

[Traprock Peace Center](#)

[Transcription of Scott Ritter's Answers to Questions during his talk at Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, MA on October 15, 2002.

We have tried to make this an accurate transcription. However, it is not perfect, and to ensure accuracy in quoting, one should compare it to the audio of the presentation, available as a CD, video, or via the web at <http://traprockpeace.org/ritter101501QA.mp3> or at <http://traprockpeace.org/RitterQandA101502.ram> (real audio). If you have any difficulty downloading the audio, please feel free to [email us](#).]

Scott Ritter:

Q and A: Do I think that Saddam Hussein poses a viable threat to the United States and its neighbors? I don't know. What I do know is that we need more information. Because the way that this threat is being quantified by the administration is in terms of weapons of mass destruction. That's the big link. Iraq has biological weapons, and is pursuing nuclear weapons. We keep hearing that we don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud. Politics of fear. That's an image that's in your head. Does Iraq have a nuclear capability today? I doubt it, but I don't know. Does Iraq have a chemical weapons capability today? It could. I mean, I testified when I resigned in 1998 that Iraq could reconstitute chemical weapon capability within six months once you pull inspectors out. They've been out four years. I have no way of knowing what's been happening in Iraq in the last four years. So I'm very concerned. I share the President's concerns. I share everybody's concerns about what's going on in Iraq. I know the nature of the regime, and I don't trust him as far as I can throw him. The world would be a better place without Saddam Hussein. But I'm also someone who believes that, before we ask our service men and women to go off and die in our name, which is basically what we're asking them to go to war; die in our name, die in defense of us. But we should exhaust every venue possible short of war to resolve this situation, if the issue is Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. We have a situation today where Iraq has agreed to be held accountable to the rule of law as set forth in existing Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq's disarmament. These are very stringent resolutions. There's nothing wimpy about these resolutions. They're pretty tough resolutions. They are the ones that govern our work. Our failure in Iraq to achieve disarmament came not only from Iraqi obstruction. We overcame most of that. It came from American manipulation of the process. It came from the Security Council being unwilling to enforce the laws it had passed. I don't care how tough your law is; if you're not willing to enforce it, you don't have a good law. It's like passing a speed limit and saying "45 miles per hour, and that's it," and have a cop sitting there with a radar gun, and everybody blows by at 75. If the cop doesn't do anything about it, what good's the law? If you say Iraq has to be disarmed, then Iraq has to give you immediate access to any facility designated for inspection, and you show up and knock on the door, and Iraq refuses to open the door, something's got to be done about it. You don't need a new law. The law's already tough. It says Iraq has to let you in. It already says that if Iraq doesn't let you in, military force is authorized. So we don't need a new law. Iraq has said it will be held accountable to existing law. If we're concerned about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, why don't we send in inspectors before we send in marines? To me, that would be part of the process of exhausting every venue possible short of war before sending the inspectors in. Now, some people say, well, isn't that what the Bush administration is trying to do by pushing the United Nations to pass a new resolution that's very tough on Iraq to get the inspectors in, to let the world know that, this time, there won't be a second chance? The problem with this new resolution, though, is that it's applying for the death penalty right up front. It's saying that, if Iraq doesn't

cooperate, we're going to war, we're going to eliminate Saddam Hussein. That's a lot like a prosecutor asking for the death penalty before you convicted the criminal. You're still doing your investigation. We don't know that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. It also is putting on conditions that, frankly speaking, nobody could ever accept. The concept of inspectors coming in with an army of occupation, a no-drive, no-fly zone around industrial facilities, perpetual occupation with armed guards. If I want to talk to an Iraqi scientist, I kick him and his family out of the country. That's just a recipe of massive defection. That's where the United States could come in and pull out all the people, pull them out of Iraq, and keep them out of Iraq. Iraq will never accept this. It has nothing to do with disarming Iraq and everything to do with humiliating Iraq, guaranteeing that Iraq will reject this resolution, thereby giving a green light to America to strike. I don't know what the nature of the Iraqi threat is. I'm a little skeptical that it poses the kind of grave and imminent threat that President Bush has spoken about. It seems stunning that, the day we voted on this resolution that congress voted, the CIA came out with a report that said there is no grave and imminent risk from Iraq in terms of weapons of mass destruction, and if we invade Iraq, there's more of a risk of Iraq using weapons of mass destruction against us when we invade. Why wasn't this part of the congressional debate? Why did congress vote to go to war before this became available to the public domain? Why now are we getting generals coming out and saying that there's no rush to go to war? The former commanders of Central Command, the military command responsible for that part of the world, are saying "there's no imminent threat from Iraq. We could wait a year just to find out what's going on there. There's no need to rush out to war." Every four-star general who commanded that region has come out against the war. That speaks volumes about what's happening. Again, the short question, I don't know. But I do know that there is a way to investigate this that doesn't require putting American lives at risk.

Q and A: The question dealt with the level of animosity that probably exists inside Iraq today towards the United States. Let's get this off right from the start. Iraq is a western-oriented, secular country, or it was up until 1991. What I mean by that is, Iraq is not an Islamic fundamentalist nation. It is ruled by a secular dictator, somebody who has rejected religion. It is not a democracy; let's not confuse ourselves here, but it is a nation that has embraced a western economic model. The Iraqis did business with the west. They did business with the United States. They did business with Europe, and their factories and their economic activity was modeled on this kind of interaction with the west. Iraq is a nation that, alone of Arab Islamic states, had equal rights for women. Stunning that women can go to college as equals of men, wearing western clothes, and graduate and be integrated into the work force. Iraq is a nation that had universal health care, some of the finest health care around; low infant mortality, high literacy, a very modern state, advanced state with a great deal of love towards things western, including the United States. Iraqis loved to send their kids out to be educated in the United States. Not only did we teach them about the basics of science; we taught them how to build nuclear weapons and biological weapons and chemical weapons, but, seriously, a lot of the scientists that I did business with in Iraq were educated in the United States. Iraq had close links with the west until we imposed economic sanctions. I'm not a student of human psychology, but I would just imagine that, if I were a mother, my faucet, turn it on, put a cup down there, pick up the water, and it's some of the safest drinking water in the world. I could drink it safely, give to my kids to drink it, not a problem. If my kid got sick, I could bundle up my little bundle of joy and take it to the hospital say "kid's got a cold, doctor." Let's give him some antibiotics, kid's taken care of, go home, and all is well that ends well. But, suddenly, in a situation where I turn on that spick, and because of the war and we bombed water purification

plants, raw sewage is sweeping in, and that water is polluted. If I drink it now, I'm sort of healthy, I can get sick and my body can fight it, but I feed it to my kid, and my kid gets sick. Unheard of before this, but now we got it. So I take my kid to the doctor, but there's no medicine. So now I've got to sit there and hold my kid while it dies. For five weeks, I watch my kid die. I can't help it. Am I learning to love America? Am I feeling the love? I don't think so. I think I'm learning to hate. When you do this generation after generation, and several generations have grown up with this in Iraq, learning to hate the United States. Now, trust me, if Saddam Hussein dropped dead tonight, Iraq would erupt in joy. Because there is no love for Saddam Hussein. They hate the guy. They hate us more. They've learned to hate us in the decades of economic sanctions. Bombing. We bomb Iraq. We run hundreds of combat sorties into Iraq right now. People say, "but Scott, well, we're not quite at war with Iraq." No, we're at war with Iraq. We're bombing Iraq as we speak. They're not learning to love us. We have been warned by every major opposition party: the Shi'a in the south, who operate out of Iran, have come right out. The head of the Shi'a movement has said, "Do not invade Iraq, because if you do, the Iraqi people will fight you, not because they love Saddam, but because they love their country, and they hate you." The Kurds have said the same thing. The Sunnis have said the same thing. Every Iraqi who wants Saddam Hussein gone has said, "don't invade, because all you'll do is compel the people to resist you." And they will resist. They will resist. Unfortunately, we've taken a nation that had very close links to the west and turned it into a nation that's on the verge of becoming very Islamic and very fundamentalist. What happens in the neighborhood when the economy goes bad, I mean here in the United States. If the economy is good, on Sunday morning, how many people do you find in church? Not as many as you would when the economy is bad. When the economy goes bad, people take faith. They fall back on their faith, because sometimes that's all you've got is faith. You go to the church, and you pray for better times. In Iraq, they're going to the mosque and praying for better times. The country that was very secular has become very Islamist. And if we go to war against Saddam Hussein, we're going to destabilize this region. We'll take a nation that at one time was very pro-western and very secular and convert it into a radical anti-American, fundamentalist Islamic nation. And it's not just Iraq that will go this way. The entire region will follow. The President of Egypt, Hosni Mubarak, has warned President Bush: "if you go against Iraq, you will unleash forces in Egypt that I can't control. I may lose power." The king of Jordan said the same thing. So has the king of Saudi Arabia. There's a good chance that, if we go to war against Iraq, we're going to turn that whole region into a seething mass of anti-American Islamic fundamentalism. There's that poster that ran in the New York Times last week. I think it's Osama Bin Laden with his finger out there in the old Uncle Sam recruiting poster, "I want you to invade Iraq." Because if the United States invades Iraq, it's just one big recruiting theme for Al Qaeda. When we started this war against terror on September 12, 2001, the FBI and the CIA had a database of around 2-6000 names of known or suspected Al Qaeda operatives. Last month, that list was up to 70,000. We've been at war against terrorism for a year, yet the terrorists are growing exponentially. If we go to war against Iraq, no computer will be able to hold the number of names on the Al Qaeda supporter list. So that's one of the big dangers of this war. If Iraq truly was a threat, and we could demonstrate this threat with substantive factual information, we would have the international community behind us, including the bulk of the Arab world. We would have the Security Council behind this, and we wouldn't be worrying about this. But, because we're acting unilaterally, we're going to be doing a lot more harm than good, not only in Iraq but in the region as a whole.

[unintelligible question] I have all these leads that I'm investigating. I have to give each one of these leads some credibility. So if you stop me, I can say "hey, judge, you stopped me." I think we're following the lead here. He could be pursuing chemical weapons capabilities. I've got another lead here that says he's testing biological agents on Iraqi civilians. I've got another lead here that says he has components of three nuclear weapons. On and on and on and on. So that's what I was doing on Good Morning, America, protesting the fact that the judge, or, in this case, the prosecutor in the United States, had stopped me from doing my investigation. Holding Iraq accountable by continuing economic sanctions was stopping me from doing my investigation. So I was sitting there saying, "I have leads that I was to investigate. Your law that you [the Security Council] passed says that, if Iraq has these weapons of mass destruction, they represent a clear and present risk to international peace and security. I never said tonight that we achieved 100%. I think I used the term 90-95%. That implies less than 100%. That means Iraq hasn't been disarmed, hence my statement. Iraq hasn't been disarmed. Hence, my conclusion that, in accordance with your own law, if Iraq hasn't been disarmed, what do they represent? A clear and present risk to international peace and security. You see, I'm a cop. I'm black and white. I'm doing my job. I got leads. I'm investigating these leads. I'm maintaining the integrity of the investigation. The United States bombs Iraq in December, 1998 using the information that I was gathering about weapons of mass destruction to target Saddam Hussein. What did they just do? Corrupt the integrity of the prosecution. All these leads I have, throw them away. Can't consider them anymore. They're gone. See, I'm a bad cop now. My police department is corrupt. All that stuff that we did is no longer admissible. We can't talk about it. Hence, in 1999, after the corruption of the investigation, when you remove the leads, and you deal with the facts that we can now call admissible, what did we know? That we had destroyed 100% of the factories used by Iraq to produce weapons of mass destruction. That we knew. 100% of the production equipment associated with those factories. That we knew. 95% of the product produced by those factories. That we knew. Now there's some that we can't account for. I've been very up-front about this. Some we can't account for, like anthrax. It's amazing, this anthrax. It keeps coming up. Liquid bulk agent. Anthrax, produced by Iraq, last known production batch very early 1991. We blew up the factory; they can't produce it anymore. Liquid bulk anthrax has a storage life of three years under ideal storage conditions. Three years. After that, it germinates, and it's useless sludge. So, on the one hand, as a cop, I can't account for some anthrax. So I assume it exists. But, on the other hand, putting on my new hat as an investigator looking at the totality of the evidence, I say, even if Iraq hid it from us, it's no longer viable. It has a shelf life of three years. The last known production batch was in 1991. Really, the last year that Iraq could have had the Anthrax produced in that factory was 1994. It's now 1999. Should I still hold Iraq accountable for unaccounted-for anthrax produced in this factory? No. It's that kind of change. I call it a qualitative analysis that took place. It's a qualitative analysis that one couldn't do under the old rules, because we had to hold Iraq to a 100% level of accountability. But when the United States corrupted the process, destroyed the credibility of the inspectors, I took a step back. And if you read my writings, and I'm not blaming you because I don't know where you're getting your information, but if you read the totality of my writings, you'll see that I explained this shift. It's not as if I woke up one day and went "I'm going to give Iraq a clean bill of health." I sat there and walked through the process and said, "you know, we were holding Iraq accountable to the law. We shredded the foundation of the law. Now we still have to deal with the situation of Iraq." How do we do this? A qualitative analysis. Now that qualitative thinking came about in 1999, one year before the meeting with the businessman. Now let's talk about this businessman, since you brought it up. My job is to inform people. I wrote a

book in 1999 called "End Game." I think it's a good book. It was just re-published now because the publisher suddenly thinks it's a good book, too. But, unfortunately, in 1999, it didn't get too much publicity. It was just up there. Nobody picked it up. I wrote a lot of articles. You're reading them now, because obviously you've shown that you've read it, so good. But in 1999, not too many people read this stuff. So the question was put to me in a congressional hearing. "How are you going to get this message out?" Now, one of the people who was sponsoring this hearing was David Barnier of Michigan. And I said, "I'd like to make a documentary." A documentary film. I think that, if I can get a documentary, tell a story of the inspectors, get it on tv, a lot of Americans could see this, and we could get a debate going. In the audience there was an American citizen named Shakir al-Khafaji. Now he's also of Iraqi origin. Shakir al-Khafaji came up afterwards and said, "what are you doing about this movie," and I said, "Well, it's really tough. You know, because I've taken this idea, and I've pitched it to the network, and no one wants to fund it. It's too controversial." He said, "How much money do you need." I said, "the budget's about \$500,000." He called me up a month later and said, "I can underwrite it to \$400,000." I went, "okay, that's a start, but let's meet." So I flew to Michigan, and I met with him. I sat down with his lawyers, and I said, "where's this money coming from?" He demonstrated how he's liquidating his own personal assets. And I made him sign an agreement said that said that nothing about our transaction would violate U.S. law, which means that there could be no quid pro quo arrangement with the Iraqi government. He can't give me money up front and then take money in the back. Then I went to the FBI and opened up my books to the FBI, and said, "this is what I'm going to do, and I want you to investigate. And if you find any inkling of wrong-doing, shut it down. Shut it down." They never found any inkling of wrong doing. Now, this money didn't go into my pocket. This money went to fund a movie. Movies are very expensive. The movie actually ended up costing \$458,000. My letter of credit, and notice what I'm saying, "letter of credit," I borrowed the money from him. He didn't give me the money. I borrowed it. My letter of credit was \$400,000. So I had to come up with \$58,000 of capital on my own to finish this movie. And you know what? The movie's finished. It's getting a hell of a lot of airplay right now in Europe. It's sold to seven networks in Europe. It's shown in Boston, it's going to open. It's open in New Orleans, it's open in San Francisco, it may open in New York City. It's going to open across the country. Then we're going to get it on tv. Of course, it's going to be a day late and a dollar short. This is a movie that needed to be seen last year. You know why it wasn't seen last year? Because the weekly standard that speaks of taking advantage of America's overwhelming military and economic strength to impose a unilateral American solution on global issues outside the framework of international law. If we see a threat, define a threat, and you know how we define a threat? Any group of people or nations who seek parity. You see, we'll want to maintain dominance. There's another term for this kind of policy. It's called imperialism. *applause*

And I admit to being a poor student of history. Remember, I'm in the marine corps, not the air force. They take really smart people in the air force. I went into the marines. But, when I study history, I tend to believe we fought a revolution to free ourselves from imperialist power. Why, in God's name, would we become one today? And what to we think the world's going to do when we try to impose American imperialism? Sit back and do nothing? You know, there's a term that people use to describe this. People who are sympathetic to this policy. It's called Pax Americana. The American peace. America imposing a peace on the world today. Well, that term's been used at least twice, but Pax Britanica was British peace, talking about the British empire imposing a British peace on the world back in the 19th century, the 1800's. But if you study that period of time, what

you'll see is that Britain was involved in a never-ending series of colonial wars fought against the British empire to try to impose this British peace, this Pax Britannica. There was no peace. It was war, war, war. It's also used Pax Romana during the Roman empire, you know, the great Roman peace. But I remember how Pax Romana ended up. Barbarians at the gates. The end of the Roman Empire. You know, this is what our future has. We have a great nation right now. A wonderful nation, the best nation in the world. It's a nation worth defending. But it's a nation in which our founding fathers said, "we need to abide by the rule of law. We have to be good citizens, not only here at home but abroad." Go back and read the writings of the early leaders. They reject this kind of imperialist vision. That's not what America is about, and yet, that's what we're becoming. That's what we're turning into. And if we become an American imperial power, we will fight a never-ending series of wars, and the only way this is going to end up is with Barbarians at the gates, with our country becoming something. We may call it the United States of America, but it won't be the United States of America. It will be something far different, something worse.

Why the rush? Because the Bush administration is trying to sell this doctrine to the American people, like one would sell a used car. They've sold their old Camaro there. They know I want a Camaro. They know we want cheap oil. They know Americans want cheap oil. So we're told that we can get you cheap oil. Pax Americana is about getting American access to oil. Well, Iraq's got a lot of oil. We can get our hands on that sucker. We can sell it to you. Like that '98 Camaro there, Ritter. Sign right here. 600 bucks, take the car. Mind if I turn the ignition? Ha, why would you want to turn the ignition? Just give me \$600. Take the car. Look. *kick kick kick* Tires are good. Can I lift the hood? You don't want to really lift the hood. Just buy it. Buy it. Wouldn't you get a little nervous with someone trying to push a car onto you like that? Well, that's what's happening right now. We're getting a policy pushed on us, a policy of American imperialism, but they don't want to call it that. Iraq is the case study for implementation of this new policy of American unilateralism. And once American troops enter into combat, it's very difficult for the American people to start questioning to the degree we needed this policy. We're going to wait. We're going to get sucked in. American marines are going to be on the ground. And we can't oppose the war when American lives are on the line, so we support the marine, not because we're pro the policy but we're pro those poor 19-year-old kids engaged in combat. We support them. Bring the boys home. Bring them home victorious. Whatever. But the war never ends, you see, because it's Pax Americana. The war will never end. They're going to always be at war, and it's going to take ten years before we wake up and realize, "my god, we entered into a nightmare." A nightmare. We don't need to live that nightmare. That nightmare is being pushed on us. That's what the rush is. You see, if they stopped and took a pause, if they waited a year like many people are saying, if they had the debate in congress like they should have had, people would have woken up and say, "woah, you're selling me a bill of goods here. This isn't what I signed up for. This isn't about defending America, because we haven't been able to quantify the threat. You haven't been able to tell me how many chemical weapons, where they are, what they are. You just told me there's a threat here. You told me I have a brain tumor and you want me to lay me down for surgery, but you're not showing me the x-ray." Wouldn't you be a little nervous? I'd be a little nervous. The rush is they're selling us a brand of American doctrine that is un-American.
applause

Q and A: What can a citizen do now? Gosh, you know, I don't have all the answers, and I don't mean that facetiously, but when I really say I'm a simple marine, I'm truly a simple marine who is

brought into this concept of activism unwillingly. I don't like being up here talking about this because I get asked questions like that, and I don't have the answers. You know, what can you do? Be an American citizen. What does that mean? You have to determine what that means. You know, Americans have a long history of protest. It's a beautiful part of American democracy, protest. *applause* Two weeks ago I was in London. An American marine in London. I'm a Republican, for goodness sake. My hair was a little bit shorter than it is now. And I'm in London, standing on the embankment, and I'm surrounded by 350,000 citizens. Citizens. Not raving lunatic left-wing liberals but citizens. There is a place for raving lunatic left-wing liberals, but the amazing thing was that we had raving lunatic left-wing liberals and arch-conservative right-wing Republicans standing side by side, marching together in protest of the war. 350,000 people. *applause* And that was a voice that Tony Blair couldn't ignore. So what can you do? I'm telling you right now, you put a million people in the streets of Washington, D.C., and George Bush can't ignore that. October 26, Washington, D.C., there is a protest. What can you do? Go to Washington. March on Washington. Go and hold your elected representatives accountable. I'm trying to finish up an article. I'm a little nervous trying to put it out there right now, but I call it the Scarlet Letter. And, you know, I'm sure everyone has read that book, you know, Hester Prynne, she committed adultery, so she had to wear the scarlet letter, an A. I think every one of our elected representatives who voted for a war should be branded with a scarlet letter. *applause* an A for accountability. You see, they gave up their constitutional responsibility. They gave it to the President. They betrayed us. They betrayed we, the people. Are we going to ensure that Hillary Rodham Clinton, who said that she's voting for war to avoid war, will she go to the grave of every American soldier that dies and help pour dirt on the body? I don't think so. I've been to too many funerals, and I have to tell you, the saddest thing in the world, the saddest thing is to watch a mother shovel dirt onto the grave, the coffin of a 28-year-old son. You do that one time, and you never want to do it. You do it six times, and it sickens you to think of how many thousands of American mothers are going to be forced to shovel dirt on the coffin of their son because Hillary Rodham Clinton didn't have the courage to tell the President, "no," because senators didn't have the courage. Hold them accountable. Brand them with an A, an A for accountability. You, Senator, you, Representative, will be held accountable for the vote. That's what you can do. That's what you can do as citizens. You have the vote. Hold them accountable. Demonstrate in the street. People say the way you're going to stop this war is with street heat. Okay, so be it. October 26. Put some heat on the Bush administration. On November 5, it's an election. Show your displeasure at the polls. Show your displeasure. You know, that's the only way you're going to change this thing is to empower yourselves. Get together in a like-minded group of people, and empower yourselves. And if you're Democrats, I'll give you a word of advice as a Republican. Don't allow the Republican Party ever again to seize the mantle of artificial patriotism by waving the flag and touting defense as the only path forward. The Democrats today are afraid to speak out because they lack the credibility in the area of defense. The Democrats have not voted for a strong defense budget in years. The Democrats are seen as anti-military, so they're very scared now to stand up and say, "no war" because people say "of course you say no war. You're anti-military. You're anti-defense." It's not unpatriotic to be pro-defense and anti-war. That's not unpatriotic. Establish your credibility, your bonifites as American patriots and say that you are willing to do whatever it takes to defend this democracy, including investing in a defense that's required to defend our nation, not to impose American unilateralism but to defend our nation, to ensure that, when we send our marines, our soldiers, our sailors, and our airmen off to fight in our name, that they have the best equipment, that they have the best training, the best leadership, so that we guarantee victory when

we do go to war. You invest in that, and now, when the time comes for a Republican president to intimidate you and say, "I want to go to war, and if you go against me, you'll be seen as weak," you can stand up and say, "Mr. President, we're not weak. We're Americans, and we'll vote the way we see fit, and we're against your war." And you'll have the credibility because you'll have the background. Don't let the Republicans ever do this again, because it's anti-American. It really is. I can train a monkey to wave a flag. That is not a patriotic act. I wore a flag on this shoulder in combat. I know what that flag means. It's false patriotism to have people marching down the street waving the flag when they haven't the foggiest clue what that flag means, what the sacrifice means on that. I know that the Constitution gives an American a right to burn that flag in town square, and I'm willing to die to give that person to burn that flag. That's what this country is about. *applause* Don't let people wrap themselves in the flag and intimidate you into silence ever again.

Q: Okay, I talked about Saddam Hussein and the brutal nature of his regime. What I would say is this, and it's a pretty harsh statement. I'm not willing to shed one drop of American blood for Iraq. I hate to say that, but it's up to Iraq to solve its own problems. Now, Iraq is a member of the international community, and so is the United States. We have all signed the United Nations charter, and in that charter, we aspire to have respect for human rights. There is a vehicle for holding Saddam Hussein accountable, and it's called the International Court of Justice. You know, if we want to get rid of Saddam Hussein that bad, and I do, I'm all in favor of an indictment. I'm all in favor of indicting Saddam Hussein as a war criminal, as a man who has violated human rights, and holding him accountable. You know, we have a dictator on trial in the Hague right now named Slobodan Milosevich. Yeah, I want to get rid of Saddam Hussein. Let's indict him.

[...unintelligible comment from the audience] Indicting him could, but you know what I would do. Let me give you my formula for indictment. We have weapons inspectors. Iraq is told they have to allow the inspectors in, or else the hammer falls, and Iraq is taking this seriously. They now know that, if they don't cooperate with the inspectors, the hammer falls. There's no longer a need for economic sanctions against Iraq. Lift economic sanctions. Get the inspectors in, and lift the sanctions. Iraq is a body that has adapted. It's been shocked by economic sanctions by war. Its blood pressure is low. If I put someone who is stabilized and I start resuscitating him, bringing him back to life, okay they got the blood pressure going up, the body's doing good, and I suddenly withdraw the life support, they might die. They're going to be shocked. We lift economic sanctions, put the inspectors in, indict Saddam Hussein, get the indictment, and then re-impose economic sanctions targeted against the senior leadership and the upper echelons of Iraq, this time linking the sanctions to Saddam Hussein's being turned over to the International Court of Justice, I can guarantee you one thing. He'll either die at the hands of the Iraqi people, or they'll turn him over. And it'll take about six months. This is what happened to Slobodan Milosevich. So, yeah, there's a way you can get rid of Saddam Hussein. Indict them, and hold the Iraqi people accountable for his future, for his fate. I'm not willing to sacrifice one American life for an internal domestic Iraqi problem. That just isn't what I put the uniform on to do. I put the uniform on to defend the constitution of the United States. I put the uniform on to defend you. If Iraq is a threat to us, I'll die for you. But you shouldn't ask other people to die because Iraq has a domestic problem. We can help Iraq solve its domestic problem by rightfully indicting Saddam Hussein as a war criminal in accordance with the rule of law and then holding him accountable for this. That includes holding the nation accountable by imposing sanctions that are linked to him being turned over to the court of law, not linked to weapons inspections. That was such a lie to say that we're

going to impose sanctions and link them to disarmament, when James Baker said in 1991 that, even if Iraq cooperates, we'll never lift economic sanctions until what? Saddam Hussein is removed from power. Madeleine Albright clearly made this statement in 1997. So let's be honest. We're not going to lift sanctions until Saddam Hussein is removed from power. So why not link sanctions to Saddam Hussein's removal from power? Indict him, and then make it happen. That's how I would talk about getting rid of Saddam Hussein. But, again, I just can't see shedding one American life for that. That's just not worth it.

Q: Now, I don't mean to be facetious about it, but, yes. Now, how you hold them accountable is another question. You know, I voted for George W. Bush for President. The way I would like to hold him accountable is to ensure that, in 2004, he doesn't win the Presidency again. *applause* As I said, anybody who voted for this war powers resolution, who abrogated their constitutional duty as an elected representative by giving the President war powers[??] should never hold office again. They should be voted out. There are a number of ways that people can be held accountable. I think it's unrealistic to imagine a scenario. I mean, look. Where are people right now who said they could make a case to charge Henry Kissinger with war crimes? They probably can, but, let's be honest here, that's not going to happen. We're not going to have a situation where the President of the United States or any elected representative is going to be brought to trial for what has transpired. Should they be in a perfect world? Yeah. Hell, we just killed a lot of people. Somebody should be held accountable. The way to hold a politician accountable is to remove that politician from office. So that would be my method of accountability. George W. Bush is a one-term President, and anybody who voted for this war powers resolution should never hold office again. Next time they come up for election, their constituents should run them out of office. That's how I would seek to hold them accountable.

Again, thank you very much; it was a pleasure to be here tonight. *applause*

Back to [Traprock Peace Center](#)