

Traprock Peace Center (<http://www.traprockpeace.org>)

[Transcription of Scott Ritter's Speech at **Deerfield Academy**, Deerfield, MA on October 15, 2002. Also, you may listen to this speech and listen or read his answers to questions at <http://traprockpeace.org/recorder101602.html>.

We have tried to make this an accurate transcription. However, no transcription is guaranteed to be 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/ritter101501.mp3> or at <http://traprockpeace.org/RitterSpeech101502.ram> (real audio). If you have any difficulty downloading the audio, please feel free to email us. (charles@mtdata.com) Thanks to Mike Gorse for his terrific and quick work on the transcription.]

Scott Ritter:

It certainly is a pleasure to be here tonight, and to talk. I need to emphasize right up-front that I'm here for the students of Deerfield tonight. This is a night that I'm dedicating to you, because you guys are the future of America, and I know you guys here that. That's one of these over-worked terms that everybody throws out at you. "You're the future." Look. Those of you who are seniors this year, when you came in as freshmen, the people in the three classes above you right now are the same age as those young Americans who are getting ready to go to war. Let that register in the back of your mind, how serious this topic is. We're here to talk about war, plain and simple. A war with Iraq, a war between the United States and Iraq. War is not a video game. War is not Nintendo where, oops, I made a mistake, you hit reset, and everybody comes back to life. War is terminal.

As a marine corps officer I used to take my young marines to the firing lines, and we'd, you know, you guys are 200, 300, and 500-yard line, and little paper targets pop up, and *pop pop* you send rounds down range. It's pretty cool. You hit the target center mass, and this little circle comes up and tells you how well you did, and you keep score. You think we did that because we like to keep score? No. We did that because I was training marines how to take 5.56mm of copper-jacketed steel and put it into a human body. When the bullet hits a body, it's not a nice, clean little hole. It hits the body, it may hit a piece of bone and deflect, shattering internal organs, and coming out your back about this big. You may not die instantly. You can lay on the ground for some time, bleeding to death. It hurts. And that's what war is about. We train our people to do that to the enemy. They train to do it to us. As an officer, I sat on the hill with a radio. I used to call in air strikes and call in artillery on stacks of tires. We didn't do it because the U.S. government has a grudge against Goodyear. We did it because, at some point in time, I, and others, will be called upon to direct air strikes, to bring in 155mm of steel and case tie explosive down on human beings, ripping their bodies apart, killing them.

This is what war is about, and we have hundreds of thousands of Americans preparing to go to war as we speak against Iraq, a nation of 23 million who may or may not oppose us. We don't know what the outcome is going to be. There will be those who will say, "once we show the will to go to war against Iraq, the Iraqi army will just surrender, throw down their weapons, put their hands in the air, and just give up. The Iraqi people will welcome us with open arms. It doesn't matter if the international community is not behind us right now when we go to war. Once we show the resolve

to go to war, everybody will line up behind us and support us and praise us for what we're doing." And you know, I hope that's the case. I really do hope that's the case. Because that means fewer people need to die.

And, again, it always comes down to this bottom-line equation. What is war about? Death and destruction. There's nothing glorified in war. Trust me, I've been there. There's no rock-and-roll music blazing in the background, no banners unfurling. When you're getting shot at, what you're trying to do is dig yourself into the ground and disappear. You're not feeling brave. You're feeling scared. All you have to do is experience 30 minutes where you're convinced you're not coming home, you're not going to see your mom, you're not going to see your dad, you're not going to see your sisters, you're not going to see your friends, you're going to die, and you know you're going to die. Do that for 30 minutes, convinced that you're dead, and suddenly get off the helicopter, the tanker, or whatever you're on, and realize that you're alive, and you understand how important life is, how valuable life is, and why, in God's name, you'd ever want to be in a situation where someone's trying to kill you again? See, those who have been to war, those who have experienced war, are not the ones leading the charge today. People who wore the uniform of American service members, the army, the air force, the navy, the marines, people who have experienced combat, people who are trained for combat, aren't jumping up today and saying, "let's go to war against Iraq." They know that war represents basically the failure of humanity, because war is about one human killing another human. And people who have trained for war appreciate life more than people who don't know what war is. You know, those people who are crying for war today, calling for war, never wore the uniform, don't know what combat is. To them, it's an academic exercise.

So one of the things I want to impress on you, if I can impress on you, is that war should never be undertaken lightly. It's not a game. It's not a macho display. War is about death. War is forever when it kills people. They don't come back. Well, sometimes they do come back missing an arm or a leg. Sometimes they're missing both their arms, both their legs. Sometimes they've had their spinal cord severed. Sometimes they're comatose forever. That's what war is about. So let that sink in when you realize that, probably by the end of this year, our country is going to be at war with Iraq. Now, the average age of the infantry men and Marine Corps rifle platoon is about 19.5 years, 20 years old. You seniors who are getting ready to graduate understand that these are people who are your age or just a year or two older than you, going to war. Two years ago, they were graduating with their high school class. Life was a big adventure. Four years of fun behind them, they were looking maybe to join the military, enlist, get that college bonus, come out and get a skill, integrate themselves in the work force, because they were going to be all they could be. They were going to be an army of 1. This is what it was all about.

And now they're going to put their boot on the ground in Iraq, and they are going to enter into a situation which the general which I have the highest respect for, Anthony Zinni, said there's going to be thirty days of playing the last 15 minutes of Saving Private Ryan over and over and over again. Anybody who hasn't seen that movie, the last 15 minutes of Saving Private Ryan is about urban warfare. So a lot of people look at warfare, especially between the United States and Iraq, as this thing that was fought in the flat deserts of southern Iraq in 1991. You've seen the images, all those dead Iraqi tanks and burned-up trucks and such. The Americans, we didn't suffer too much because, heck, we could bring in an airplane. We saw it in Afghanistan. The airplane comes out, black and white image, you put the cursor on it like you would on a video game, and this silver

streak comes in, and boom! Ten points for the good guys. Move the cursor over, get 10 more points. Well, of course, what people don't realize when they're watching TV is that every time that thing goes boom, there's dead people on the ground. Life's over, gone. Now, a lot of times, those people who died weren't the bad guys. They were civilians, innocents just living their life who got caught up in a thing that was bigger than they were. Iraq is full of 23 million innocent civilians who are going to be caught in this thing called war. And urban warfare is going to be different. See, they're not going to have these targets out there in the open desert for us to pick off. It's going to be the equivalent of putting people throughout your campus. Imagine how difficult it would be if you had 1400 people here, heavily armed with machine guns, hiding in your buildings, in your basements, in your rooms. We didn't know where they are, they're just there, and trying to clear it out. The only way you're going to end up doing it is what always happens; pull back, bring in the heavy artillery, and level the building. Because the first time you go in there, we just ran exercises. Marine Corps rifle company, 175 guys did an exercise, went into an urban combat environment, and within three minutes, a hundred were dead. Three minutes, 100 dead. Now it was simulated, they got to all go up and go "oops, we made a mistake," but combat, when you make a mistake, you're dead. You don't get to go "oops." You're just dead. So what happens is we pull back. We bring in the heavy artillery. We bring in the bombers, and we blow it up, building by building, leveling it, dropping it, and anybody in that building's dead. You know who's going to be in that building more often than not? Innocent civilians. Mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, people who are trapped in Baghdad. There's 5 million people in Baghdad. Five million people. Do you think we're just going to waltz into Baghdad and they'll give up? What if they don't? What if they fight? Now we've got to fight through a city the size of Detroit. Five million people, street by street, house by house.

We're going to war, ladies and gentlemen. Guys, this is what it's about. And what do we do to stop it? That's what always gets me. You know, one of the things I want to talk to you about tonight is citizenship, the importance of being good citizens. You know, as a marine officer, I took an oath when I joined the Marine Corps, uploading the constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic. That's a serious oath. I would say that most people, though, when they hear that, don't understand what that means. You know, that's that oath the President takes when he gets sworn in. It's just words. It means nothing. No. Notice what that oath said. I didn't swear allegiance to the President of the United States. I didn't swear allegiance to the Vice-President. I didn't swear allegiance to the Whitehouse, to the Congress, to the Pentagon, to anything. I swore allegiance to a piece of paper, a piece of paper called the Constitution. How many people here have read the Constitution? Wow, that's pretty good. Most of them are students, so they probably have to read it in government. But the fact is, you know, it's an amazing society we live in, where an immigrant who comes to our shores has to take a test, has to study the Constitution, has to understand their American history, has to take a test, and if they pass the test, then they have to raise their hand and swear and oath to defend that piece of paper. And, yet, if you were born in America, there's no requirement to even read the darn thing. Do people really understand what this document means? What it says? It defines us as a people, defines us as a nation. It speaks of we, the people of the United States of America. We, the people. It's government of the people, by the people, for the people. It speaks of the United States as being a nation of laws. We have rules that we abide by. It gives us rights. It says that we have the right of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly. We get to live our lives as Americans. It defines us as Americans. That's why it's so important. That's why, when you join the military, they require you

to take an oath, because you're not taking an oath to a piece of paper. You're taking an oath to a concept, an ideal - America. That's what you're willing to die for - America. There may come a point in time when you have to fight to defend what you believe in. I believe that the United States truly is the greatest nation on the face of the Earth. This is a nation worthy of sacrifice. And, indeed, if you look at the cemeteries that dot Europe, that are in Asia, that go across this great land we call America, you'll see the white crosses, the stars of David, and other markers that show where Americans have fallen in defense of this country. So I'm not up here being anti-war for the sake of saying "there's no need for war." Heck, I don't want there ever to be war again. But I am telling you that there may come a time and a place when Americans have to bring up arms and have to fight to defend this thing we call America.

Now, we're talking about going to war with Iraq. If you listen to the Bush administration, the President of the United States, talking about Iraq, it's a frightening thing. We're told that Iraq is a nation lead by this tyrannical dictator. No debate there. Saddam Hussein, I can tell you from personal experience, is a bad guy, a bad character. Nothing good about him. He's perpetrated horrific crimes against his own people, against the region, and the world would be a better place without him. We're told that this madman, Saddam Hussein, has weapons of mass destruction.

Now let's talk about this term, a weapon of mass destruction, because I think we need to bring this into perspective. When you hear "weapon of mass destruction," that implies massive death, massive destruction. That's what it's called, a weapon of mass destruction. The categories that are most often used in defining weapons of mass destruction are nuclear weapons, biological weapons, and chemical weapons.

Now, nuclear weapons, I don't think there's any debate. That is a weapon of mass destruction. If you drop a nuclear bomb on a city, you kill a lot of people *clap* that quick. Biological weapons, though. That's a different thing. First of all, what is a biological weapon? It's bacteria, it's a virus, it's biology. It's something that, I subject to you, you get sick, you may or may not die, but it's not a weapon unless you get sick. You know, there's bacteria right now filling the air. We're being subjected. As soon as someone coughs or sneezes, that's a form of biological warfare. That's a vector. Germs are going out. You're sucking air in, but your immune system might be able to fight it. You don't get sick. Not a very good weapon, is it? In Japan, there was a Japanese terrorist group a couple years ago that tried to subject the United States military forces there to a biological attack. And they actually brewed up anthrax and botchulitum toxin, and then ran around in a van spraying the stuff out the back.

Biological attack. No, I'm not sick, because they didn't make it right. They didn't know how to make it. There's biological stuff all over the place. It's not a weapon unless it can target a human and have a high probability of getting him sick. Now, Iraq has produced biological agent. What that means is they've brewed up specific germs. Anthrax, everybody here should know anthrax. We got subjected to an anthrax attack last year. There's letters that went around the congress filled with anthrax. Now, what made that a weapon is that that anthrax was, in a dry powder form, that it had been milled down to very small particles 3-5 microns. It allowed it to float in the air, be breathed in, fight your body's natural defenses, and get into your lungs. And when it gets into your lungs and multiplies, you get sick. You die. That's a weapon. It just killed you. But agent, biological agent, in the case of anthrax, is generally a liquid sludge. That's all the Iraqis ever made.

Now, they put it into a bomb. They put it into a missile warhead. But the only way an Iraqi biological bomb or warhead would ever kill you is if it hits you in the head. Because if it missed you and landed in the ground next to you, it would just break open, and you'd have sludge on the ground. You're not going to die. The way you die is if they take that agent and they do one of two things with it. Convert it into dry power, mill it down into fine dust, so then when the bomb hits and opens up, the dust goes up in the air. Now you breathe it in, and you get sick. Or they turn it into an aerosol. Once again, small, fine liquid particles are floating in the air, if you breathe it in, you get sick. That's a biological weapon. Iraq never produced a biological weapon. So understand, when you hear people talking about weapons of mass destruction and Iraq's biological weapons capability, they never produced a biological weapon. They produced a lot of biological agent, but they never successfully weaponized it. So let's ratchet down the fear factor a little bit. The other thing is, what was one of the biggest lessons that came out of that anthrax attack? Take cipro, and you're okay. So, wham, you all got anthrax now. You just breathe it in, I just gave it to you. You're not all going to die, because all I have to do is go out and get you a bunch of cipro, you take a dose of cipro, and most of you are going to do fine. You're not even going to know you got sick. See, biological weapons aren't the kind of weapons of mass destruction that people often times are led to believe. So you'll hear a lot of people talking about Iraqi biological weapons, and one bag of sugar can kill a million people. No. No. That would be under ideal conditions, and you very rarely get ideal conditions when you're talking about this. First of all, you've got to manufacture it properly. Then you've got to disseminate it properly. Then you've got to hope that the temperature is right, the weather's right, and everything else works out. So let's keep that fear factor ratcheted down a little bit.

Chemical weapons. Very dangerous stuff, chemical agent. It can kill you in a number of ways. It can give you a blister on your skin. It can attack your blood. It can attack your nervous system. But most of it requires contact with the skin. So, again, I have to disseminate it properly and in the proper doses. Tough to do. The Iraqis never produced a really good chemical weapon. They used them against the Iranians. They had to fire tens of thousands of rounds of artillery shells filled with chemical agent to kill a couple hundred or a couple thousand people.

You know, a weapon of mass destruction, if you want to talk in terms of killing people, is a Marine Corps rifle company with an unlimited supply of ammunition. I take my young marines, and I give them an unlimited supply of ammunition, they will kill more people than an Iraqi chemical bomb or an Iraqi biological agent. But no one talks about marines as being a weapon of mass destruction. More people are killed in combat with machine guns, with artillery shells, with bombs, with landmines, than are killed with so-called weapons of mass destruction. A decade of sanctions against Iraq killed between 350,000 and 1.2 million people. No weapon of mass destruction there, huh? That's a lot of dead people.

So, what I'm trying to get at right now is the President says Iraq has weapons of mass destruction capabilities that threaten the national security of the United States. And Iraq is a nation that produced nuclear weapons, or, at least [was] seeking to, produced biological weapons, chemical weapons, and long-range ballistic missiles. That Iraq was obligated under international law, Security Council resolutions, to disarm, and that Iraq has not been fully disarmed. And, so, we have a situation today where Iraq's capabilities, combined with the nature of the leadership of Saddam Hussein, threaten the national security of the United States. We're also told that Iraq is a

state sponsor of terror, that Iraq is a nation that supports the kind of activities that you find in, for instance, Al Qaeda, the group that actually did attack the United States a year ago, killing 3000 Americans in less than a hundred minutes. That Iraq, as a state sponsor of terror, is a nation that would naturally align itself with anti-American Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, and then give them these weapons of mass destruction, enabling the terrorists to launch another attack against the United States. But this time, the attack, because it would use weapons of mass destruction, would make the events of September 11 pale in comparison. Again, the specter of massive death, massive destruction, and when most Americans hear this, they feel threatened. They feel concerned, as they should. That's a pretty horrifying thing to consider. So when the President says, "in order to save ourselves from this threat, we need to go and remove Saddam Hussein from power. We need to go into Iraq and ensure that we disarm Iraq by putting American troops on the ground and hunting down these weapons. We need to destroy terror by cutting off the head of the snake, Saddam Hussein," A lot of Americans say, "well, you know, when you put it that way, I'll support war, because we're talking about the defense of the United States. The problem is the truth is far from what I just described to you. Weapons of mass destruction, Iraq had them. In 1991, the international community determined that, because Iraq had invaded its neighbors, behaved irresponsibly, and had chemical, biological, and nuclear, and long-range ballistic missiles, that it represented a clear and present risk to international peace and security, and they determined that these weapons would be removed. They created weapons inspectors to go into Iraq to overdo that.

That's where I came in. No, actually I came in about six months later, because the first weapons inspectors that went in, notice what I say about weapons of mass destruction, I talk about chemistry, biology, nuclear science, ballistic missiles, rocket science. That's the kind of background that one needs if you're going to investigate chemical weapons, biological weapons, nuclear weapons, and long-range ballistic missiles. If you study my resume, you won't find any of that stuff. I'm not qualified to be a weapons inspector on paper. Now, I'm an intelligence officer. My job is to spy, to gather information. That's what I do. Now, that wasn't the job that needed to be done up-front. You see, when they created the weapons inspectors to send them into Iraq, to get rid of weapons of mass destruction, the decision was that Iraq would have to give up all of its information, make a declaration listing a totality of its information about all of its weapons of mass destruction; chemical, biological, nuclear, and long-range ballistic missiles. Information is what fuels inspections. See, I can't do an inspection unless I know where to go and know what I'm looking for. So Iraq was supposed to declare everything, and then the first inspectors would come in with a clipboard, piece of paper, and go in, and say, "okay, 15 bombs, 15 bombs. Check them off." And that's it. But what happens when the Iraqis lie, as they did? Iraq didn't want to give up their weapons of mass destruction, so they told massive lies. They denied having a nuclear weapons program. They denied having a biological weapons program. They declared less than 50% of their chemical capability, less than 50% of their ballistic missile capability. They lied. So information is the fuel that drives inspections, and the Iraqis tell a lie up-front, how can the inspectors do their job? They can't. So a whole bunch of really highly qualified chemists, biologists, nuclear physicists, and rocket scientists milling around, not able to do anything. So they bring me in, the spy. You see, my job is to get information, gather data so I could take that information and empower the smart guys to go into Iraq and do their job. But this is a different proposition altogether, because the way the game was supposed to work is that Iraq provides the data, then we inspect. Now we have to go in and collect the data, bring it back, and then inspect. It's a different game altogether. Now, it requires us to do things in Iraq that the Security Council

didn't necessarily envision us doing up-front. This was supposed to be a gentleman's agreement, and suddenly we bring in someone who's not quite a gentleman. Gathering information is a delicate business; especially when the people who you're gathering information from don't want you to gain access to it, protect that information with guys with guns. So it's not a matter of just walking up to the door, *knock* knocking on it, opening it up, and saying, "I'm here to get the information that you're hiding from me." It doesn't work that way. You have to use tricks that police officers use when they're investigating a criminal. You want to find out if the guy is selling drugs or running numbers, intercept his phone calls. Tap his phone. You want to find out if Iraq's hiding weapons, you tap their phones. It's not that easy because, you see, here in the United States, the cops sort of have all the power, and in Iraq, the Iraqis have all the power. So that's why they bring in sneaky guys who can go in and tap the communications without getting caught. Now normally you call this spying. Spying is short for espionage. Espionage basically is a situation where a nation's laws are being violated to gain access to it, to information that you don't have a right to gain access to. So if I'm an American, as I used to be, or I still am (some people claim I'm not), but when I used to work in the former Soviet Union as an intelligence officer, if I were to try and gain access to information about Soviet ballistic missile capabilities, I don't have any right to this information. There is no law that says I have a right to this data, but I'm there, told to collect it. So I will do what I can to gain access to it. If I get caught, though, I'm violating Soviet law. I'm a spy, and I will be held accountable to Soviet law. In the case of Iraq, they're not allowed to have this information. By law, they have to give it up, turn it over. They chose to hide it, to retain it. But there is no legal protection for this data. So it gives the inspectors pretty much a green light to do anything they want to do to gain access to this. So now I can tap their phones. I can't get caught, because they'll kill me. They'll kill my guy who's doing it. I can fly airplanes overhead and take pictures. I can recruit people on the inside. Don't get caught doing it, though, because they'll kill them. It's a dangerous game we're playing. Everybody collects information, and this information fuels inspections, and, eventually, we were able to force the Iraqis to admit that they lied to us.

Now, you've heard people say that the weapons inspectors destroyed more Iraqi weapons of mass destruction than all U.S. military action did during Desert Storm. Well, let's be honest here. The weapons inspectors, we never found a single weapon in Iraq. We never found a single weapon in Iraq. We never hunted down and destroyed a single weapon in Iraq. And, yet, I can stand here and tell you we can account for 90-95% of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability. Now, how do you make that leap there, Scott? You just said you didn't find anything, but you can account for it. You know, how many times does a cop go in and just open the door and find the body laying there? No, you have to get the criminal to confess to the crime, then the criminal leads you to where the body is hidden. This is what we did in Iraq. We gathered the data and confronted the Iraqis with their lies. We confronted them with their mistruths. We confronted them with the inconsistencies in their story, and it took time. It wasn't easy, and it wasn't pretty. Yet, by 1996, five years after this process began, we were able to have forced the Iraqis to admit they had a nuclear program, to find that nuclear program, and we eliminated that nuclear program to admit a biological weapons program, to find it, and we eliminated it. The same thing with chemical, the same thing with ballistic missile. We were very successful. Now I can also tell you that we did this without believing a single word the Iraqis ever told us. See, they lied to us once. We just assumed that everything they told us was a lie. So how did we get 90-95%? We go to Europe, the nations that sold Iraq this material, and we hunt down the bills of lading, the invoices, the receipts, the letters of

credit, how much money was spent. We'd go to the Iraqis and say, "how many machines of type A did you buy?" They'd say, "oh, 2, and here they are. One was blown up in this building, and the other one is over here, dismantled, all destroyed. We're clean." We slide a document that says they bought 12, and we demanded to know where the other ten were, and they'd have to take us to them. And that's how we disarmed Iraq, through hard work by police investigators.

Now, I like to use the term police investigators because I want to drive this home, what this is about. This is about holding Iraq accountable to the rule of law. The law says Iraq must be disarmed. Their weapons must be done away with. And if they don't, they will pay a heavy consequence. But the law also empowers us, the inspectors, to implement this. What would happen if you had a drug dealer on the streets of Deerfield? Hopefully the cops would get him out, get him off the streets. Let's say, though, there's a three-time convicted drug dealer who just got out of jail, and now he's on the streets. And the cops are convinced this guy's pushing dope. Convinced. So they launch an investigation. That the cop plants evidence, "hey, I'm the cop, I'm convinced the guy's selling dope, but I can't get the goods on him." So I go in one night, and I slide a bag under his bed. Then I do a bust, and I pull out the bag, and I go, "guilty! Found you!" What just happened? It's a violation of due process. It's a violation of law. The cop's the bad guy now. That criminal is going to walk. The evidence is no good. He may be dealing drugs, but we can't convict him of that, because the evidence was planted. What happens if I do an illegal wiretap? I don't go to the judge, but I listen to his phone conversations, and I get him making a deal over the phone, and I arrest him because of that, and he goes to trial, they're going to find out I didn't have a right to that conversation. The criminal walks. If I don't read him his rights, the criminal walks. Well, that sort of happens with Iraq, too. You see, we're trying to hold Saddam Hussein accountable to his obligation to disarm. As inspectors, we have rules that we have to abide by. I just told you that Iraq's not allowed to have that information, so, as an inspector, I'm allowed to go in and do whatever I need to do to get the information. But the information about what? Weapons of mass destruction. That's what the law says, for Iraq to be disarmed. But now we have to come face to face with an uncomfortable reality, that, while international law speaks of disarming Iraq, America's policy with regards to Iraq has been, since 1991, to get rid of Saddam Hussein, plain and simple. In 1991, the determination was made that Saddam Hussein must go. We just fought a war, but we didn't have the international agreement to go into Baghdad and remove Saddam, so we held back. We felt that, if we just contained Saddam and stabilized Saddam, we could have him fall within six months. That was the assessment. Six months, and Saddam was gone. That's a heck of a policy, just wait six months, everything will be taken care of. Well, we wanted to stack the deck in our favor, so we needed to contain, and the vehicle to contain was economic sanctions.

But let's talk about economic sanctions for just a second, because it's again one of these academic terms like "war." A lot of people talk about war where, if you know it, there's an old saying, "many people eat meat, but very few go to a slaughter house, and if you went to a slaughter house and saw how meat was made, you wouldn't eat meat." A lot of people talk about war; very few people understand what war is really about. A lot of people talk about economic sanctions. Very few people understand what economic sanctions are really about. Let me tell you what sanctions are about. Sanctions are designed to hurt the civilian population of a targeted country until that civilian population manifests its pain by holding its government accountable. The concept of sanctions on Iraq [is] to strangle the Iraqi people until the Iraqi people hold Saddam Hussein accountable. Now, "strangle." That's one of those terms. What does it mean? Strangle means killing, and that's what

sanctions do. They kill. 350,000 to 1.2 million Iraqis have died in the last decade because of economic sanctions. Not because of warfare, but economic sanctions. And most of these are children under the age of five, preschool and younger. Imagine that. 350,000 pre-school and younger kids dead. That's what sanctions do. Saddam Hussein is not hurt by sanctions. The Iraqi people are hurt by sanctions. And, yet, sanctions have been the cornerstone of our policy in Iraq now for more than a decade. See, we had sanctions imposed on Iraq when they invaded Kuwait in 1990. The sanctions were supposed to be lifted when Kuwait was liberated. The war I fought in liberated Kuwait. So one would think that sanctions would be lifted when I was done, but no. We needed to have six more months so we could get rid of Saddam. Just wait and get rid of Saddam. So we wanted those sanctions to be continued. But we needed a link now. What was this link? Weapons of mass destruction. See, now they said, "Saddam must be disarmed." There [were] weapons of mass destruction, and until he complies, we're going to keep economic sanctions in place, continuing the stranglehold on the Iraqi people. Well, six months came and went, and Saddam Hussein is still in power. The sit-on-your-hands-and-wait policy didn't work. But sanctions now are in place. And now the inspectors are going forward, trying to disarm Iraq. But America's policy never was about the disarmament of Iraq. It was always about getting rid of Saddam Hussein. Weapons inspections were only useful to the United States in so far as they facilitated the continuation of economic sanctions. That's easy to facilitate when Iraq's not cooperating, when Iraq's lying. But I told you, even though Iraq lied and didn't cooperate; we were able, by 1996, to make a determination that 95% of Iraq's capabilities were accounted for. We had fundamentally disarmed Iraq, but we couldn't lift the sanctions because the Security Council said 100%. We had to get rid of everything. So we kept trying. Kept trying to get rid of everything. But now what do we do? Who's hiding the remaining 5-10%? We don't know. We don't know. This is in 1996.

The other thing that was happening in 1996 is that the U.S. policy of getting rid of Saddam Hussein matured a little bit. You see, originally, it was "strangle Iraq, sit on your hands, Saddam goes in six months." That didn't work. So now it's "strangle Iraq and support an opposition to overthrow Saddam Hussein." But that didn't work. Why? Because Saddam Hussein has one of the most brutally efficient security services the world's ever seen. It's a police state. They truly have the thought police. If you think a bad thought about Saddam, you're pulled out, and you're killed. Not just you but your family, your friends. Everybody near you is killed. And that's the policy of intimidation. So the U.S. ratcheted up. They said, "we'll support the CIA to go into Iraq and try and put a bullet in Saddam's head, get a coup, overthrow Saddam." But this failed. Three CIA-sponsored coup attempts failed, from 1994 to 1996. Why? Because Saddam Hussein has one of the most brutally efficient security services the world's ever seen. You can't get to Saddam. So that's the situation that exists in 1996. Saddam's pretty much untouchable. The people of Iraq are getting starved to death, and the inspectors need to find the remaining 5% of the hidden weapon. Who do we think's hiding it? Saddam's security force. Pretty convenient, huh? Because now we get to turn all this intelligence capability that we have in Iraq onto a target that's not only useful from our perspective in terms of hunting down the 5%, but suddenly we're collecting data on how Saddam Hussein's protected. You see, he's been coup-proof, bulletproof for five years.

And now the inspectors are dishing up the dirt where Saddam spends the night, how his convoys are protected, where he goes for dinner. Too good for the United States. They have to take advantage of that to try to remove Saddam Hussein. But they need the data. In order to have the

data, you have to keep the inspectors going. That's me. I keep going. I keep going to work. I keep spying on these facilities, trying to find out where Saddam Hussein is hiding his material. But what happens at the end of the day when we're so good at collecting this data that we've collected everything we can about Saddam Hussein's security, and we start to realize that they're not hiding it? There's nothing left. We probably can go to the Security Council and close the books and say, "we've succeeded. We've disarmed Iraq." But that's the last thing the US wants. Because what happens if you declare victory, and say, "boss, we disarmed Iraq. They have nothing left." Now the US has to go back to the rule of law, which says that, if Iraq has been disarmed, you have to lift economic sanctions. And if we lift economic sanctions, you've broken containment of Iraq, which means Iraq comes back to the family of the international community with Saddam Hussein still in power. Remember America's policy. It's not about disarming Iraq, ladies and gentlemen. It's about getting rid of Saddam Hussein.

So the last thing we can have happen is that Iraq is disarmed. So now who becomes the enemy to the US? The inspectors. We become the threat. Our success isn't just handing the US a tremendous intelligence jackpot in terms of Saddam's security, but it threatens their policy of getting Saddam Hussein altogether. So what do you do? You have to wait until you get enough data to take out Saddam, and then you have to kill the inspectors. How do you do that? You start manipulating the work of the inspectors, corrupting the process, corrupting the integrity of the investigation, asking the cops to plant evidence, asking the cops to do illegal wiretaps, asking the cops to become the bad guys, which is what happened. You see, as long as we're focused on hunting down Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, we're okay. I told you, Iraq doesn't have any right to that information. But, as inspectors, we were compelled to respect the dignity, the sovereignty, and the national security of Iraq when we did our work. This means that we can't spy on Saddam Hussein's security. It has nothing to do with our mandate of disarming Saddam. We can go after weapons. We can't go after Saddam. The US asked us to go after Saddam. In December, 1998, the US used the weapons inspection to deliberately provoke a crisis with Iraq, to go in, force the Iraqis into a situation where they stopped cooperating with inspectors, and then the US ordered the inspectors out. Iraq never kicked them out. The US ordered the inspectors out, and then bombed Iraq, going after Saddam Hussein using the information that the inspectors gathered. Now, the idea is that they'd get Saddam, say, and kill him, and that would be the end of the story. But they had an ace up their sleeve. You see, what happens if you don't get Saddam, if you don't kill him? You have to still contain him. How do you contain him? By making the allegations that he still has weapons of mass destruction. Now what about those inspectors who were closing in on the final 5%? No no no. Those inspectors are dead now. Because, you see, when the US pulled the inspectors out and had used the inspectors' information to bomb Saddam Hussein, when Saddam Hussein emerged from the rubble and said, "I'm still alive, you inspectors are never coming back in, because you're not here to disarm me, you're here to kill me. I reject you coming back." That's what happened. You heard a lot of talk about how Iraq kicked the inspectors out. They didn't. The US pulled the inspectors out. You heard a lot of talk about how Iraq obstructed the work of the inspectors. Yeah, they did. I'm not trying to give them a clean bill of health. But you have to understand that the US also corrupted the process of inspection.

That's the situation we've had now for four years. No inspectors in Iraq. We don't know what the final disposition of their weapons programs [is]. We don't know if they are fully disarmed. And this creates what I call the politics of ignorance, where the President of the US can say anything he

wants about Iraq, and we have no way of disproving it. Now you bring in the politics of fear that exists in this country, especially since September 11, 2001. After our country was attacked on September 11, the American people, by enlarge, were afraid, afraid of the unknown, afraid of terrorism. Now they are told to be afraid of Saddam, afraid of his weapons of mass destruction. The politics of fear and the politics of ignorance combine to create the situation that we face today. The situation where the President of the US can tell you that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction but not tell you how he knows. I mean, let's be serious. If you went to a doctor, and the doctor said, "hey, you've got a brain tumor, a big old cancerous growth right here in your head, and I want you to lie down on the table right now, and I'm going to whop off the top of your head and dig that tumor out and save your life," wouldn't you want to see the x-ray? You would, wouldn't you? You'd say, "Doc, can I see the x-ray or the MRI? I want to see this little lump in my head," and if the doctor said "no, just trust me. Trust me, it's there, lay down on the table," would you be a fool laying down on that table? Of course you would. The President of the US has told us that we have a cancerous growth called Saddam Hussein that needs to be excised. The President of the US is telling us that Iraq has these weapons capabilities that are ready to attack us, but he won't provide the evidence. He won't provide the x-ray or the MRI. And yet we're going to go to war, and the American public isn't demanding answers. Why? Politics of fear, the politics of ignorance.

Ladies and gentlemen, one thing I'd like you to consider is that it's not inconceivable for a President to lie to the American people. It's not inconceivable for a President to lie to the American people for the purposes of generating support for a war. Read your history books. 1964, Gulf of Tonkin. Lyndon Johnson lied to the American people, fabricated an attack on American shipping, got congress to sit down and pass him sweeping war powers capabilities that lead to our involvement in Vietnam. It took America ten years, 58,000 dead soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, and over two million dead Vietnamese, and a trillion plus dollars of wasted national treasure before we realized that we had made a mistake. We're getting ready to go to war again, ladies and gentlemen, a war that could be every bit as bad as Vietnam, a war that could be worse than Vietnam. Shouldn't we be debating this before we go to war? Shouldn't we be having a national dialogue before we go to war? Shouldn't we have all the facts put on the table before we go to war? Shouldn't we ask to see the x-ray, the MRI, before we go to war? But we're not. I don't know how many people followed the debate that took place in congress last week about war. There was a lot of misinformation in there. There was a lot of non-information at all. Congress basically was bullied into giving the President these war power acts. I think congress ran away. Read the Constitution. It comes back to that. Why did our founding fathers give congress the power to declare war? Because they wanted Congress to understand the ramifications of their action. You see, declaring war is a final action. Declaring war requires a little bit of courage. Declaring war requires congress and senators to stare their constituents in the eye and say, "I am declaring war, and you are going to fight, and you're going to die, and you're going to kill in the name of the American people." It puts a lot on the line there. What did congress just do? Mr. President, here's a war powers thing, and a lot of them. "I'm voting for war to avoid war." It's a funny statement. You just gave the President the ability to go to war. They didn't declare war. They washed their hands, like Pontius Pilate washing his hands. They gave the President the authority to go to war in the name of the American people, but congress isn't going to be held into account. That's not the way American democracy works.

So, once again, we come back to this concept of citizenship. You're going to get the right to vote pretty soon. Voting is the greatest equalizer we have in this thing we call American democracy. Voting makes us all equal. We all get to go at the end of the day and pull that lever. We get to hold our representatives accountable. Our representatives take decisions in our name, and these decisions sometimes have great consequences like war. Right now, we have a situation where it's stunning. Congressmen acknowledged that they were receiving phone calls, faxes, and letters 50-100 to 1 against going to war, and it was overwhelming, just the wave of anti-war sentiment coming and saying, "don't go to war. We won't support it." But what did congress do? They put that aside, and they voted for it, not because they wanted to represent the will of the people but because they were scared of this upcoming election. You see, they thought that, if they voted against the war, that the Republicans, if you were a Democrat, the Republicans would come and say you're soft on Saddam, you're not supporting the President in a time of war, etc., and they would lose the election. They didn't trust you. They didn't trust the people. And maybe they shouldn't. Because, frankly speaking, the people haven't done a very good job in the last couple years in terms of participating in American democracy. See, what happens when American democracy falls asleep is that we start stumbling towards an abyss, and this is what's happening today. We are on the verge of a war that, by classified Pentagon assessments, could cost us 20-30,000 dead, that could kill upwards of 100,000 Iraqis right up front, maybe more down the road, that could lead to a 15-year occupation of Iraq with 100-150,000 American troops. This is a major, major issue, and, yet, we're sort of stumbling towards it like a flock of lemmings heading to the cliff, except that the leaders of the lemmings aren't going over the cliff with us. They're just encouraging us to keep moving. Democracy only functions if we, the people, get involved. It only functions well if we, the people, get involved empowered with knowledge and information. We needed to have a debate, a national debate on Iraq. We didn't have one. We're going to war. Don't let this mistake ever happen again. The power is in your hands. And, again, I'm addressing the students at Deerfield. The power is in your hands. Be good citizens. Become involved. Become empowered with knowledge. Make votes. Hold your elected representatives accountable. Don't allow the mistake that you're going to see materialize in front of your eyes and now trust me, we're going to war. You're going to live through a nightmare. We have to learn from this mistake. We have to learn that these sorts of things can be avoided if you get involved. That would be the biggest lesson I hope you take away from all this. So you have to become good citizens. Good citizenship doesn't mean you're anti-war or pro-war. At the end of the day, you could take all the information, digest it, and say, "you know, Scott, I disagree with you. I think that we have to go to war. I think that Iraq is a threat." And you know what? That's an informed decision, and I respect that. I don't want people to support everything I said. I'm just trying to throw out some information and facts that you may not have heard on TV or read in the newspaper, to generate a discussion, to generate a debate, a dialogue. It's amazing, that's what American democracy is supposed to be about. You know, on local political issues, I mean, you guys have student government, so when you run for office, you've got people out there. Some people want more student power, some people want less, I don't know what your decisions are, but you have two groups who debate. At the end of the debate, the person who wins, does he turn to the person who lost and say, "traitor, unpatriotic?" No. See, everybody was a patriot. Everybody was a good citizen by being involved. And yet, on issues of national security, somehow the American public is intimidated. You see, right now, to speak out against the President's war on Iraq gets you labeled as a traitor. I'm a twelve-year veteran of the United States Marine Corps. I've gone to war for my country. I've got two classified commendations from the director of the CIA for my work in defense of American

democracy. And, yet, I am labeled as a traitor, unpatriotic for speaking out in this manner. How can that be? How can anybody be unpatriotic if they participate in a process of American democracy? You cannot allow the politics of fear, intimidation, and ignorance to drive you as citizens. Empower yourself with information, with knowledge, and participate, participate, participate. Because that's the only way we're going to prevent our country from making the kind of mistake that it's making right now. Hold your elected representatives accountable for what they do in your name. Thank you very much. *Applause*