Qadhafi would become a hero, and he

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

would make more terrorism. I think I am giving him a fair paraphrasing of his remarks.

Then Mr. Rather he asked me, what do I think would happen? And I said, nothing. Nothing would happen. American embassies will not be burned. Qadhafi would crawl into his hole. He would be very careful in committing any more terrorist acts, not because he is not a terrorist but because he might die. He almost did in that raid. And people will respect American power. In fact, what that single action did was to produce a complete cessation, nearly a complete cessation of terrorism from Libya. He tried one clandestine act, was caught in the process and of course didn't do anything since, but Libya has avoided this because of that action.

In short, what I am arguing is that the application of American resolve and force, preferably with other countries, but the application of that force against militant Islam and against militant Islamic terrorism is the only way to compress it. There is no other way to compress it.

But I am also arguing that, in the long run, what you have to do is to get at the sources of fanning the hatred, the sources that fan the hatred, the regimes that propagate the creed, and where else, where better to begin the process of changing these regimes than in the places where you are going to change them anyway? You can go, of course, to other places in the Arab and Muslim world in which you are not engaged directly in the conflict today. I would not advise that.

I would say, use the opportunity of eliminating the nuclear threat from Iraq and begin a regime change there. Use the opportunity of a regime change in what I call "Arafatistan" when we have a new regime there to begin a process of democratization, a process of economic reconstruction and open opportunity, political and economic for the people. Use that in order to begin to change the political culture that is so close to being closed, have it ventilated.

That, ultimately, is the protection; and I think that will create not inflaming of masses but the dousing of the hatred that has systematically sprayed from these regime centers.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Clay.

Mr. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Prime Minister, I would just like to ask—it seems pretty obvious on its face, but I am going to ask this question: Why is Saddam Hussein creating these weapons of mass destruction? Why is he in such a rush to get his hands on nuclear weapons? He doesn't have a means to deliver a nuclear weapon, but it seems to me that he has some plans, he has some goals. So, as I say, it is pretty obvious. But it seems like there are those who probably do not understand his intentions.

I think some of our allies—and if you look at the situation with the United Nations, he has continued to deny them the opportunity for inspections. So it seems like that there is a good reason for why he is persisting in this course.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Mr. Lewis, he is not developing those weapons to win the Peace Prize.

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. LEWIS. Yes. Where do you think he would be more likely to direct those weapons through a terrorist organization?

Mr. NETANYAHU. It depends on how confident he feels. Just imagine, suppose he had a nuclear weapon. Suppose we had not knocked out the Osirak reactor, that he would have developed by the late 1970's, or the late 1980's, he would have developed a nuclear bomb, a lot before that. Now he devours Kuwait, which he did. It is not clear to me that we would have had a Gulf war, because he would have brandished that weapon right up front, and he would have said, go ahead, make my day, or whatever he would say, OK?

Of course, the United States would now be caught in a tremendous bind. Because if he had that weapon, he doesn't necessarily need—in the age of terrorism, he doesn't need ballistic missiles to reach the United States. First of all, he is developing ballistic missiles, but he could equally use terror proxies to deliver a payload here.

I had written in 1996 that the danger of militant Islam and these regimes and the terrorist organizations is not understood in the West. I said that because of the proliferation of these adherents in the West then these regimes do not need ICBMs because they, the terrorists, will be the delivery system. They themselves could deliver a payload.

And I said, too—and here again you are catching me quoting myself because, well, people like to quote themselves. What can I do? I said that the next thing you will see is not a car bomb in the basement of the World Trade Center. I said the next thing you will see is a nuclear bomb in the World Trade Center. Well, I wasn't exactly right. They didn't use a nuclear bomb. They used two airplanes stocked with fuel. It is like a small tactical bomb.

That is what they used, and that is what Saddam could use. Once he has the weapon, he has the choice. He could flaunt it, he could use it, he could let others use it, he could have delivery systems in the West that do not require missiles, he could put it on top of a missile.

Do we want to wait? Is the issue that we want to wait and find out? Do we have any doubt that he is developing? To be honest and fair—and I must be honest and fair. This is not a court of law. This is not a question of legalisms. It is a question of a realistic assessment of a threat, a probable threat to our common civilization.

There is no question whatsoever that Saddam is seeking and is working and is advancing toward the development of nuclear weapons, no question whatsoever. There is no question that once he acquires it, history shifts immediately.

I will give you an example to drive this point home, and I will do something that—well, I am a private citizen, so I will say this. Now, just imagine, imagine that the Taliban takes over Pakistan. Pakistan is alleged to have nuclear weapons. Now imagine that the Taliban would have atomic weapons. Imagine that you could forestall it. Would you forestall it, Mr. Lewis? Don't you think this is a catastrophic development?

Mr. LEWIS. Absolutely.

Mr. NETANYAHU. You see, all nuclear proliferation is bad, but some of it is a lot worse. If Holland acquires nuclear weapons, it

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

is not the same thing as the Taliban or Saddam or Iran, the Ayatollah acquiring nuclear weapons, or Qadhafi. It is fundamentally different. Because these regimes have no compunction whatsoever in the use of these mass weapons. Saddam himself has shown that he was willing to gas people, one of the few instances since the 1920's when gas warfare was used.

You cannot rely on the concerns, on the—I would say on the mechanisms that inhibit the use of these weapons that apply elsewhere. Even in nondemocracies there are such inhibitions. What you have here are single-man regimes, typically, without the political, military, and scientific buffers that always provide a hedge between the leadership and pressing that button. Here it is Saddam's whim. He decides. He pushes the button. He has a peculiar way of resolving issues like that.

During the Gulf war, there was a debate, a problem of some medical shortages. He was sitting in the cabinet room, he called the health minister to the other room, and he killed him. He could press the button, he can press the trigger.

The emergence of nuclear weapons—that is, single-man regimes or zealot, tyrannical, terroristic regimes that acquire nuclear weapons is an enormous threat to our civilization. I cannot stress that enough.

I am not speaking here as a partisan, because we don't have—am I speaking as an Israeli? Yes. But I am speaking here as a citizen of the free world, as a citizen of a world that is entering dangers that are not yet understood. It is not important that we meet here in 10 years and I will quote what I said here today, because if they had nuclear weapons on September 11th, we couldn't meet here.

Mr. LEWIS. Well, I think the question was asked after September 11th of last year, why didn't we know and why didn't we do something? I think we can be forgiven for being caught off guard the first time, but I don't think we can be forgiven when we know, we absolutely know that a man like Saddam Hussein has that kind of power and has all the will to put those weapons in the hands of terrorists and we don't do something about it. I don't think we can be forgiven for that.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Lewis.

Ms. Watson.

Ms. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am sitting here, and I am very troubled. We were attacked a year ago on September 11th by what we thought was a group called al Qaeda led by Osama bin Laden. I don't hear his name anymore. We launched a response to an attack on the continental United States. I don't hear his name anymore.

We have not won a war in Afghanistan. We don't know whether Osama bin Laden is dead or alive. No one has given us any proof. We do not know where the al Qaeda cells are around the globe. All of a sudden, we are no longer looking for him.

I think they brought off a brilliant scheme. Our most prestigious intelligence group in the world could not warn us, and we did nothing. So I am troubled, because we have won no war against the terrorists. It seems to me that we are focusing on somebody who is

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

in a neighborhood who has weapons of mass destruction, but the circumstances could describe India; Pakistan, in their squabble over Kashmir; Iran and several other places in the world, but we are focusing on Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

There is an orderly process that seems to be overlooked in all of this. I was very fascinated to hear Kofi Annan today; and, in essence, he was saying that only the United Nations can give any legitimacy to any type of action by one country against another.

We tried to change the leadership in Cuba. We had the Bay of Pigs, if you remember, trying to go after Fidel Castro. He is only 90 miles off our coast. Now we are trying to choose a new regime and a new leadership in Iraq.

There is no guarantee that we are going to gain a democratic leadership in Iraq. But what really troubles me is that we are going to go against the orderly process, a diplomatic effort, and we are going to become aggressors in a neighborhood that we are not even part of.

Listening to you, Mr. Prime Minister, I would think you are building up a great case for Israel to be the aggressor and we are your allies. But as a member of the United Nations, we then will violate the process that we bought into, and that is very troubling to me.

Oh, I know all about the danger that Iraq presents, but I don't know and I feel very uncomfortable in going this alone without the support of the United Nations. Since we, and you, are a member of the United Nations, we violate the orderly process. Would you comment, please?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes. Well, I think the first question is, do you want to merely avenge September 11th or do you want to win the war on terror? If you want to stop with September 11th, go after al Qaeda——

Ms. WATSON. Can you connect the dots for me between the aggressors on September 11th? The aggressors. This is my question.

Mr. NETANYAHU. And I will answer it. I think that there are now developing enormous threats, not merely to Israel. Israel was attacked because it is seen as a frontline, a frontal position of the United States.

They hate us because they hate you. They hate you because of us, that, too; but the main reason they hate us is because they have hated you, and for these militants they have hated you for about 2 centuries and the West for about 5 centuries. So there is a hatred of the United States. That hatred has produced that attack.

That attack by bin Laden is something that you want obviously to punish and, in many ways, you did the first thing that is required. You took down the Taliban regime, and now bin Laden has scattered. I do not think he is going to be effective, because he needs territory to work from. He is on the run. It is very hard to work when you are on the run, when you have no inviolable territory.

I suppose he is like kind of a Dr. Goebbels after the collapse of the Nazi regime. So apprehending him is obviously important. It is also a matter of justice. Apprehending Goebbels was a matter of justice.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

But if you start taking away the regimes that could serve his purpose—for example, I was told by your members here that al Qaeda, some of them are in Iran. Deprive that base, there is no international terrorism of any kind. Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas—you name them, all of them—there is no international terrorism if you take away the support of sovereign states, and the sovereign states are a few. If you want to win the war, you just have to neutralize these states.

In neutralizing them, you have two options. It is like when Kamikaze fighters are coming at you and bombing you. You can shoot one, you can shoot the other, but if you really want to stop it, you have to shoot down the aircraft carriers. There are only a handful of aircraft carriers.

Now, when I say shoot down, you have really two options. You can either deter or destroy. Saddam has not been deterred. He has not been deterred. He has not been deterred by inspections, he has not been deterred by—even by your threats. He devoured Kuwait like that. And once he possesses nuclear weapons I assure you he will not be deterred. You will be deterred. That is the difference.

So I think if you want to win the broader war on terror, you have to get rid of these regimes.

Now the question you asked, and I think it is an important one, you said what about the U.N.? The U.N. is the one that should give you the legitimacy, and I think Kofi Annan, who happens—personally, I am very close to him and a friend of his, but I take issue with his claim today that the U.N. offers—only the U.N. offers unique legitimacy.

Well, yes, it offers something unique. I mean, this is an organization where Libya is chairing the Commission for Human Rights and where Syria chaired the Security Council. It is a fact that the U.N. has failed time and again, failed time and again to act against aggression at times, often in fact siding with the aggressors.

And the reason that is the case is something that was seen over 2 centuries ago by a great thinker like Immanuel Kant. He said that an amalgamation of dictatorships and democracies together would not protect peace, because dictatorships tend toward war and only democracies tend toward peace, and he was right. And the United Nations, unfortunately, is such an amalgamation. It failed. It failed in the case of preventing Saddam from almost acquiring a nuclear bomb; and when we bombed that, the U.N. attacked us.

By the way, I said that the entire world condemned us, but that is not exactly true. Because I am told that sort of in the bowels of some of the main security organizations of the U.S. Government, they were following this when we struck at Osirak. And at the time Saddam was calling—he never used the name "Israel." He always said the Zionist entity. I think the movie Raiders of the Lost Arc or, sorry, the Empire Strikes Back was making its heyday then.

So, anyway, when they heard that Israel had struck at Iraq, they said, hooray, the entity strikes back. But, nevertheless, the formal position of the United States, the formal position of the U.N. condemned Israel, was about to place sanctions on Israel. So the U.N. in this case and in many cases simply has not been able to overcome the debilitating weaknesses inside it, notwithstanding the

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

goals and ideals of the charter, hobble its ability to be effective in stopping aggression.

Aggression has been stopped in the last 100 years not by the U.N. and not by the League of Nations, its predecessor. It simply crumbled and died effectively in the mid-1930's, unable to stop the totalitarian aggression. Aggression has been stopped only when the key democratic countries were able and willing to act. When they were unable and unwilling to act, no international structure was sufficient. That happened in the first half of the 20th century. It must not be allowed to happen in the first half of the 21st century.

I think we are fortunate to have the United States, whose people and leadership and, I think, a broad spread of leadership, a bipartisan leadership, understand that this aggression has to be stopped and stopped in time.

Ms. WATSON. May I just followup with this last—one last question?

Mr. BURTON. Well, OK.

Ms. WATSON. So that I might quote you accurately, are you saying that we are to circumvent the United Nations and not seek a legitimate process through the United Nations but that the United States needs to go it alone? I just want you to clarify what you are saying.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes. I am saying that you can seek U.N. support, and it would be good to have it, but I wouldn't make a precondition of eliminating Saddam's regime before it acquires nuclear weapons. Because if you make it a condition, you will never reach it.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your very generous 5-minute rule here.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Is the 5-minute rule on you or on me? I am sorry.

Mr. SHAYS. No——

Mr. BURTON. He is taking a little poke at the chairman, but that is all right.

Mr. SHAYS. No, no, I am not taking a poke. I am just trying to condition for the fact that I may take 10 minutes instead of 5.

I want to first say to you, Mr. Netanyahu, you had been warning the world, not just the United States, about terrorism for decades. You have had a lonely journey, not unlike Churchill, frankly, in the 1930's. I happen to think that you are dead on, and it is a privilege to be able to ask you some questions, but I have a number——

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you.

Mr. SHAYS [continuing]. But I first wanted to make a statement.

We knew that Saddam Hussein had a robust chemical, biological and nuclear program before the war in the Gulf. We knew he had it after. And we knew that he kicked out the inspectors when we were successfully dismantling his chemical, biological and nuclear program. We know that for a fact.

We also know that he had a delivery system for chemical and biological agents; and while that was more quiet in the past, it is now very clearly public information.

So I am left with drawing this conclusion: Why would the burden have to be on those who say that he is still continuing these pro-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

grams? Why shouldn't the burden be on those who claim that he has stopped? Because no one can give me even a scintilla of possibility that he has changed his mind-set and changed his ways. I would love a short answer to that, because I have some followups.

Mr. NETANYAHU. I have nothing to add to your very acute reasoning here, but I do want to say that the last point, one of the points, if we are connecting the dots, is that intelligence, including from defectors who say exactly what you are saying, that he is absolutely committed, pushing with all of his power, to develop these weapons. So you must ask, OK, if we want to take Newtonian physics, if an object is moving in a certain direction with a certain momentum, there has to be something that will make him change his mind. What is it? The kicking out of the monitors? No.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me ask you this. In 1981 I was a State legislator. I was frankly shocked that there was a preemptive strike. I voiced my concern as a State legislator. Not that it mattered much, but I just—when the press asked me, I said I am shocked by it.

One of my first briefings when I got elected in 1987 was my interest in understanding that raid; and after our people described it to me, I figuratively got down on my knees and said, why didn't we congratulate and thank them for doing it? This gets into this whole issue then—in other words, Israel. This gets into this whole issue of preemption.

We knew that we had an ally, the Soviet Union, who became our enemy, socially, politically, economically and militarily. We developed—we knew what the threat was. We developed a strategy, and it was reactive, it was containment, reactive, mutually assured destruction. Now that went out—clearly went out the window on September 11th. I mean, that was the one question that I didn't have an answer to. There was no red line. That is what we learned from the terrorists.

Now, it strikes me that we have to know the threat, as all three commissions have told us, we have to have a strategy, and then we reorganize.

I don't see how we can come to any other conclusion that the strategy has to be preemptive. And I would say to my colleague, the Ambassador, who I understand where she is coming from, but it strikes me—and I was surprised by my own majority leader being surprised that we can't do preemptive. What other choice is there in combating terrorism if it is not preemptive?

And I will just qualify it with one other point, color it in a little bit.

At that very table we had a noted scientist who said his biggest fear was that a small group of dedicated scientists could create a biological agent, an altered biological agent that would wipe out humanity as we know it. We were all struck with the fact that if a country allows that to happen, what are we going to do? Just wait until it happens? It has to be preemptive. Is there any other choice but preemptive?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I think not, but I think that there are two, three reasons why that is the case.

The first reason is that you have now—when you have—here is the situation where you have to go through and oust the regime, as opposed to deter it. One, you may have a regime that is not

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

deterable. For example, if it has a penchant for suicide, you cannot rely on deterrence, because if the regime is willing to die a collective death for the glory of their twisted version of Islam, it is not going to work. Or if there are people within it who are moving in that direction, deterrence may not necessarily work.

The second is a regime that knows no limits to the use of force, that it simply completely is committed to that force. A good example of that is the Nazi regime. No matter what you did to it, as long as it lived, as long as Hitler breathed, as long as that clique was there, it simply would not stop. You had to oust it.

And the third situation where you must change the regime is that, if you don't, you cannot begin to effect a societal change.

I think the removal of the dangers—I don't think you can rely on deterrence when it comes to most of the terror network. I think this is what distinguished it from, say, the Communists. You know, the Communists, you could deter them. It was very easy. They were very rational. I don't think they were pursuing any rational goal, but they pursued it rationally. Any time they had to choose between their ideology and their survival, they chose their survival. They backed up—Berlin, whatever, Cuba.

The ability of Islam is that you cannot rely on that they will make that decision, because they will go down with the ship. They have no compunction of killing people on this side of the aisle but also quite a few of their own. You never heard of a Communist suicide bomber, but militant Islam produces hordes of them. So when you have a regime system that is not susceptible to deterrence, you have no choice but to take it out.

But what does "taking it out" mean? It means—and this is, I think, my answer to you, Congressman Shays. It means that you cannot just have regime removal. You really have to have regime change in the fundamental meaning of that word. You really have to start changing the mentality, the poison, toxified mentality that these regimes have put into the minds of millions, hundreds of millions, and that is the real task, the great challenge. Now, if you don't, then it is a question of time where you will have suitcase devices of mass death. You can have biological devices, you can have nuclear devices. It is just a question of time.

So the ultimate protection—and I come back to the example of Germany. The ultimate protection that you won't have it, that you won't have a new Hitlerism, is the ventilation of German society by democracy. The long-term protection—and it is not foolproof, but we have to try—is, once the regimes are ousted, it is to begin the process of democratization in these places which harbor this militancy today.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me just ask in one other area here, and it does strike me that, based on your testimony, that preemption is required somewhere, but if you have a preemptive strike in one place, it may not—it may result in not needing a preemptive strike elsewhere.

But I want to ask you about Abu Nidal in Baghdad. I am struck by the fact that, in a sense, Saddam was trying to destroy the evidence. I mean, he is one of the most vicious terrorists, and I am struck by the fact that Osama bin Laden, what he did was he united terrorists. There wasn't just one type of terrorist from one

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

country in Afghanistan. He brought them all together. There was a network. I am just interested to know your feeling about that so-called suicide. Is it possible that Saddam was basically trying to destroy any evidence? That, somehow, he is protecting terrorists and giving us then legitimacy in going in?

Mr. NETANYAHU. It is possible, but I can't tell you about that specific case. But I can tell you that the terrorists and the terror regimes, they are all—they are all connected, sometimes loosely, sometimes tightly. For example, you know that Osama bin Laden, first of all, enjoyed a domicile in Afghanistan. Actually, they moved from the Sudan to Afghanistan. He has to have a place. Once he had that place, he moved from there, for example, to Lebanon where he had meetings with Hezbollah who were tied in with Palestinian terrorists. So bin Laden was trying to penetrate our area as well as through Hezbollah, other areas.

Mr. SHAYS. So the key point is he had a network and he was kind of the president.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Yes, but the key point is this. I don't care how many networks he has. If he doesn't have regimes that give him an inviolable place where he doesn't have to run and hide all the time, his effectiveness goes down the tubes very fast. That is the key thing. If you take away the sovereign states, you bring down—you just bring down this whole structure of international terrorism.

But what you don't know is you cannot prevent the reemergence of this madness 20 years or 30 years or 15 years from now. The only way you can do that is by making sure that when you bring down the regime, instead of replacing one dictator with another, you begin a different process that is distinguished around the world everywhere, except up there, everywhere you have democracy sweeping the world, everywhere you have the United States pressing for democratization.

It has been a spectacular success. I mean, the whole world is democratized. You have democratized Latin America, and if anyone veers there, you go down gangsters on them. Russia is democratized. You are seeking human rights and democratization in China, South Africa, Mongolia, Albania. Everybody is democratizing, except this one area. This one area remains, and it is a big one, with these poisonous regimes in there, remains untouched. And in the gurgly caldron of this mad zealotry are brewing the new bin Ladens, the new suicide bombers from the Arafats and the Talibans and the bin Ladens of this world.

You can't leave it that way. You can't just go into the caldron, pick up the Taliban and throw him out and get a new one. You have to turn over the pot. You have to do something else. You have to start a different process.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Shays.

Mr. Waxman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Prime Minister, we have known each other for many years; and I have always held you in the highest regard and with great respect and admired your eloquence and with none more so than on the two occasions you appeared before this committee—today and then right after September 11th. And at your last appearance,

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

you articulated the empathy and the solidarity with the United States as a fellow victim of terrorism, because Israel has been suffering from terrorist attacks before September 11th and even more since September 11th.

So the United States and Israel share not only that, but the reason we share that is we share values of democracy, of pluralism, of respect for individual rights, and so your enemies are our enemies and our enemies are also your enemies.

Today we are talking about Saddam Hussein not just here, but the President of the United States before the United Nations. And he has said to the United Nations, as an international body, isn't it their obligation, he has said, to enforce the rules and resolutions that they have adopted that have been flaunted by Saddam Hussein? Now, I certainly hope that the United Nations wouldn't hobble themselves and live up to the responsibility that they have to insist—in fact, demand—that Saddam Hussein open up his country to full, unfettered inspections and end any kind of weapons that he might have.

The question I want to ask you is, is there a value as you see it from an Israeli perspective for the U.N. to act in concert with the United States in going against Saddam Hussein, one, to stop what he is doing to develop these weapons? And, second, should there have to be a military action to rebuild Iraq after Saddam Hussein?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Congressman Waxman, there would be much value if you could rely on it. I don't want to pull rank, but I spent 4 years in the U.N. and a hell of a lot of time on the Security Council, and I cannot tell you that this is necessarily a bastion of responsibility. On occasion, not very frequent, the U.N. does the right thing, but on many occasions, it does the wrong thing. This is an organization that branded Zionism as racism. You know, it is what Abba Eban once said, that, you know, that if the Arab countries put before the U.N. a resolution that the earth is flat, it will be passed by the U.N. That problem of inconsistency is what plagues this issue.

Now you have a question, I think a different question: Is it desirable to get U.N. support? The answer is, absolutely yes. The question I put forward is, is it a precondition for such action? Suppose you try, you give it some time, it doesn't happen. What do you do then?

Now, there are two ways of trying. One is you talk to them. They either do it or they do not do it. The other is you actually try to press forward a resolution and somebody, one of the permanent members, vetoes it and maybe passes another resolution. So now you may be actually working against a failed resolution or even an antagonistic resolution of the U.N. Well, an antagonistic resolution, one of those you could always block at the Security Council, but a failed resolution is different.

Mr. WAXMAN. I want to certainly say that if the United Nations doesn't live up to its responsibilities, that shouldn't preclude the United States from living up to its responsibilities.

Mr. NETANYAHU. I fully agree with you.

Mr. WAXMAN. And then the question is, what actions we should take; and the President has argued that we need a regime change in Iraq because Saddam is clear in his motives to want to dominate

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the Middle East and particularly the oil wealth by virtue of having a nuclear bomb which he is actively working to achieve.

Now you said one of the reasons Israel is so concerned about all of this is there are things that happen if you do take action and things that happen if you don't. Israel, everyone expects, will be the victim of Saddam Hussein's last gasp to stay in power, and you argue that the United States should be working with Israel to deal with that circumstance should it happen.

I absolutely agree that it is essential that the United States and Israel work closely in concert, as we have in the past and as we need to in the future, to deal with terrorism and, God forbid, any kind of use of weapons of mass destruction short of nuclear weapons by Saddam Hussein. But let me examine a couple of things that have been thrown out in the debate here in the United States.

Some people have said if we go after Saddam Hussein, it is diverting us from the war on terrorism. How do you answer that?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I don't think so. I think it helps you enormously, because in the mind-set of the terrorists and the people they wish to recruit, there is a common front, as I said, of a handful of states and actually not a much larger number of organizations. So if you start taking them one by one, taking them on, deterring some, destroying others, you are sending a message to the entire terror network.

I would put it just as a victory for terrorism anywhere in any part of the terror network emboldens the entire terror network. A defeat of any part of the terror network discourages the terror network and makes it lose its head of steam. It is exactly opposite the advice that I suppose you are hearing from some that, if you take action, you will inflame more militancy and more terrorism.

My experience has been the exact opposite, the exact opposite. You might have an exchange for a while of blows and counterblows, but if you are persistent and you are applying your power concertedly and consistently, you will douse the flames. Is douse to dampen?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes.

Mr. NETANYAHU. All right. You will douse the flames.

My English is rusty, you know, Henry.

Mr. WAXMAN. Let me ask you another question that has been talked about, this doctrine of preemptive action.

Some people have said preemptive action is appropriate if there is an imminent threat, but the President today said of the United States that he is worried about the gathering danger. He didn't say an imminent threat, but the gathering danger.

Now, how do we decide when preemptive action is appropriate? Saddam Hussein is working on weapons of mass destruction. So is Iran. Syria is much more active in helping Hezbollah and Hamas as part of the terrorist network. Do we follow this doctrine of preemptive action beyond Saddam Hussein? Do all of these countries merit preemptive action by us, and how do we distinguish?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Probably not. Not because they don't merit it in moral terms, but because you wouldn't need it. I think the first question you ask is, how limited is it? Do you want to wait and find out? The answer is no. You had what I called here the wake-up call from hell, but you don't have to wait until hell rushes you and

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

meets you in the face. It already has, in effect. So on the question of time, I think the sooner, the better.

But now the question is, when you choose a target, I think Iraq brings two things, a confluence of two things. One, it is sufficiently important in this network to have a tremendous effect. If it collapses, it will have a beneficial seismic effect, quite the contrary of what is being described. And the second thing is that it happens to be one of the two and now, as we have learned, one of the three regimes that is racing to build nuclear weapons. So you get two birds with one stone. You knock out a main developer of nuclear arms in the tyranny work and you also send reverberations across the network.

So if I had to choose, yes, I would choose that. Is Iran less dangerous? No. Is it more dangerous? Maybe. Certainly not less dangerous. But would I counsel necessarily a preemptive strike to Iran? I am not sure. I would be very careful about that. I think that there is a great deal of possibility of internal processes of change in Iran that simply do not exist in Saddam Hussein.

Do you remember that at the end of the Gulf war there was an assumption within certain corners of the American government that having been dealt this blow, without regime change, without bringing him down, that there would be an internal revolt, so to speak, in Iraq? But this was wishful thinking, because Iraq simply—it is a police state without any ability to foment the kind of process that occurred in fact in Iran and the downfall of the Shah.

Iran has that ability and, therefore, you shouldn't apply force—I will say this: You shouldn't apply force indiscriminately, and certainly for the application of force, against Palestinian terrorism, against Iraq and so on, but I think that force should be applied judiciously. That is, it should be applied with great resolution, with great force, but at that part of the front, so to speak, where you will get maximum effect; and I think this is the case with Iraq. This is why the relevant question is not whether the others merit punishment but where the application of force will do the most good, and that is what I think we are discussing here.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much. You have given us testimony that will help us think through these very difficult issues; and it has been very, very helpful.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you very much.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Waxman.

Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to see you again, Mr. Prime Minister.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you.

Mr. LANTOS. My colleagues have raised many of the issues that I wanted to raise, but I would like to go at them in a somewhat different way, so if you will bear with me, and I will be happy with whatever length of response you give me.

Much of this debate in Europe, the United Nations and, to some extent, in this country about Saddam Hussein has the quality of people discussing the merits of an abstract painting. You like it, I don't like it, this is what I like, this is what I don't like about it. I find this extremely disturbing because, obviously, with vis-a-vis Saddam Hussein, we are looking at a record, his historic record,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

which there is no point repeating, because we are all aware of it: what he did to his own people, what he did in the beginning of the war against Iran in which hundreds of thousands on both sides died, the gassing of his own people, the attack on Kuwait, the attempted assassination of our own former President, the list is long.

But every one of us in this body, every one of us in the public arena who deal with foreign affairs also brings a record.

Now, I was intrigued by your discussion with Mr. Shays concerning preemption; and I am delighted to tell my good friend who joined this body many years after I did that when your air force took out the Iraqi nuclear reactor at Osirak the following day I gave a floor speech in the Congress commending that action. Because it was self-evident that, without preemption, Iraq would have proceeded with a program of developing nuclear weapons, and the Persian Gulf war could have turned out quite differently, because the civilized world could well have faced a nuclear-equipped Iraq and might not have been willing to undertake a war against a nuclear-equipped Iraq.

So it seems to me that the President's speech today at the United Nations—and I don't know if you have had a chance to see it or read it—was right on target, and I think the enemies of the United States would be well-advised to understand that there is enormous bipartisan support for the President's position vis-a-vis Iraq. And when the President comes before us within the next few weeks or months with a proposal to obtain congressional approval, while he is unlikely to get the almost unanimous approval that he got against the war on terrorism a year ago—my friend and colleague Henry Hyde and I sat in the manager's chair for 9½ hours because everybody wanted to speak on this issue. We had one negative vote. We are likely to have more negative votes than one—but there is little doubt in my mind that there will be overwhelming bipartisan, bicameral approval when the proposal comes before us.

Now, one of the many criticisms of the concept of preemption stems from our rather naive historic imagery of chivalry as part and parcel of military activities. Some people still feel that chivalry is not dead, that Saddam Hussein will act according to the appropriate rules and procedures, and it is so self-evident to even the most superficial observer of recent history that it is only his capability or lack of it which prevents him from striking out with whatever force he has. So the notion of preemption is not just an option, it is mandated by the nature of this new enemy. This is a new kind of enemy, and to apply the rules of 17th century chivalry to the regime of Saddam Hussein to me appears to be absurd.

I would like to ask you to comment, if you would, about the public views and private views of many Arab leaders that has been commented on in the media, but perhaps those of us who occasionally or frequently meet with Arab leaders are personally exposed to this profound dichotomy, a totally different private view of a possible strike against Iraq and an utterly divergent public view.

First of all, do you agree that is, in fact, what is happening, that many of the Arab leaders are really telling totally different stories in private and in public? In private, they are saying, go to it, we can hardly wait to get rid of him, we will be supportive in whatever way we can, but publicly denouncing this possible action.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The second thing I would be grateful if you could comment on is a chronological question. Some of the opponents of regime change in Iraq argue that it may not be too difficult to change the regime in Iraq in a military sense, not a cake walk but not overwhelmingly difficult, but that what comes after it we have no idea about, and how long we may have to stay there, nobody knows. I am puzzled by these objections, because when North Korea attacked South Korea and almost took over the whole country, the South Koreans were able to maintain a small perimeter around this port city of Pusan, and now we are back to the 30th parallel. We have been there for almost a half a century.

The question to be asked is, would we prefer a Communist North Korea regime-controlled Korean peninsula to this very long-term commitment that we had to make? It is costly, it is cumbersome, we don't like it, but it seems to me that it is infinitely preferable to have at least half of the peninsula today free and open and democratic and pro-western than to have the regime in the north run this whole Korean peninsula.

My view is that whether we are talking about the cold war, which lasted two generations, our military involvement in Korea, which is now into its third generation, and long-term, rational commitments of our resources, preferable to accepting extreme fanatical, irrational regimes, developing weapons of mass destruction as the alternative?

Mr. NETANYAHU. The answer to your second question is clearly that I agree with you. I think—imagine—we know what is happening in that half of the Korean peninsula, because this regime that is at a starvation level, probably the lowest GDP per capita on earth, is busy developing nuclear weapons and missiles and then exporting it to the other terror regimes. So there is something developing, Congressman Lantos, which I think is certainly developed in my thinking.

I am a Kantian, as you can see by my references to Kant, and Kant basically said 200 years ago that the way to secure world peace—in his great essay that he wrote, Perpetual Peace, he said the only way to do it is to distinguish between democracies and dictatorships. Understand that whereas democracies tend toward peace because they reflect the will of the majority, dictatorships tend toward war, because a dictator gets to be a dictator by practicing aggression toward his own people, so he will do it to others, too.

Kant said basically that the only way you could have peace with dictatorships—he said peace with democracy is automatic and self-sustaining, but peace with dictatorships can be purchased, he said, by deterrence, deterrence not by the United Nations, but what he called the League of Free Nations, which means the democracies banding together to deter aggression or roll it back if deterrence failed, which is essentially NATO.

What didn't happen opposite Germany happened vis-a-vis a far greater dictatorship of a much more powerful dictatorship of Soviet Russia and it worked, a cold peace. We called it the cold war, but it was a cold peace, a peace of deterrence.

I have come to the conclusion that, faced with these types of regimes who may be undeterable, there really is, in the long run, only one kind of peace; that is the peace of democracies or, if you

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

will, the peace of democratization. Because if you have these territories in which madness rules, in which they develop botulisms that they will put in Manhattan or Washington or suitcase nuclear devices that will detonate in the cities of the West, that you not only have to preempt and oust these regimes but you really have to begin this process of democratization.

So I think Kant was right for 2 centuries, but I think in the 21st century we may have to go back to a democratic peace, period.

I think this relates to your question, are we willing to pay the price? Well, I think freedom has its price, and our security has its price. I tend to think that the American people—I tend to agree with you from my visits to the United States and even my talk in the corridors of Congress, I think there is a solid majority who understand that action must be taken, sometimes with a shorter time horizon, sometimes with a longer time horizon, both going back and going forward on the need to secure our world. But I think that, yes, you have to pay the price for freedom.

On the question of the private and public opinions of Arab leaders, it is well-known that not only on this issue but on many issues there is a divergence, simply because there isn't pluralism in Arab public political life. There is a party line that is enhanced and enforced by a collection of dictatorships, usually, and so people don't deviate from it.

In the case, however, of Saddam, I see the following. I see something somewhat different than this dualism. In 1991, there was practical Arab unanimity on the need to roll back Saddam from Kuwait. Saddam had devoured an Arab country, and every country thought it would be his next target. Therefore, they proceeded to support the extradition of Kuwait from Iraq's gullet, and there was perfect unanimity and even public unanimity in the presence of Arab countries in the coalition.

A decade later, you see something else. Some of them—and the more democratized, the more liberal these leaders are—want to see Saddam go. Some of them may be even his closest neighbors, but they won't say it openly. But others, many others, fear that if Saddam goes then he will be replaced. That regime will begin a regime change in the broader sense of the word; that is, the process of democratization in the Arab world. That is why you are getting a much broader consensus, not uniform and not totally private but pretty broad and private, against an American action, because the regimes themselves are fearful of the dynamic of freedom.

Again, this doesn't apply to all of them. Some of them are much closer to liberalizing their societies than others. But I think this is a dynamic that now occurs.

In any case, if I had—you know, asking for an Arab consensus, public or any other type, before you take on Saddam is actually a little worse than waiting for a U.N. consensus. Actually, it is a lot worse, and some things you just do the right thing, and I think America is about to do the right thing.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. SHAYS [presiding]. Thank you Mr. Netanyahu. Do you have time for a few more questions?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I have all the time in the world, Mr. Chairman.

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. I do want to say that the Chairman was very sorry that he did have to leave and was grateful that you were willing to spend your day or afternoon with this committee and he wanted me to convey that.

You had mentioned that it would be our responsibility to—Israel would clearly become the target if there was a preemptive strike against Iraq. I have a sense that if the United States and others were able to push the border of his activity closer to Baghdad that most of the missiles would not reach Israel, but the point you made was that we would need to help you acquire smallpox and immunize your population. I think you made reference to that. And I am curious how long it would take to do that.

Mr. NETANYAHU. It does not take very long. I don't want to get into these discussions. I will just tell you that, for example, the cost of a vaccination against smallpox, which is what we are really talking about, the cheap one costs 20 cents and the expensive one costs $1.

Well, you know, we have 6 million citizens in Israel. Not a huge cost. And I think we are well underway to produce this. But I am saying—I don't want to get into the intricacies, Congressman Shays, of the precise way of allocating vaccines and other devices, but I want to say and I do want to stress the principle once again, and I thank you for again bringing it up, I think it is absolutely essential that the United States and Israel see to it that Israel has all the means of civil defense available in today's world before that action is initiated. If not, then the risk that we are taking will be an undue risk.

I do not represent the government. The government, I don't know if it even takes a formal position, but I do talk to an awful lot of Israelis across the board. And I think they would, if they were here, approximate—and if I can speak for so many people who actually agree with me, they would say, yes, we want Saddam's regime taken out; yes, we are prepared to take the risk; but no, we are not prepared to take a risk that has not been reduced to its barest minimum.

And it is not difficult to see that all of these means of civil defense are available. That is as important a responsibility of the United States as it is of Israel because, after all, Israel will be the first one attacked.

Mr. SHAYS. Israel has been fighting terrorism for 50 years, and you clearly have learned a long time ago there is no good terrorist. It has been amazing, the thought that your country has put into this effort, and we are learning a great deal from you.

The chairman did want some questions about Saudi Arabia. It has never come up in any dialog. I don't think you brought it up, and I am curious why it has not kind of shown.

Mr. NETANYAHU. I thought I was talking about Saudi Arabia all the time, Mr. Shays. I think that Saudi Arabia is one of those cases of a regime that at once has fueled terrorism and at the same time has espoused a relationship with the United States. It has fueled terrorism by funding terrorists, including al Qaeda received a lot of Saudi money in the early nineties. But it is now fueling Palestinian terrorism by offering a graduated remuneration system for suicide bombers. Saudis pay the families. That is as big as stimulus

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

as you can—incentive for the suicide bombing. The disincentive is that the family is actually worse off. And if you had an incentive that the family benefits from Saudi money, you are actually stimulating terrorism.

So Saudi Arabia has been doing that, and it has also been unfortunately fomenting inside Saudi Arabia and outside Saudi Arabia, the Wahhabist creed that is I think a particularly insidious form of militant Islam. At the same time, Saudi Arabia, at least on the diplomatic level, claims to be a friend of the United States. I think the way to handle that is to say to the Saudis something that President Bush had outlined in one of his speeches. He said, "All nations will have to choose. You are either with us or against us in this battle." And I think the Saudis should be held accountable to that. I think they should be pressed as forcefully as possible to cease and desist those things that promote militancy and terror, and I think you should hold them to it.

Mr. SHAYS. Is it your view that the Hamas and the Hezbollah on occasion work together?

Mr. NETANYAHU. That the Hamas and Hezbollah—absolutely. We know they cooperate.

Mr. SHAYS. Funded primarily by the Iranians and Syrians?

Mr. NETANYAHU. Funded by Iran, the Hezbollah is operating with the compliance of Syria on Syrian-controlled soil in Lebanon. Syria also enables Iran to land planes in Damascus airport, stockpiled with rockets, rockets aimed at our cities, and other weaponry to go through Syrian territory and Syrian-controlled territory in Lebanon to reach the Hezbollah.

Hezbollah is a perfect example of the terrorist network. You have two terrorist regimes cooperating with one another, fielding a third terror organization that has links to about, oh, about a dozen directly—links to about a dozen of the two dozen or so terror organizations. Direct links, so everybody is connected in concentric circles.

Mr. SHAYS. If you could sort this out for me, though, I was trying to allude to it at the end when my time was really running out. I thought—not to put a nice word next to horrific people—but I gave the al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden credit for doing something that has not happened in the past, and that is basically to unite a world organization of terrorism, schooled at the university in Afghanistan. But whether they were from Indonesia, Malaysia, they train in Kosovo, in Chechnya, that come back—what I am struck with is that it strikes me that—there is really no good terrorist—that they interact. That if a nation like Iraq is having Abu Nidal as a resident, protected, that is a very strong case for the fact that this is in fact a terrorist nation interacting with the rest of the world in this fight against the West.

And I guess I would like you to tell me why we cannot hold accountable the people that Saddam Hussein houses and allows to live in his country, why we can't make the very strong claim that he is a part of al Qaeda and the whole organizational process.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Well, he provides safe haven to Abu Nidal and others who practice terrorism. And without safe haven, there is no terrorism. Syria does the same. There are more than a dozen terrorist groups that have official addresses in Damascus. It is the

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

same system. And I think that obviously right now he is very careful. He would be very careful right now. He is under the gun. He understands that his days appear to be numbered, so he will make all the noises and he will make all the gestures to say that he is abandoning it and finished with it and so on; all the while trying in his basement, the basement of his 50 palaces, to develop the bomb. If he gets away with that, then he will treat you and us and everyone very differently.

By the way, I should say that within the constituent parts of the terror networks, both the regimes and the organizations, there is cooperation and harmony but there is also competition. Everyone wants to be the king of the militant Islamic heap. They all want to be on the top. The new Saladins or the new Nassers. And Osama bin Laden wants to be the ultimate grand maestro of terrorism. And I must say that he has capabilities, unfortunately, or has talents that put him close to the top. They all want to be the linchpins, they all want to be the crucial one that connects, unites, and commands all the rest. But effectively what they do is cooperate with one another.

And unless you dismantle this system in its entirety—if you leave any part of it intact it will grow, it will grow back. It is like a malignant growth. You have to get rid of the system. And I think we are getting close to getting rid of the system.

Mr. SHAYS. We are about to adjourn. Is there anything else that you want to put on this Congressional Record?

Mr. NETANYAHU. I want to thank you and Mr. Shays and Congressman Burton and, first of all, thank Congressman Lantos for the degree of his patience and also for all of your discerning comments. I think that today was another expression of the strength of this country and the strength of democracy. Nations, democracies, do not go to war easily and they usually debate and argue before they do.

Sometimes they have to be bombed into going to war. In fact, that is what happened in World War II. All of Europe had been conquered. America was actually bombed in Pearl Harbor and was—and that was a pivotal event that opened the eyes of Americans, and once their eyes were opened they gathered the power that is available in this great free Nation, and the result was preordained.

I think in a similar way, the bombing of September 11th opened the eyes of Americans to see the great conflict and the great dirge that face us; and once opened, and the overpowering will of the majority of the people of the United States, of the steamroller that is inexorably moving to decide this battle.

I think this was called by Congressman Lantos "the hinge of history," and it is exactly that. It is the hinge of history. And 1 year later, I can come in and say that history is moving in the right direction. That had America not woken up, had America not mobilized his action, had it not—if it had not had the courageous leadership of President Bush, then I would not be able to say that I am confident today.

But I am saying that I believe that the war on terror is going in the right direction and that I am confident that if we pursue this direction, then we will achieve victory. And victory is victory for

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

America and victory for Israel and victory for Britain; victory for all the democracies, however vacillating and however reluctant their governments are. This is a victory for all free societies, and I am sure it will be achieved. Thank you.

Mr. SHAYS. I would just conclude by saying it is going to be a very interesting debate, because even in my district, the phone calls against preemptive action are basically 40 to 1 against it. So it is going to be interesting to see how this plays out.

And just on a lighter note, you mentioned television; and one of your colleagues, Foreign Minister Perez, said "Television makes dictators impossible." And then he went on to say, "It makes democracy intolerable."

Mr. NETANYAHU. I would agree with that part of Mr. Perez's statement.

Mr. SHAYS. Have a good day, thank you for coming. This hearing is adjourned.

Mr. NETANYAHU. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 08903 0350

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1016-A

CONFLICT WITH IRAQ: AN ISRAELI PERSPECTIVE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 12, 2002

Serial No. 107–139

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/congress/house
http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
83–514 PDF WASHINGTON : 2003

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES
FEB 26 2003
DEPOSITED BY UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The University of Michigan Documents Center

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN