

Despite an outstanding 2002 Interpol warrant, until last week he was able to successfully dodge arrest.

Mr. President, Viktor Bout benefited from the unrestrained capitalism and weak institutions that emerged in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union. He used that tumultuous period for his own personal gain, as he built an aircraft fleet, purchased cheaply from the stockpiles of discarded Cold War weapons, and sought out clients around the globe to help perpetuate his diabolical money-making schemes. He exploited the dearth of arms control initiatives in fledging countries and recognized that the lack of an international framework would serve his interests well.

According to Douglas Farah, one of the authors of the recently published "Merchant of Death," "[it] is highly unlikely [Bout] could have flown aircraft out of Russia and acquired huge amounts of weapons from Soviet arsenals without the direct protection of Russian intelligence, and, given his background, the [Russian military intelligence] seems the most likely candidate." Indeed, it is likely that such assistance was needed to create such a vast empire.

Mr. President, this empire had many and varied clients. In fact, during the early years of the Iraq war, Bout's aircrafts were used to support U.S. Government contractor and subcontractor work. I inquired about the use of these aircrafts at a 2004 Iraq hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and learned shortly thereafter that both the State and Defense Departments had done business with Bout. Not long after my inquiry, this business relationship was purportedly terminated and Bout's assets were frozen by the Treasury Department. But despite this corrective action, Bout's work remained uninhibited and, according to some credible reports, he continued to associate with other entities of the U.S. Government.

Bout was clearly a savvy and dependable broker, but he used these talents to do business with some of the most unsavory characters in the world. The U.N. investigative team which pursued Bout found that he was pouring small arms and ammunition into Afghanistan, Angola, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and the Democratic Republic of Congo for years—enabling millions of innocent people to be slaughtered and supporting carnage at unprecedented levels.

Bout was able to circumvent both national and international arms controls by exploiting holes in the system. Despite the arrest warrants, asset freezes, and international embargoes, he was able to operate with impunity because of the lack of concerted international cooperation within the arms control and law enforcement arenas. Last week's arrest is a testament to the importance of that global cooperation and a reminder that as our world continues

to globalize we must work together in order to hold individuals like Bout accountable for their actions.

UPCOMING ELECTIONS IN ZIMBABWE

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, since independence in 1980, politics in Zimbabwe had been dominated by one party and indeed one man President and head of the ruling ZANU-PF, Robert Mugabe. In February 2000, Zimbabwe's citizens delivered a blow to President Mugabe when they rejected his party's proposed new constitution, and then in June's legislative elections, even without access to the state-run media and without significant financing, opposition candidates managed to win 58 of 150 parliamentary seats, up from just 3.

In 2000, I joined many in Zimbabwe and the international community in hoping that this victory would mark the end of the ruling party's stranglehold on the state and herald the opening of democratic space and opportunities in a country that has seen repression for too long. Instead, Mr. Mugabe and his party responded to these defeats by tightening their grip on power. In 2000, international headlines warned of "Zimbabwe's unprecedented economic and social crisis" with unemployment at 50 percent and almost 60 percent inflation, and the 2000 elections were marred by the harassment of opposition candidates and supporters in which at least 25 were killed.

These numbers pale in comparison with the devastating economic and political situations in Zimbabwe today. According to official figures, annual inflation now tops 100,000 percent with 80 percent employment despite the fact that at least one quarter of the population has fled the country. Meanwhile, the harassment and intimidation of the independent media, opposition politicians, civil society leaders, and human rights advocates has become more widespread and systematic.

Exactly 1 year ago today, when opposition party activists and members of civil society attempted to hold a peaceful prayer meeting in response to President Mugabe's announcement that he would seek reelection, they were brutally assaulted by ZANU-PF police officers, security forces, and youth militia. More than 50 were arrested, at least 1 killed, and many badly beaten.

On this somber anniversary, I appeal to political leaders here in the United States, in Africa, and around the world to send a strong signal to President Mugabe and his supporters that we want to see Zimbabwe recover from its current crisis and we will be watching as the unprecedented simultaneous presidential and legislative general elections are held on March 29. The violent repression, and even coercive harassment, we saw in March 2007 is unacceptable and will have negative consequences both internally and externally.

For years, I have been frustrated and saddened by the hastening decline of this country. The courageous, patriotic citizens of Zimbabwe who resist the state's repression, even at enormous personal cost, must know that the world supports them, and the country's corrupt and tyrannical rulers must be told that their time is up.

Although it will not happen this month, I hope that someday soon the people of Zimbabwe will be given a chance to freely express their will in a genuine democratic process that is free from manipulation, intimidation, and coercion.

THE TRUE COSTS OF THE IRAQ WAR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the economists Linda Bilmes and Joseph Stiglitz recently produced an illuminating analysis of the real costs of the war in Iraq, which was published last Sunday in *The Washington Post*.

As the war grinds on toward its fifth year, and as the war continues to warp our Nation's priorities at home and abroad, this is an analysis that every American deserves to see. I also commend it to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, Mar. 9, 2008]

THE IRAQ WAR WILL COST US \$3 TRILLION, AND MUCH MORE

(By Linda J. Bilmes and Joseph E. Stiglitz)

There is no such thing as a free lunch, and there is no such thing as a free war. The Iraq adventure has seriously weakened the U.S. economy, whose woes now go far beyond loose mortgage lending. You can't spend \$3 trillion—yes, \$3 trillion—on a failed war abroad and not feel the pain at home.

Some people will scoff at that number, but we've done the math. Senior Bush administration aides certainly poo-hooed worrisome estimates in the run-up to the war. Former White House economic adviser Lawrence Lindsey reckoned that the conflict would cost \$100 billion to \$200 billion; Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld later called his estimate "baloney." Administration officials insisted that the costs would be more like \$50 billion to \$60 billion. In April 2003, Andrew S. Natsios, the thoughtful head of the U.S. Agency for International Development, said on "Nightline" that reconstructing Iraq would cost the American taxpayer just \$1.7 billion. Ted Koppel, in disbelief, pressed Natsios on the question, but Natsios stuck to his guns. Others in the administration, such as Deputy Defense Secretary Paul D. Wolfowitz, hoped that U.S. partners would chip in, as they had in the 1991 Persian Gulf War, or that Iraq's oil would pay for the damages.

The end result of all this wishful thinking? As we approach the fifth anniversary of the invasion, Iraq is not only the second longest war in U.S. history (after Vietnam), it is also the second most costly—surpassed only by World War II.

Why doesn't the public understand the staggering scale of our expenditures? In part because the administration talks only about the upfront costs, which are mostly handled