

Patience, not war

by Terry Sanford

Senator Sanford is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and is a North Carolina Democrat serving his first U. S. Senate term.

Last week's meeting of Secretary of State Baker with the foreign minister of Iraq was disappointing, but not surprising. So nothing has changed. There is no new justification for the United States to succumb to anger and rush to war.

It has always been easier to settle an argument with a gun. It is much more difficult to settle one by other means. To find a way to resolve national difference without war, people throughout the world have been struggling, without success, for all of the century and longer.

But we are making progress. Probably the greatest thing coming out of World War II was the birth of the United Nations. Until now, the U.N. has been stymied by the Cold War conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States. In the Iraqi crisis, we have seen how effectively the United Nations mobilized its moral force, backing it up with the military might of its members, principally, the United States. Today, we have arrayed in Saudi Arabia the greatest concentration of military might since World War II. The question is which way do we go first? Do we resort to the age-old way of war, or do we at least try to use this new force of sanctions available to us through the combined weight of the nations of the world through the United Nations?

After the invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein, I wired President Bush to congratulate him for taking a strong stand against Iraq's illegal aggression and to note the rare opportunity that it presented. I believed he could be the president who finally made the United Nations work for the benefit of all the world.

Indeed, the time for that kind of resolution of conflict has arrived. The time has come when punishing aggression, preventing war-like acts by nations, can likely be accomplished through the strength of the United Nations. The only fortunate side of the invasion of Kuwait is that Saddam Hussein has given us the opportunity to show just how effective we can be without actually going to war.

We can teach Saddam a lesson, we can teach would-be aggressors the same lesson, and we can greatly diminish the chance of future invasions of neighboring nations.

Through the United Nations we have isolated Iraq politically, commercially, and economically. We have sealed Iraq off from the rest of the

It is, I suggest, immoral to start a shooting war until we have exhausted all other alternatives. It is not only reckless impatience, but a lack of real courage to rush hurriedly into war.

world. If we continue relentlessly to enforce the embargo, we will have caused economic collapse, which certainly will have the capacity to bring Iraq into compliance with the demands of the rest of the world.

It is not only reckless impatience, but, I would suggest, a lack of real courage to rush hurriedly into war. We will have not given the embargo enough time to be effective. Risking lives in a war is not to be taken lightly. Certainly, where we have such a good alternative as we now have, it would be unthinkable not to try it. Obviously, it takes time, it takes courage, it takes moral strength, it takes patience, it takes wisdom, to make the nation being punished realize the embargo can be forever. That is the path I hope our president will take.

War, actually, is not the courageous choice. You can make the decision, Mr. President, that gives us a great opportunity for building a more stable world. We can make the United Nations work. The chances are good that the embargo will be effective. It is, I suggest, immoral to start a shooting war until we have exhausted all other alternatives.

Let us stand tall, Mr. President. Let's not take the quick and easy way. Future generations will praise your wisdom. Mothers, wives and children will offer prayers of thanksgiving that you got the job done without sacrificing the lives of our loved ones.

Stand behind Bush

by Jesse A Helms

Mr. Helms is serving his fourth term in the U. S. Senate. He is the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary of State Baker's seven-hour meeting in Geneva made clear that President Bush and Secretary Baker have exhausted every reasonable diplomatic effort to resolve the crisis in Kuwait. The Iraqi refusal even to receive the president's letter in a diplomatic forum demonstrates a complete lack of good faith in the peace process.

It is now time for the American people to rally around the president and support the 400,000 American troops now poised in the gulf. These 400,000 troops in the Persian Gulf are in a situation fraught with danger.

For the past five months the American people have been subjected to a cacophony of carping criticism and second-guessing that, intentionally or not, has persuaded Saddam Hussein that the will of the American people is weak when vital principles are at stake. The only hope for avoiding hostilities—if there is a hope—is for Saddam Hussein to be convinced beyond a doubt that the American people stand behind their president.

I have not agreed with all aspects of the president's program, but I communicated my concerns to him privately. I have issued no press releases, nor have I consented to go on television to differ with president. Now that the critical moment has arrived, it is time for all of us to stand united behind him.

On August 8, in response to the request by Saudi Arabia, the president sent troops to the gulf. The president stated four goals: the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait; the restoration of the legitimate government of Kuwait; the security and stability of the Persian Gulf; and the protection of the lives of American citizens abroad.

All four of these goals are directly related to the national interest of the United States. The principle of national sovereignty is the very basis of our independence and national survival. These principles are of particular importance to the United States when the victim whose sovereignty is violated is a country such as Kuwait, which has a key role in economic and diplomatic relationships with the United States.

President Bush is to be commended. He has not deviated from his original purposes. His forthright stand has protected American lives in Kuwait and Iraq. He has demonstrated that we are willing and able to protect the security and stability of the Persian Gulf.

Congress has a duty to abandon partisanship, just as it did 50 years ago when another tyrant threatened the freedom and security of the world.

All presidents in modern times have made the security and stability of the Persian Gulf a paramount interest of our foreign policy. Our interest is not, in the first place, economic. But the oil supplied by the gulf is indeed a major element in our own national security and stability. If we allow aggression to disrupt our relationships with friendly governments, the strength and independence of the United States is threatened.

The president's action in August was therefore action in the defense of the nation.

Some have argued that the sanctions imposed upon Iraq must be given time to work. They have already worked. They are demonstrated that the whole world is standing together against the aggression of Saddam Hussein. The world does not turn upon economic issues alone, and it is difficult to imagine that a tyrant who has killed 500,000 of his own people for political reasons will be persuaded ultimately by an economic squeeze. Besides, Saddam Hussein has stolen almost \$7 billion in gold and cash from the Kuwait central bank, and he has the economic cushion to resist the squeeze.

The U.S. Constitution was carefully crafted to allow much room for judgement in matters of war. The power to declare war does indeed lie with Congress—nobody disputes that—but Congress has used that power only five times. On the other hand, the power to make war clearly belongs with the commander-in-chief. The president has a duty to seek the support of Congress, and he had some that. But the Congress has a duty to close ranks and abandon partisanship, just as it did 50 years ago when another tyrant threatened the freedom and security of the world.