

**Addressing the Iraqi WMD Threat  
Testimony before the  
Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation,  
and Federal Services  
Senate Government Affairs Committee  
March 1, 2001**

**Robert J. Einhorn  
Senior Adviser, Center for Strategic and International Studies  
Washington, D.C.**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on the question of how the United States should deal with the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) threat posed by Iraq.

Although President Bush has put Iraq in the same category as Iran and North Korea as states hostile to the U.S. that are seeking WMD capabilities, the current regime in Baghdad is truly in a class by itself. It has invaded Iran and Kuwait (seeking to absorb the latter), harbored terrorists, repressed and terrorized the Iraqi people, ignored United Nations Security Council resolutions, violated its international arms control obligations, fired ballistic missiles at its neighbors, pursued the full range of WMD programs, and used chemical weapons against Iran and its own people. Iraq has earned the right to be considered the world's number one outlaw state.

Iraq poses a critical test for the international community. Can a state defy the U.N. Security Council with impunity? Can it be allowed to regenerate WMD and other proscribed military programs and then use those capabilities to threaten its neighbors and other states farther away? We have an enormous stake in how those questions are answered, not just in terms of the stability of the Gulf region and the world at large, but also in terms of global efforts to prevent the proliferation of WMD and missile delivery capabilities.

If Iraq's WMD ambitions are not thwarted -- in a situation where a country has engaged in clear-cut acts of aggression, been defeated on the battlefield, been caught red-handed violating arms control agreements, and been subject to the most far-reaching verification measures every put in place -- a damaging precedent will be set for stopping proliferation in future cases where the circumstances for enforcing compliance are not nearly as promising. More specifically, if we fail to stop Iraq's WMD programs, we will have a much more difficult time heading off attempts by Iran to acquire corresponding capabilities. And a nuclear arms competition north of the Gulf would be sure to stimulate interest in such programs elsewhere.

Iraq deserves its place on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism. We should continue to investigate its possible links to anti-American terrorism, and we should continue to be concerned that it might in the future share WMD-related materials and expertise with terrorist groups. But National Security Adviser Rice was right when she said that we don't need evidence of a Baghdad connection to September 11<sup>th</sup> to know that Iraq is a menace to its neighbors and to international security. Iraq's determined and illegal pursuit of WMD capabilities is a sufficient basis -- independent of whatever role it may play in global terrorism -- to treat it as a dangerous threat that must be neutralized.

**Current Iraqi WMD programs and capabilities**

Despite persistent Iraqi efforts at deception, evasion, and concealment, the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) did a remarkable job for much of the 1990s in ferreting out and destroying a large share of Iraq's prohibited weapons and related infrastructure. However, when U.N. inspectors departed Iraq in December 1998, their work was far from done. Significant disarmament tasks and unresolved compliance

issues remained, especially in the biological and chemical weapons categories but also, to a lesser extent, in the missile and nuclear areas.

The absence of U.N. inspectors and operational monitoring equipment now for well over three years has magnified our uncertainties about Iraqi WMD programs and capabilities. During that period, there has been an increase in illicit Iraqi oil revenues, which are the proceeds of sales made outside the U.N.-mandated Oil-for-Food Program and are paid directly to Iraq rather than to the U.N. escrow account. These illicit oil sales, together with illegal surcharges paid to Iraq by disreputable oil traders operating within the Oil-for-Food Program, have been a source of unregulated income that Baghdad has used for clandestine purchases of goods to maintain the loyalty of regime supporters and to augment Iraq's conventional and non-conventional military capabilities. This acquisition of smuggled imports has been facilitated by the woefully inadequate monitoring of trade by Iraq's neighbors at their land borders with Iraq. Moreover, in addition to goods smuggled outside the Oil-for-Food Program, there is a growing risk -- in the absence of knowledgeable U.N. monitors in Iraq to do post-shipment checks -- that dual-use items imported legally under the Oil-for-Food Program will be diverted to proscribed weapons uses.

While acknowledging that Iraq's refusal to admit inspectors has been a serious handicap in keeping track of WMD-related developments, the CIA nonetheless judges that, "given Iraq's past behavior, it is likely that Baghdad has used the intervening period [since December 1998] to reconstitute prohibited programs." (Unclassified Report to Congress on the Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions, 1 January through 30 June, 2001.) The following is a brief summary of the status of Iraqi programs.

**Nuclear.** A combination of Desert Storm air strikes and UNSCOM/IAEA disarmament activities essentially eliminated the physical infrastructure of Iraq's pre-war nuclear weapons development program -- the nuclear facilities, equipment, and materials. However, the "intellectual infrastructure" remained largely intact. CIA Director George Tenet told the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on February 6<sup>th</sup>: "We believe Saddam never abandoned his nuclear weapons program. Iraq retains a significant number of nuclear scientists, program documentation, and probably some dual-use manufacturing infrastructure that could support a reinvigorated nuclear weapons program." It is generally assumed that teams of Iraqi specialists have been kept together by the regime and are engaged in theoretical weapons design work and other low-profile, laboratory-scale activities, including the development and perhaps the fabrication and operation of machines for the enrichment of uranium. Most IAEA and other experts on Iraq's nuclear program believe that, if Iraq could obtain sufficient weapons-grade fissile material (either through smuggling or producing it indigenously), it could construct a workable nuclear device in a matter of several months to a year.

The key, then, is access to bomb-grade nuclear material -- especially highly-enriched uranium, which is a much more likely choice for Iraq than plutonium. A year ago, the Pentagon reported that "Iraq would need five or more years and key foreign assistance to rebuild the infrastructure to enrich enough material for a nuclear weapon. This period would be substantially shortened should Baghdad successfully acquire fissile material from a foreign source." (Proliferation: Threat and Response, January 2001.) A critical question is whether Iraq, using either the centrifuge or diffusion method of enrichment, could produce enough weapons-grade uranium to build a bomb without being detected by remote intelligence-gathering means. Many experts believe it could.

**Biological.** After repeatedly denying the existence of a BW program, Iraq was forced to admit in 1995 that it had produced anthrax, botulinum toxins, and aflatoxins and that it had filled both missile warheads and aerial bombs with BW agent. The story it has stuck to in recent years, without providing any credible substantiation, is that all BW agents and munitions from its program were destroyed by Iraqi authorities. UNSCOM believed, however, that Iraq had produced three or four times more BW agent than it had declared and that large amounts of growth media, agents, and munitions remain accounted for. The CIA maintains that Iraq has continued dual-use research that could be used to enhance its BW capabilities and assesses that Iraq "may again be producing biological warfare agents."

**Chemical.** UNSCOM destroyed large quantities of Iraqi chemical warfare agents and munitions, but important questions remain about the size and disposition of the CW program. An Iraqi document once seen by a U.N. inspector suggested that Baghdad had under-declared its CW munitions and may have hidden about 6000 weapons. UNSCOM also reported that over 500 tons of precursor chemicals for the nerve agent VX remained unaccounted for. Despite repeated

denials by Iraq that it had produced VX in weapons-usable form, physical evidence of such weaponization was discovered and confirmed by international panels of experts. Since the Desert Fox bombing strikes in December 1998, the Iraqis have rebuilt several dual-use chemical facilities that formerly engaged in production for Iraq's CW program but are also capable of producing chemicals for legitimate industrial purposes. The CIA assesses that Iraq has the capability "to reinstate its CW programs within a few weeks to months."

**Missiles.** UNSCOM believed that it had accounted for the elimination of all but a handful of Iraq's SCUDs, although the U.S. intelligence community judges that a small covert force of SCUDs may still exist. More worrisome is what Iraq is currently doing under the guise of missile programs permitted under U.N. resolutions (i.e., missiles with ranges below 150 kilometers). Its liquid-fueled Al-Samoud missile is probably already capable of exceeding the range threshold and, in any event, the program is widely assumed by experts to be a test bed for longer-range missiles. Its short-range Ababil-100 missile program is providing Iraq with a solid-propellant infrastructure and other important technologies that can be applied to more capable, longer-range missiles in the future.

In his State of the Union speech, President Bush vowed to "prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world." He also noted that "time is not on our side. I will not wait on events while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer."

How close is the peril of Iraqi WMD? Today, or at most within a few months, Iraq could launch missile attacks with chemical or biological weapons against its neighbors (albeit attacks that would be ragged, inaccurate, and limited in size). Within four or five years, it could have the capability to threaten most of the Middle East and parts of Europe with missiles armed with nuclear weapons containing fissile material produced indigenously -- and to threaten U.S. territory with such weapons delivered by non-conventional means, such as commercial shipping containers. If it managed to get its hands on sufficient quantities of already-produced fissile material, these threats could arrive much sooner.

### **Thwarting Iraq's WMD ambitions**

By now -- after close to three decades of clandestine Iraqi efforts that were extraordinarily expensive in terms of the country's most productive human and material resources and after over a decade of subterfuge and sacrifice to protect that huge investment -- it should be clear that the current government in Baghdad is deadly serious about retaining and enhancing its WMD capabilities. The importance that the regime places on those capabilities can be measured not just by the monumental costs of the programs themselves but also by the national income -- estimated at well over \$100 billion -- that the leadership has chosen to forgo rather than to do what was necessary to have the economic sanctions removed.

Those outside Saddam's inner circle can only speculate about why those WMD programs and capabilities have been valued so highly. Perhaps Saddam calculated that they would give him a decisive military advantage in pursuing aggressive designs against Iraq's neighbors or an important political symbol in bolstering Iraq's claims to dominance in the Gulf region and leadership in the Arab world. Especially in recent years, Saddam may have regarded them as a counter to Iran's WMD programs, as a deterrent to American-led coalitions that might wish to attack Iraq, and as a means of ensuring the survival of the regime.

But one thing is for sure: the present regime in Baghdad will not voluntarily come clean about its current efforts and give up WMD and missile delivery capabilities for the future. The experience of recent years -- including the erosion of international support for sanctions, the growth of illegal oil sales and imports, and the end of Baghdad's diplomatic isolation -- has given Saddam confidence that momentum is on his side and that he can have his cake and eat it too (both the end of sanctions and the retention of Iraq's WMD programs). Indeed, Saddam may figure that he comes out a winner whether or not the sanctions are removed. If they are removed, he has prevailed. If not, he gets credit for defying the U.S., sympathy for being a victim, and an excuse for maintaining an iron grip at home. No inducements or blandishments -- not even the growing prospect of military action by the Bush Administration -- are likely to produce a genuine change of heart, and a decisive and credible change of behavior, as far as WMD is concerned.

In a February 7<sup>th</sup> letter to Turkish Prime Minister Ecevit, Saddam Hussein wrote: "As pertains to the weapons of mass destruction, Iraq which no longer has any of these weapons and has no intention of producing them, is in the

forefront of those who are keen that our region be free of weapons of mass destruction.” It is doubtful that anyone in the world believes this statement. It is equally doubtful that Saddam, having repeatedly staked out this position, will now reverse himself, make a confession about past and present transgressions, and do what would be required to give his reversal credibility.

Given these considerations, **one must conclude that the only reliable and durable way of preventing Iraq from regenerating and enhancing its WMD and proscribed missile programs is to replace the current regime in Baghdad with one that is prepared to abide by its international obligations.** Of course, there is no guarantee that a successor regime will be any less interested in Iraqi WMD capabilities than the present one. That will depend on such factors as its political complexion, the circumstances in which it came to power, its relationship with the United States and its neighbors, the attitudes of Russia and other Security Council members, and the status of WMD programs in Iran and elsewhere. But those uncertainties are subject to positive influence and are far preferable to the certainty of a Baghdad government that is bound and determined to acquire nuclear weapons and long-range means to deliver them -- and sooner or later will succeed.

A consensus seems to be developing in Washington in favor of “regime change” in Iraq, if necessary through the use of military force. The debate is no longer over “whether” but over “when” and “how.” This hearing of the Subcommittee was not convened to discuss the questions of when and how. But because a strategy for regime change is likely to take additional time to develop, prepare for, and execute -- anywhere from several months to a year or more -- we should give consideration to the **interim steps** we should be taking now to address the Iraqi WMD threat.

### **Smarter sanctions**

An important interim step will be to revise the current U.N. sanctions regime so as to expedite the delivery of humanitarian and other civilian goods to the Iraqi population while focusing the sanctions more narrowly on items that could contribute significantly to proscribed weapons programs. The U.N. Security Council agreed in November 2001 to make such revisions. If current negotiations stay on track -- and specifically if Russia joins the other P-5 members -- a modified system will take effect on May 30<sup>th</sup>.

Under current arrangements, almost all contracts for exporting goods to Iraq under the Oil-for-Food Program must be approved by members of the U.N. Sanctions Committee, including the United States. Under the revised approach, only contracts containing items on an agreed list of dual-use equipment and technology (i.e., the Goods Review List) would be referred to Committee members, who would either approve or deny them. All other contracts would receive “fast-track” approval without review by the Committee. Key elements of the U.N. sanctions regime would not be affected: revenues from oil sales would still have to be deposited in the U.N.-controlled escrow account; imports of all arms and arms-production technologies would still be prohibited; and the U.S. and other members of the Sanctions Committee would still have the right, acting on their own, to block the export of any items on the Goods Review List if they judged that there was a significant risk of diversion to a proscribed weapons program.

Focusing the “smart sanctions” only on dual-use items that have the potential to contribute significantly to proscribed weapons programs would markedly reduce the workload of U.S. reviewers and enable them to give more careful scrutiny to the most sensitive cases. The more streamlined procedures would also cut down on delays and bottlenecks in the approval process and facilitate the expeditious delivery of civilian goods to the Iraqi people. This would help reduce the strong criticism that the U.N. sanctions regime has received, especially in the Arab world, for the adverse effect the sanctions are believed to have had on Iraqi civilians. (In fact, the Iraqi government deserves much of the blame for its failure to draw on the ample funds that exist in the U.N. escrow account to purchase civilian goods for Iraq. Rather than spend those funds on the needs of his people, Saddam chose to leave the money sitting there and to blame the UN for the resulting suffering. By expediting the delivery of a wider range of civilian goods, the smart sanctions can make clear who is to blame for any shortages the Iraqi people continue to endure.)

While helping to shore up international support for the remaining, more tightly focused restrictions on Iraqi imports, the smart sanctions will not solve two of the most serious deficiencies in the current operation of the sanctions regime.

The revised approach will not stop or even reduce illegal oil sales, which give Iraq the revenue to purchase sensitive goods clandestinely. Iraq provides oil outside the Oil-for-Food Program to neighbors such as Jordan, Syria, and Turkey at heavily discounted rates. The beneficiaries of these discounts will be extremely reluctant to terminate the existing arrangements. Moreover, they argue that much of the money earned by Iraq from these discounted oil sales is not available for imports of sensitive technology because it is used to purchase non-sensitive goods (albeit outside the Oil-for-Food Program) from them. Given the strong views held on this matter by such close friends of the U.S. as Turkey and Jordan, this is an extremely hard problem to solve. Still, the Administration must do whatever it can to minimize Iraq's illicit oil revenues -- by pressing the neighboring states (especially Syria) to limit their purchases of Iraqi oil or to put those purchases under the Oil-for-Food Program and by strengthening the effort to stop middle-sized oil trading companies from paying illegal surcharges to Baghdad.

A second serious problem not addressed by the smart sanctions is clandestine Iraqi imports. Truckloads of goods come into Iraq unmonitored and, with more countries resuming flights into Baghdad International Airport, the potential for using air cargoes to smuggle in sensitive goods is growing. Past efforts to get Iraq's neighbors to take a more serious approach to border controls have been met with resistance on the grounds that they lack the resources to do the job and that more rigorous screening would be highly disruptive of cross-border trade arrangements critical to them economically. Despite this resistance, the Administration should do what it can -- including increasing its technical and material assistance for border controls -- to persuade Iraq's neighbors to do a better job stopping illegal Iraqi imports. It should also press states that trade with Iraq to scrutinize exports more carefully to ensure that they are not contributing to proscribed Iraqi programs.

### **Return of the inspectors: verification gain or trap?**

In the last several weeks, President Bush and his senior advisers have repeatedly called for the return of U.N. inspectors to Iraq. However, a number of experts outside the government -- as well as some Administration officials -- have expressed skepticism about the value of resuming U.N.-mandated verification in Iraq, and have even suggested that the return of inspectors could undermine U.S. objectives. Uncertainty about the Administration's attitude has led to speculation that its calls for inspection are intended to provide a justification for military action if Baghdad -- as expected -- refuses to admit the inspectors. It is therefore useful to review the arguments for and against returning the inspectors.

Critics of sending inspectors back to Iraq say that the UN Monitoring, Verification, and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) would not have the intrusive and comprehensive inspection rights enjoyed by UNSCOM and, in any event, would not exercise them as aggressively as its predecessor had. Moreover, they argue, the resumption of inspections would not provide much verification benefit, both because the Iraqis have had years to perfect their concealment methods and because they would simply deny access if the inspectors got near anything incriminating. Early on, the critics warn, Iraq's supporters on the Security Council, especially Russia, would start demanding the suspension and lifting of all remaining sanctions on the grounds that the failure to find evidence of non-compliance shows that there is nothing to find. According to this scenario, Iraq would be given an unwarranted clean bill of health and strong pressures would develop for ending the sanctions regime altogether.

Just as worrisome, assert the critics, is that having the inspectors in Iraq will complicate a strategy of regime change. In addition to the practical matter of ensuring that inspectors do not become targets or hostages in any military action, the return of inspectors would give other countries, including the Europeans and states of the Middle East, an excuse for arguing that military action should be deferred while inspections are "given a chance" to resolve the WMD issue.

### **Risks are not as great as feared**

Some of the concerns of the skeptics are exaggerated. On paper, at least, UNMOVIC has the same rights as UNSCOM. Security Council resolution 1284 states that "Iraq shall allow UNMOVIC teams immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records and means of transportation which they wish to

inspect.” Moreover, while UNMOVIC’s operating style would be less aggressive than that of UNSCOM, what we know about UNMOVIC’s leadership and its plans for resuming work in Iraq suggests that the new body would carry out its mandate in a meticulous and thoroughly professional manner. Hans Blix, UNMOVIC’s Executive Chairman, has taken the view that “cosmetic inspections are worse than none,” and that the Security Council has not authorized him to provide Iraq any “discounts” on its obligations.

With respect to concerns about the hasty suspension of sanctions, Security Council resolution 1284 prescribes a necessary sequence of milestones that must precede any decision on suspension. Given the need to set up equipment, re-establish a monitoring baseline at hundreds of sites throughout Iraq, approve a work program, and evaluate the degree of Iraqi cooperation for a required length of time (120 days), such a decision could come no sooner than about 9-11 months after the inspectors returned.

With respect to concerns about Iraq receiving an unwarranted clean bill of health, resolution 1284 makes clear that no decision to “suspend” sanctions can be taken until UNMOVIC and the IAEA report that Iraq is cooperating “in all respects” and making progress in resolving “key remaining disarmament tasks.” The mere absence of new discoveries of non-compliance would not constitute cooperation; Iraq would have to provide the necessary access to locations and people and work actively to help solve remaining issues. In the event that Baghdad blocked inspections, refused to turn over documents, or rebuffed attempts to interview specialists, UNMOVIC and the IAEA would have a powerful weapon at their disposal. They could simply report that Iraq is not cooperating -- in which case resolution 1284 specifies that sanctions could not be suspended or, once suspended, would be reinstated. No decision to “lift” sanctions altogether could be taken until all remaining disarmament issues, not just the “key disarmament tasks,” are resolved. Moreover, decisions to suspend or lift sanctions must be taken by the Security Council, and an affirmative U.S. vote would be required.

The critics are probably right that the inspectors would rarely, if ever, be able to find -- or be allowed by the Iraqis to gain access to -- proscribed weapons, equipment, and facilities that Baghdad has taken pains to conceal. But even if the inspection teams are unable to finish the job of disarming Iraq and bringing it into compliance with its obligations, their presence in Iraq would still be of value in terms of understanding and constraining the WMD threat -- especially compared to the current situation.

The installation of sophisticated monitoring equipment at hundreds of locations and the constant movement of inspection teams around the country would complicate Iraq’s covert programs, making it harder and more expensive to keep those efforts hidden and probably slowing their pace and decreasing their scale. By closely monitoring Iraq’s missile production and testing facilities, the inspectors would gain a better appreciation of the nature of Iraq’s missile programs than we now get through remote means. With respect to known dual-use chemical and biological facilities and other installations now considered suspicious, special sensors and site visits could provide confidence -- at least while the monitoring equipment was operating and the inspectors had access -- that prohibited activities were not taking place at those locations. U.N. monitors could also do post-delivery checks within Iraq to verify that potentially sensitive dual-use equipment and materials imported through the Oil-for-Food Program have been put to their declared use rather than diverted to weapons programs.

These benefits do not add up to stopping Iraq’s illegal weapons programs. But in terms of keeping track of WMD-related developments in Iraq, they would constitute a significant advance over what we can do today.

### **But some concerns are well-founded**

While the critics tend to exaggerate the risks and minimize the benefits of resuming U.N.-mandated verification in Iraq, they do make some telling arguments.

In particular, they are right that U.N. inspectors cannot compel compliance and therefore cannot end the WMD threat posed by Iraq. At their very best, U.N. monitoring and inspections can complicate, constrain, and slow Iraq’s clandestine efforts and give us a better picture of what is going on in Iraq than we currently have. But that amounts to containing or managing the threat, not eliminating it.

Moreover, the critics are right that a resumed U.N. verification effort in Iraq would hardly be a stable or durable arrangement. The Iraqis, in the expectation that sanctions would soon be dropped, might be on their best behavior, at least at the outset. For example, they would probably not interfere with the installation of equipment at previously monitored facilities. But as UNMOVIC and the IAEA sought to monitor and inspect new sites, and as they pressed Iraq for documents and interviews to help resolve outstanding issues, the "cat and mouse" game would begin. Iraq's lack of cooperation might be passive at first (e.g., failure to produce documentation) but could be expected to grow more active (e.g., blockage of inspection teams). When UNMOVIC and the IAEA reported Iraq's non-cooperation to the Security Council and the prospect of suspending sanctions was pushed further into the future, Iraq would grow increasingly impatient and frustrated. Sooner or later a confrontation would almost surely take place. Iraq might evict the inspectors again or the U.N. might decide to withdraw them because their situation had become untenable. If this is an accurate forecast -- and the experience of the 1990s gives little reason to believe it is not -- it raises serious questions about the value of sending the inspectors back at all.

The resumption of U.N. inspections could also lead to serious disputes within the P-5, especially between Russia and the United States. We could expect Russia and perhaps other P-5 members to minimize the significance of unresolved disarmament issues, find excuses for Iraqi non-cooperation, and seek the earliest possible suspension and lifting of sanctions. The Russians would be supported by many countries that have long favored the removal of sanctions and the avoidance of a confrontation with Iraq at any cost. While the U.S. could, if necessary, exercise its veto to prevent a premature and undeserved removal of sanctions, pressures for removing them could build (regardless of the extent of Iraqi cooperation) and the U.S. could find itself increasingly isolated for what would be portrayed as an excessively demanding position.

Finally, the return of U.N. inspectors could indeed complicate a strategy of regime change. A large number of countries could be expected to make the case that, as long as there is any prospect that U.N. inspectors can resolve the WMD issue peacefully, military action should be put off. The controversy over whether military action was "premature" under the circumstances could make it harder to gain the support of the key countries needed to execute a strategy of regime change.

### **Will Iraq admit the inspectors?**

The debate about whether the inspectors should return is probably moot. So far, Iraq has showed no willingness to accept UN inspections on terms the U.S. could conceivably support. In a recent interview in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz offered -- knowing that it was a non-starter -- that Iraq would allow inspectors only if other countries (i.e., Israel) admitted them to ensure the absence of WMD anywhere in the Middle East.

Still, we cannot altogether rule out the possibility of an Iraqi reversal on admitting the inspectors, especially if the Bush Administration's recent tough posture has made Iraq nervous and if the Russians are applying strong pressures on Baghdad. If the Iraqis surprised us and said the inspectors could return, the Administration -- especially after what it has been saying recently about the need for the inspectors to return -- would presumably have no choice but to go along. But it would have to insist on a clear understanding among the P-5 that U.N. verification would be carried out in accordance with existing Security Council resolutions (including with respect to the timing and the conditions for considering a suspension of sanctions) and not on the basis of any new rules Iraq wished to establish.

### **Conclusions**

Iraq already can threaten its neighbors with chemical and biological weapons. Unless it is stopped, it will sooner or later have nuclear weapons. We just don't know how long that will be -- and we don't even know whether we will be able to detect Iraq's achievement of a nuclear capability. Clearly, time is not on our side.

There are steps we can take now to address the Iraqi WMD threat. We can put in place smarter sanctions that can help shore up international support for retaining restrictions on sensitive Iraqi imports. We can seek to minimize illicit Iraqi oil revenues, urge tighter monitoring of trade at Iraq's borders, press supplier governments to adopt more rigorous scrutiny and control over exports to Iraq, and work with other governments to interdict sensitive cargoes headed to Iraq

when we receive information about such shipments. And if Iraq agrees to admit U.N. inspectors on terms provided for in existing Security Council resolutions, we can give our full support to that resumed verification effort, while stressing to the other P-5 members the need to be resolute and unified in the face of any Iraqi failure to provide full cooperation.

Taken together, such steps may be able to buy some additional time. But they cannot provide any assurance that current Iraqi WMD programs will be stopped and prevented from regenerating. That -- as more and more Americans of both political parties are coming to agree -- will require replacing the regime in Baghdad.